

# 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 XLIV.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1892.

NUMBER 2252.

## The Independent

For Table of Contents see Page 10.

### IN THE SNOW.

BY RICHARD HENRY STODDARD.

NOT as in this winter's snow,  
Where, while lost therein, I see  
No one out of doors but me;  
No one in the buried street,  
Nor in the cold blast of the sleet;  
But five-and-twenty years ago,  
When beneath a hostile star,  
The whole land was wrapt in war  
(Naught to hope, but much to fear),  
When these long embankments here  
Were projected, not in white  
But in great earth-works of red clay,  
Low in the morning, high at night,  
I tramp through the meadows, sad and slow,  
Where the distant bugles seem to blow  
Back to that burning August day!

NEW YORK CITY.

### THE CHICKADEE.

BY CELIA THAXTER.

CARE keeps its hold with constant clasp,  
Whatever may betide us;  
Grief waits the shrinking heart to grasp,  
Pacing, half veiled, beside us.  
But oh, the sky is blue,  
And oh, the sun is bright!  
And the chickadee in the dark pine tree  
Carols his meek delight.

The earth in silent snows is bound;  
Want grinds and pain oppresses;  
Life's awful problems who shall sound?  
Its riddles sad who guesses?  
But oh, the sky is blue,  
And oh, the sun is bright!  
And the chickadee in the tall pine tree  
Sings in the cold's despite.

Give me of thy wise hope, dear bird,  
Who brav'st the bitter weather!  
Share the glad message thou hast heard,  
And let us sing together.  
The winter winds blow wild,  
No storm can thee affright.  
Thy trust teach me, oh chickadee,  
Sweet chanting from thy light.

ISLES OF SEAGALS, N. H.

### OLD LAMPS FOR NEW.

BY REBECCA HARDING DAVIS.

ALL of the good Christian folk who read THE INDEPENDENT—whether they call themselves Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Unitarians, or by some other partisan name—are now no doubt busy making plans for the betterment of themselves and their neighbors during the year just begun. Indeed, they are perpetually devising new methods for drawing the minds of the people about them away from money-getting and money-spending up to God. They deserve credit for their new methods, some of which are helpful enough; but may I ask them why they do not try some of the old ones which have proved efficacious for many centuries?

Why, for example, have they cut themselves off wholly from the mighty aid of symbolism in teaching their religion? Take any house of worship (outside of the Roman and Episcopalian sects) in our smaller towns and villages, and there is nothing in its appearance to suggest to the child or ignorant man the idea it embodies any more than if it were a theater or a town hall. Inside

there may be soft seats for the luxurious comfort of the church-goers, or stained glass to please their eyes; but there is neither painting, sculpture nor symbol to remind them of the life of that Jesus in whom they profess to believe. Music and the efforts of the preacher are the only methods used to attract their attention, to warm their emotions, or to kindle their devotion.

Why should not the eye be appealed to as well as the ear?

Let us talk common sense about this thing and put aside for awhile the prejudices of our grandfathers.

It is folly to say that symbols and painting or sculpture do not powerfully influence the majority of men. The very people, good, well-meaning men and women, who would shudder at the introduction of a picture or crucifix in their meeting-house, touch their betrothal rings with tenderness, and look with brimming eyes at the clothes which their dead baby wore. Does not the poor photograph on the wall soften their hearts toward the prodigal son who is sowing his wild oats, they know not where? Did they not march to battle with stouter hearts for the sight of the old flag going before?

They all know the value of symbols. They use them in their college clubs, their political organizations, their friendships, their tenderest home ties, their treatment of their dead; everywhere—but in their religion. Why?

The American, passing through Continental Europe, finds in almost every town galleries of paintings of scenes in the history of the Savior. At the street corners there is the carven figure of the infant Jesus, his hands outstretched to bless. The roofs of the houses, even sometimes of the barns of pious peasants bear his name; in the fields or in solitary mountain passes stands the rude crucifix, to remind the lonely traveler of him.

What is all this?

"Romish" superstition you have been taught. Clear your eyes, look for yourself, and see that it is a great object lesson, by which the facts on which the Christian faith is based reach the knowledge and hearts of the people through their eyes.

You "fear that these people believe that the poor picture or stone figure is the real God and make an idol of it?"

Do you believe that it is your real son who hangs on the wall in the photograph, or your country itself that flutters in the flag?

Do not fall into the vulgar error of supposing that the man whom you do not know is necessarily less intelligent and more of a savage than yourself.

We Americans, for the most part, utterly reject this object teaching of our faith. We adhere to the purblind foolish policy of the Puritans who threw away, without discretion, every method, however good, of the Church which they left. They dealt according to their light with the needs of their day. Let us deal with the needs of ours.

There are literally millions of men, women and children in the United States now, both ignorant and educated, who never read the Bible, never go into a church, never hear a sermon. Except an occasional cross on a spire there is no outward visible sign in this country of the religion which it professes to believe. Here is a method by which the main facts underlying that religion can be brought before every man. Shall we reject the method because Cotton Mather did not like it? Is that reason enough?

Another question I should like to ask is, why all churches are not open at all times? If it serve a good purpose to have a house devoted to the worship of Almighty God by a hundred people on Sundays or on Wednesday nights, why should it not be devoted to his worship by any one of the hundred on any day or hour?

You will say, let the man and woman who long to come closer to their Heavenly Father for comfort and help on a week day enter into their closets, and, when they have shut the door, pray to him.

But suppose there is no closet? The manufacturer in his mills swarming with workmen, the lawyer in his office, the overworked mother in the wretched shanty, in which there is not a corner where she can be alone for a minute with her Maker, apart from the children to whom she is giving her life—it is not easy for them to find a secret place of rest and silence.

Why should their church offer them a refuge only for six hours in the week, and then, surrounded by a crowd? It should be always open; the place where they could

be sure of finding, what every human being should find each day, solitude and quiet for a brief space, to recollect himself, to see where he stands, to face his own soul and his God.

I shall be told, perhaps, that nobody would seek this place. A woman would not, probably, be ashamed to be seen going apart to pray on a work-day morning; but what would induce Mr. Smith on his way to his shop or his bank, or the young Smiths going to school to have the world know that they had turned aside for a moment to be alone with God? The act would be peculiar, eccentric; it might be mistaken for the hypocrisy of the Philistine, etc., etc.

The people whom we accuse of idolatry before their pictures and crucifixes are not troubled by these qualms or fears. Spend a morning in a cathedral in Rouen or Antwerp, and you will see not only young women and old crones on their way to market come in and drop on their knees in silent prayer, but merchants going to change, fashionably dressed young fellows and school-boys. They do not heed you or the crowd. They say their prayer and go out as simply and quietly as they would have bought food. One act is apparently as necessary to the day's routine as the other.

I remember one old woman who was kneeling one rainy afternoon last August before a crucifix on a bridge in Berne. She was in an agony of supplication, her hands were clenched, the tears streamed down her old cheeks, her eyes were fixed on the face of Christ. She was as utterly unconscious of the passing crowd as if they had been but the stones of the highway.

What American could have done this without shame?

I do not say that the prayers of many of these worshippers are not formal, or offered ignorantly. My point is that even if the man prays to the Virgin Mother, he is not ashamed to do it; he is not ashamed of his need or of his faith in a higher power who can help him.

We are ashamed. The majority of American men do not go into a church on Sunday, much less openly on a week day, with their heart's hurt to be healed.

Why is this? Is it because we have shut up our churches, kept our religion out of sight, unfamiliar to our children and young people, made of Jesus a doctrine, an idea, rather than a loving Man ready to help them in their smallest needs?

There are many things, it seems to me, which in our frantic haste to escape from the older sects we have thrown away, which some day we will go back and pick up again remorsefully.

PHILADELPHIA, PENN.

### A CHAIR RIDE IN KOREA.

BY BISHOP D. A. GOODSELL, D.D.

IT happened in this way. We had finished our work at Seoul, the squalid capital of Korea. The missionaries had met; the ordination was over; Japan called loudly for service. So we turned sadly and lovingly away from the brave men and women of the missions—I say missions, for the good Presbyterians were good Methodist Episcopalians while we were there—and then made ready for Nagasaki.

It was a June day; a perfect one. Our heavy baggage had been left at Chemulpo. A small trunk and lesser impediments had been packed over the mountain to Seoul. Much more must go back; for had we not found in a city where, some had told us nothing could be found, a lacquered trunk, bound intricately with brass, and inlaid with mother-of-pearl, in beauty beyond anything we had seen; wonderful brass ware, a butterfly brooch of white jade, silver, malachite, mother-of-pearl, red jade and false pearls fit to deceive the wisest; dainty brushes, embroidered satin pillow ends, chains of charms of Indian, Chinese, Japanese and Korean old coins, a venerable matchlock, native silk and grasscloth, old brass-bound cabinets and dressing cases where again mother-of-pearl painted the birds and fishes of Korea?

As all must reach the sea twenty-eight miles away on pony back, our packing was a fine art. Yet one thing went so well within another, and Mr. Ohlinger's white robed and black hatted teacher had such deft hands, that visibly we had but one trunk, three bags, and a box, no more than the stout little pony could well carry.

A crowd, not curious, gathered near the house. The Korean has far less curiosity than a Japanese; amazingly

debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real and full satisfaction to Divine [the Father's] justice in their behalf. Yet inasmuch as he was given by the Father for them, and his obedience and satisfaction accepted in their stead, and both freely not for anything in them, their justification is only of free grace; that both the exact justice, and rich grace of God might be glorified in the justification of sinners.

CHAPTER [XII] XIV.

OF ADOPTION.

No change was made in this chapter.

CHAPTER [XIII] XV.

OF SANCTIFICATION.

No change was made in this chapter.

CHAPTER [XIV] XVI.

OF SAVING FAITH.

The grace of faith, whereby sinners [the elect] are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts; and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the Word: by which, also, and by the administration of the sacraments and prayer, it is increased and strengthened.

CHAPTER [XV] XVII.

OF REPENTANCE UNTO LIFE.

IV. As there is no sin so small but it deserves CONDEMNATION; [damnation] so there is no sin so great that it can bring CONDEMNATION [damnation] upon those who truly repent.

CHAPTER [XVI] XVIII.

OF GOOD WORKS.

VII. Works done by unregenerate men, altho [for the matter of them] they may be things which God commands, and of good use, both to themselves and to others; and [while this] ALTHO THE neglect of such things is sinful and displeasing [unto] to God. Yet because they proceed not from a heart purified by faith, nor are done in a right manner according to the Word; nor to a right end, the glory of God, [they are, therefore, sinful] [not free from sin] DO NOT MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DIVINE LAW, [and cannot] be accepted of [please] God, or make a man meet to receive grace from God; HENCE THEY CANNOT BE PLEADED AS A GROUND OF ACCEPTANCE WITH GOD. [And yet their neglect of them is more sinful and displeasing unto God.]

CHAPTER [XVII] XIX.

OF THE PERSISTENCE OF THE SAINTS.

No change was made in this chapter.

CHAPTER [XVIII] XX.

OF THE ASSURANCE OF GRACE AND SALVATION.

No change was made in this chapter.

CHAPTER [XIX] XXI.

OF THE LAW OF GOD.

No change was made in this chapter.

CHAPTER [XX] XXII.

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY, AND LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.

No change was made in this chapter.

CHAPTER [XXI] XXIII.

OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP AND THE SABBATH DAY.

IV. Prayer is to be made for things lawful [for the forgiveness of all sins except the sin unto death], and for all sorts of men living, or that shall live hereafter; but not for the dead, [or for those of whom it may be known that they have sinned the sin unto death].

CHAPTER [XXII] XXIV.

OF LAWFUL OATHS AND VOWS.

III. Whosoever taketh an oath ought duly to consider the weightiness of so solemn an act, and therein to avouch nothing but what he is fully persuaded is the truth. Neither may any man bind himself by oath to anything but what is good and just, and what he believeth so to be, and what he is able and resolved to perform. [Yet it is a sin to refuse an oath touching anything that is good and just, being imposed by lawful authority.]

VII. No man may vow to do anything forbidden in the Word of God, or what would hinder any duty therein commanded, or which is not in his own power, and for the performance whereof he hath no promise or ability from God. In which respects [popish] monastical vows of perpetual single life, professed poverty, and regular obedience, are so far from being degrees of higher perfection, that they are DANGEROUS [superstitious and sinful] snares, in which no Christian may entangle himself.

CHAPTER [XXIII] XXV.

OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.

III. Civil magistrates may not assume to themselves the administration of the Word and sacraments; or the power of the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; or, in the least, interfere in matters of faith. Yet [as nursing fathers] it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the Church of our common Lord, without giving the preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest, in such a manner, that all ecclesiastical persons whatsoever shall enjoy the full, free and unquestioned liberty of discharging every part of their sacred functions, without violence or danger. And, as Jesus Christ hath appointed a regular government and discipline in his Church, no law of any commonwealth should interfere with, let or hinder, the due exercise thereof, among the voluntary members of any denomination of Christians, according to their own profession and belief. It is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the person and good name of all their people, in such an effectual manner as that no person be suffered, either upon pretense of religion or infidelity, to offer any indignity, violence, abuse or injury to any other person whatsoever; and to take order, that all religious and ecclesiastical assemblies be held without molestation or disturbance.

CHAPTER [XXIV] XXVI.

OF MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

III. It is lawful for all sorts of people to marry who are able with judgment to give their consent, yet it is the duty of Christians to marry only in the Lord. And, therefore, such as profess the true, reformed religion should not marry with infidels, nor with the adherents of false religions, [Papists or other idolaters] neither should such as are godly be unequally yoked, by marrying with such as are notoriously wicked in their life, or maintain damnable heresies.

CHAPTER [XXV] XXVII.

OF THE CHURCH.

The section relating to the Pope of Rome is altered so materially that the text of the present confession is given entire first, and the changes proposed are given in another paragraph.

VI. There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ; nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalted himself, in the Church, against Christ, and all that is called God.

VI. [There is no other head of the Church but the] The Lord Jesus Christ IS THE ONLY HEAD OF THE CHURCH and the claims of the Pope of Rome OR ANY OTHER HUMAN AUTHORITY to be the vicar of Christ, and [the] head of the Church universal is without warrant in Scripture or in fact, and is a usurpation dishonoring to the Lord Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER [XXVI] XXVIII.

OF THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

There is no change in this chapter.

CHAPTER [XXVII] XXIX.

OF THE SACRAMENTS.

There is no change in this chapter.

CHAPTER [XXVIII] XXX.

OF BAPTISM.

There is no change in this chapter.

CHAPTER [XXIX] XXXI.

OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

II. In this sacrament Christ is not offered up to his Father, nor any real sacrifice made at all for remission of sins of the quick or dead, but only a commemoration of that one offering up of himself, by himself, upon the cross, once for all, and a spiritual oblation of all possible praise unto God for the same; so that the [Popish] Roman Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, as they call it, is most [abominable] injurious to Christ's one only sacrifice for sin [the alone propitiation for all the sins of the elect].

VIII. Altho ignorant and wicked men receive the outward elements in this sacrament, yet they receive not the thing signified thereby; but by their unworthy coming thereunto are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, to their own condemnation [damnation]. Wherefore all ignorant and ungodly persons, as they are unfit to enjoy communion with him, so are they unworthy of the Lord's table, and cannot, without great sin against Christ, while they remain such, partake of these holy mysteries, or be admitted thereunto.

CHAPTER [XXX] XXXII.

OF CHURCH CENSURES.

II. To these officers the keys of the kingdom of Heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have ministerial and declarative power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by the word and censures; and to open it unto penitent sinners, by the ministry of the Gospel, and by absolution from censures, as occasion shall require.

CHAPTER [XXXI] XXXIII.

OF SYNODS AND COUNCILS.

There is no change in this chapter.

CHAPTER [XXXII] XXXIV.

OF THE STATE OF MAN AFTER DEATH, AND OF THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

There is no change in this chapter.

CHAPTER [XXXIII] XXXV.

OF THE LAST JUDGMENT.

There is no change in this chapter.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

IS IT BIBLICAL OR ANTI-BIBLICAL?

THE AMERICAN, ENGLISH AND GERMAN SCHOOLS ANALYZED.

THE CONCLUSIONS REACHED.

A SERMON.

BY PROF. W. H. GREEN, D.D., LL.D.,

MODERATOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

As an evidence of the great interest taken in the theological controversy now before the Churches, the topics discussed last Sunday in some of the leading churches of this city may be quoted. In the Madison Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, Professor Miley, of Drew Theological Seminary, spoke on "The Agency of the Holy Spirit in the Authorship of the Scripture." Professor Vincent, of the Union Seminary, discussed "The Bible and New Testament Criticism" at the Church of the Puritans in Harlem. Dr. Behrends, of the Central Congregational Church of Brooklyn, presented "The Bible and the Present Drift of Religious Thought" at the Church of the Covenant. A fourth sermon, on the same general subject, was delivered by Dr. Remensnyder, of St. James's Lutheran Church. Prof. W. H. Green, of Princeton Seminary, analyzed "The Anti-Biblical Higher Criticism" in the Marble Collegiate Church (Dr. Burrell's) on Fifth Avenue.

Dr. Green is recognized as the leading conservative Bible critic of this country, and his position as Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly entitles him to a wide hearing. Taking for his text the statement of the Master that Moses wrote of him, he presented and criticized the methods of the Higher Critics of this country and Europe, which criticism, he said in conclusion, would be called not Biblical, but anti-Biblical. The following is the sermon in full.

"For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?"—John v. 44, 47;

No graver crisis has ever confronted the evangelical Churches of Christendom, than that which they are called to face at present; none which affects matters so fundamental, or the issues of which are so serious and so far-reaching. Heretofore, the contests within the Church have concerned questions of doctrine or

of policy, more or less momentous; but all parties recognized one supreme authority. The Word of God was the admitted standard by which all controversies were to be ultimately decided. But now the Word of God is itself brought into question, and the issue which is forced upon us, is the Bible what the Church has always believed it to be, and what we have always been taught to regard it? Or must the old view of the Bible be given up, and a new view be substituted for it, by which its authority and trustworthiness will be seriously impaired?

Attacks upon the genuineness and the truth of the books of the Bible, made by the enemies of the Bible, are no new thing. Nor is there anything novel in such attacks made in the name of Biblical Criticism by scholars, who have no faith in the supernatural. They cannot consistently do otherwise than discredit the books of Moses with the marvelous miracles which they record, and the accurately fulfilled prophecies which they contain. The only thing that is novel in the present situation is the acceptance of these critical conclusions by Christian scholars, who claim to be evangelical in their creed, and to be reverent students of the Word of God.

They admit the allegation that it has been demonstrated that several of the books of the Bible were not written by the persons to whom they have heretofore been attributed. But this, they affirm, need occasion no concern. It is really no damage to the Christian faith. Human authorship matters little in the books of Scripture. The only thing of consequence is divine authorship. Let the critics establish what they may, the heart of the matter is beyond their reach. The divine origin and authority of Scripture are not dependent upon their human authors, but upon God, whose Word it is.

Now we wish it distinctly understood at the outset that we do not object to the application of the most searching tests to the books of Scripture, and the most thorough scrutiny as to their real origin. Turn on the light from every possible quarter and ascertain the exact truth. If all antiquity has been in error and the Jewish people and the Christian Church through all the ages have been in error in believing that the Pentateuch was the production of Moses, let the truth be told to the heavens fall.

We think it capable of demonstration that Moses did write the Pentateuch and that the objections by which the attempt has been made to set aside the faith of all past ages and to contravene the explicit testimony of our Lord in this matter can be shown to be invalid. This, however, is not the point to which I ask your attention at this time. My object at present is to set before you the gravity of the question at issue. It is not so indifferent a matter as it has been represented to be, whether or no Moses wrote the Pentateuch. It is said that the contents of the first five books of the Bible remain the same, whoever wrote them and whenever they were written. It may still be the Word of God and equally command our faith, whether it was all written in the Mosaic age and by Moses himself, or was written by other inspired men in later ages.

But this reasoning leaves out of view the intimate connection between the genuineness of a production and its truth and authority. It is not accounted a matter of indifference in the affairs of ordinary life, whether a legal instrument, claiming to be authoritative, or commercial paper, purporting to represent a given value, has proceeded from the proper authority, and whether the signature that it bears is genuine. If it is not from the source that it claims to be, and the signature attached to it is false, it is not worth the paper that it is written on.

Moses was a commissioned messenger of the Most High. His inspiration is attested by indubitable proofs. Our Lord and the inspired writers of the New Testament abundantly confirm the claim of the Pentateuch to be regarded as the Word of God, but in so doing, they uniformly attach to it the name of Moses; Moses says, Moses wrote, Moses taught, the law of Moses, etc., etc. It is as God's Word through Moses, that they commend it to our faith. If you detach these books from Moses as their author, you thereby detach them likewise from the indorsement of our Lord and his Apostles. They bid us accept what Moses taught and what Moses commanded. If these are not the teachings of Moses, and these commands are not his, their sanction is withdrawn.

Much has been said of late about the absolute inerrancy of the original autographs of Scripture, as to the question at issue at present was one of minute accuracy in trivial and unessential matters, and this related only to hypothetical originals no longer in existence, and was a mere inference from a particular theory of the mode of inspiration. This is an utter misunderstanding of the real gravity of the case. The actual issue which is now before the evangelical Churches of Christendom is far more serious and far-reaching than this. It is vital and fundamental. It is a question of the historical truth and the divine authority of the Old Testament from beginning to end. Are its statements trustworthy? Can they be depended upon, not in minor and unessential matters, but in the great body of its contents; and has it any just claim to be regarded as really the Word of God? Its historical truth and its divine authority are closely linked, and must stand or fall together, not only because that which is untrue is thereby evidenced not to be from God, but because the Old Testament is professedly a record of God's revelation to his chosen people through a long series of ages. If the facts as therein set forth are true and real, it is beyond question an immediate divine revelation. If the alleged facts are fictitious the revelation itself is unreal.

The particular point to which I wish to direct your attention this evening is the bearing of the critical hypotheses respecting the Pentateuch upon its historical truth, and consequently upon its divine origin and authority.

If, according to the common and well-attested belief upon this subject, Moses is the author of these books which bear his name their historic truth is placed beyond controversy. If Moses is the author of the narrative of those fearful plagues which broke the obstinacy of Pharaoh, and of the miraculous passage of the Red Sea, and of the majestic scenes attending the delivery of the Law at Sinai, and of the journeyings of Israel through the wilderness attended by so many manifestations of divine grace and power; and if he placed on record the legislation attributed to him and which he is said to have received directly from God himself, then we have in this fact the highest possible voucher of the truth and certainty of the whole. It is the testimony of an eyewitness and a principal actor in the scenes recorded, of unimpeachable veracity; his record was made at a time when the events were fresh in the minds of the whole people; and his word is moreover confirmed by the mighty signs and wonders wrought by him, which are God's own attestation to its truth.

But we are told that we lose nothing by accepting the critical hypothesis, which denies the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and affirms it to be of composite origin; that this hypothesis is not discredited because unbelieving critics, such as Kuenen and Wellhausen, have used it to destroy the authority of the Pentateuch. In the hands of evangelical critics it is harmless. What evil can result from admitting that the Pentateuch is a compilation from four different inspired documents? Then instead of only one witness we have four separate witnesses to the history of the Mosaic period. These have been compared to the four Gospels, which supplement and corroborate each other and give a more complete and better attested life of Christ than could have been

afforded by one alone. And it has even been alleged that we have in the Pentateuch a singular advantage beyond that which we possess in the Gospels. Uninspired men have undertaken to harmonize the Gospels, and to combine them into one continuous narrative. But there is much in even the best of these efforts which is open to question. Of different possible arrangements of the materials we cannot be certain in every case that the right one has been reached; whereas the Pentateuchal history is already compacted for us into one continuous narrative by one inspired redactor.

Such is the representation that has been made. Now let us look at the actual operation of this critical hypothesis, and that not in the hands of Kuenen and Wellhausen, but of those who call themselves evangelical critics. We shall leave out of view the more destructive speculations and inferences of the former, and confine ourselves to those consequences which are inseparable from the hypothesis, however inclined its advocates may be to present it in the most favorable aspect possible.

The authors of the four Pentateuchal documents, which the critics profess to have discovered, are altogether unknown. The age in which they lived is uncertain and can only be approximately ascertained. For convenience in referring to them they are commonly designated by the letters of the alphabet, J, E, D, and P. J, the Jehovahist, speaks of God uniformly as Jehovah, E prefers instead to call him Elohim, the Hebrew for God. D is the writer of Deuteronomy. P is the priestly writer to whom we owe the great body of the ceremonial law, as well as certain portions of the Pentateuchal history which are supposed to be linked with it. J and E are conceived to have been the oldest of these documents. The Rev. Dr. Driver, of Oxford, England, whose "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" has recently been published under the editorial supervision of Dr. Briggs, of New York City, and Dr. Salmund, of Aberdeen, Scotland, tells us that J and E were not later than 750 B.C., and they may belong to the early centuries of the Monarchy. If we understand him to mean by this vague expression the earliest date to which it can possibly apply, they may perhaps be coeval with the age of David and Solomon. At the very least, therefore, they are at a remove of 400 years from the time of the Exodus, a distance of time equal to that which separates us from the discovery of this continent by Columbus, or from the birth of Martin Luther. Or if the larger limit be allowed, they may be more than 300 years later still. Dr. Driver assigns D to the reign of the ungodly king Manasseh, eight centuries after the Exodus, and P after the Babylonish Exile, nearly or quite ten centuries from the Exodus. For our knowledge, consequently, of the whole Mosaic period we are dependent upon records, which are from 400 to 1,000 years subsequent to the events which they relate, and which are based upon the popular traditions of the time when they were prepared. And let it be remembered that the age of Moses was the foundation period of the Old Testament religion when its institutions were ordained by God himself amid signal attestations of the divinity of their origin; a period, therefore, respecting which it is of the utmost consequence that we should possess positive certainty of the truth and reality of the events recorded.

What credit would be attached to the Gospels, if, instead of being written by contemporaries and eyewitnesses, or based upon the testimony of those who were, they were composed four centuries, eight centuries and ten centuries after the time of Christ, and reported simply the stories that were circulating respecting him at these several dates? And, further, if instead of being written by well-known apostles and evangelists, their authors were entirely unknown and their origin purely conjectural? What foundation would we have for our belief in anything that is related of Jesus Christ or in the truth and reality of his miracles and his death for our redemption, if all rested upon such a basis as this?

But it is said that other histories of the Old Testament are compilations and are anonymous, and were written long after the events which they record. Thus the Books of Kings contain the history of 450 years from Solomon to the Exile, and could not, of course, have been written until after the latest event which they record. But it is to be observed that the contents of these books are throughout drawn from public and contemporary records, to which appeal is made at the close of every reign; and thus an adequate guarantee is given of the accuracy of the history. It is also the case that Moses records the lives of the Patriarchs, tho he was born 600 years after the call of Abraham. But here again it is to be observed that the inspiration of Moses, of which we have the most abundant proofs in the notable miracles wrought through his instrumentality, is God's own attestation of the truth of all that he has delivered to us in the Book of Genesis, not only respecting Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but of the earliest ages extending back to the creation of the world.

Here, however, we are met by the question, If the inspiration of Moses accredits the narratives of Genesis respecting events long prior to his time and even the primeval ages, why may not the inspiration of J, E, D and P, in like manner, accredit the contents of the Pentateuch?

The reason is obvious: In the first place, we have abundant and decisive evidence of the inspiration of Moses; of J, E, D and P we know nothing whatever, and of their inspiration we have no proof. In the second place, the hypothesis of the critics in relation to these assumed documents is absolutely inconsistent with the idea of their inspiration in any such sense as affords any guarantee whatever of their historical truth.

That this is so will appear from a statement of the grounds upon which the critics base their hypothesis for the partition of the Pentateuch. There are two principal criteria by which they undertake to distinguish the several documents, and which they regard as affording the clearest evidence of their existence. We must devote a few moments to the examination of these criteria, and shall then indicate the bearing which they have upon the historical truth of these documents and upon their inspiration in any proper sense of that term.

The first of these criteria is an alleged diversity of style and diction. Certain words and forms of speech are, it is said, peculiar to P in distinction from J and E, and wherever these characteristic expressions occur, this is an indication that the paragraph, sentence or clause, in which they are found, has been extracted from the document P. It is apparent how easy it is to make a division on this basis which is altogether factitious. The critic assumes that certain words and phrases are characteristic of one document, and certain other words and phrases are characteristic of another document. He accordingly goes through the Pentateuch with this criterion in view. Every paragraph, sentence and clause, in which any of the one class of expressions chance to be found, is regularly assigned to the one document; and with like regularity every paragraph, sentence and clause, in which any of the other class of expressions appear, is assigned to the other document. And when the partition is completed it is found that all of the one set of expressions is in one document and all of the other set in the other document. But the reason of this is, because the critic has put them there. The partition corresponds with the hypothesis, for the simple reason that it was made by the hypothesis.

There is another singular fact connected with this matter. The critics tell us that while P is readily distinguishable in style

and diction from J and E, it is not possible to establish any clear distinction of this sort between J and E themselves. And the reason of this is obvious to one who examines the subject with any care. To P are assigned the ceremonial law, genealogies, statistics and such grand, world-wide events as the creation and the main portion of the flood, but almost nothing that pertains to the ordinary current of events and the experience of individual lives. What can properly be called the narrative portion of the Pentateuch is almost entirely divided between J and E. The natural and necessary consequence of this partition is that each document has those words and phrases which are appropriate to the subject matter assigned to it. P has not the words of ordinary narrative for the simple reason that such narrative is regularly given not to P but to J and E. And for the same reason P has not the style which belongs to narrative. It is said that there is a marked difference between these documents in point of style; that the style of P is rigid, formal, stereotyped and repetitious, and that of J and E is easy, flowing and picturesque. The difference is just that between genealogies, statistics and ritual legislation on the one hand and historical narrative on the other. The differences of style are obvious enough; but they indicate not a diversity of writer, but diversity of theme. And unless it be maintained that one and the same writer must always limit himself to the same class of subjects, with what propriety can it be insisted upon that he must invariably adhere to one uniform style? Why may not a historian, while he deals principally in narrative, insert likewise genealogies and ritual laws in their proper place? And if the genealogy has not the easy, flowing style of the narrative, is that any proof that it is from a different hand?

The impossibility acknowledged by the critics themselves of discriminating between the diction and style of J and E arises from the fact that the narrative parts of the Pentateuch are partitioned between them. Where there is diversity of matter, there is diversity of style. Where the matter is of the same description so is the style. There is nothing surely in all this to indicate that the Pentateuch is a composite production, made up by the blending of different documents. And thus we dispose of the first criterion proposed by the critics, on the basis of which they undertake to parcel the Pentateuch among the documents which they imagine that they have discovered. We are obliged, of course, to deal with this matter here only in the most general fashion. It is impossible now to go into details.

The second criterion upon which the critics base their partition of the Pentateuch is the one with which we are most particularly concerned at present, since it rests upon the assumption of the untrustworthiness of these alleged documents, and is fundamentally inconsistent with their inspiration, provided the term "inspiration" be used in its proper and universally accepted sense, as such a divine control over the writers of Scripture as secured their infallibility and guarded them from error. Here is where the allegation has its root, that Biblical Criticism requires a modification of the common doctrine of inspiration, as this is claimed by the sacred penmen, and has been the uniform belief of the Christian Church. This doctrine is opposed to one of the primary assumptions of that school of criticism which rends the Pentateuch into tatters. I say "assumptions" advisedly. It is not a conclusion established by this divisive criticism; but it is assumed as the basis on which the divisive criticism is itself built. I refer to their assumption of the existence of duplicate and discrepant statements as a pervading feature of the Pentateuch narratives. This is, in fact, the main reliance of the critics. They affect to find duplicate and discrepant statements everywhere, and they point to them as clearly evidencing duplicate authorship.

The way in which these are made out, is simple enough. Two distinct events have certain features in common. These are compared, and are held to prove these events are not two but in reality are one and the same, and this in defiance of the explicit statements of the record. The critic unhesitatingly sets the direct and unequivocal testimony of the sacred historian aside, and assumes on the ground of a superficial resemblance in a few particulars that what is represented to be two separate occurrences is in fact but a single transaction. This assertion is made by the critic from no independent testimony tending to identify the two events or to show that the historian was in error. It is his own arbitrary judgment that the historian is not to be credited. Having thus converted the two events into one on the ground of a certain measure of correspondence, as the history never repeated itself the critic next displays their points of difference, not to show what they really do evidence that the events are in fact distinct as they appear on the face of the record, but that these are two variant accounts of the same thing. And as the same writer could not have given such diverse representations of the matter, it is argued that they must be attributed to distinct writers.

Thus for example Abraham, on two separate occasions, through fear for his own safety, prevaricated respecting Sarah, saying that she is not his wife but his sister. She is brought into peril in consequence, but is providentially released. The critics tell us that these must be regarded as variant accounts of the same transaction, which according to J occurred in Egypt at the court of Pharaoh, but according to E took place in Gerar at the palace of Abimelech.

Again Abraham made a covenant with Abimelech in relation to wells of water, which were an occasion of strife between their respective servants, and he called the name of the well where their bargain was made Beersheba, the well of the oath. At a later time Isaac was in the same region and had a like difficulty about wells. The name of the Philistine king was again Abimelech, which was the permanent appellation of the monarch, like Pharaoh in Egypt or Caesar at Rome. Isaac had to dig over again the wells of his father which the Philistines had meanwhile stopped. So it came to pass that he too made a covenant with Abimelech respecting wells at Beersheba, thus furnishing a fresh reason for the name which it bore ever afterward. Here again the critics can see nothing but variant accounts of the same transaction, which one document connected with Abraham and another with Isaac.

The critics still further multiply what they consider variant traditions of the same occurrence by setting one part of a transaction over against the other part of it, as tho they were conflicting statements. Thus two reasons are given in the sacred record why Jacob left his father's house to go to Padan-Aram. One was to escape the fury of Esau, whom he had overreached by fraudulently obtaining his father's blessing; the other that his father charged him to go and obtain a wife from among his kindred. The two are entirely consistent; but the critics create a discrepancy by saying that J and E give a reason of which P knows nothing but assigns as the reason something altogether different.

Again, they tell us that J and E have quite different versions of what happened to Jacob at Bethel. According to E, he had a dream, in which he saw a ladder reaching from earth to Heaven, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon it, but heard no voice and received no verbal promise. J, on the other hand, knows nothing of any dream or ladder or angels, but says that Jehovah there appeared to Jacob while he slept and made certain promises to him.

Thus by identifying distinct transactions or distinct parts of the same transaction, they find material for what they consider separate documents, each of which tells a story diverse from the others and at variance with them. The necessary effect of such treatment is, of course, to produce the appearance of discrepancies and divergencies everywhere. And the entire history from first to last is converted from a consistent, continuous and reliable record into a medley of contradictory and jarring stories, such as were floating about at the time when these several documents were written. It is obvious what becomes of the historical character of a record so dealt with. And need it create surprise that critics who have formed this conception of the Pentateuch clamor for a modification of the common doctrine of inspiration?

And it is not merely the patriarchal history, which is thus resolved into a mass of discordant materials. The Mosaic period fares in the same way. The same methods are applied to it and with a like result; and this not in its subordinate details but in matters of the greatest consequence. God reveals himself to Moses in Exodus, chapter iii, and again in chapter vi. Both times he announces his purpose to deliver Israel from the bondage of Egypt, and bring them to Canaan by the instrumentality of Moses. Stress is laid upon his name Jehovah as pledging this result, and upon Moses shrinking from the task, his brother Aaron is associated with him as a spokesman, and the miraculous sign is given of the rod changed into a serpent.

Here, again, the critics tell us, these are but different narratives of the same thing, and there are numerous contradictions between them. The locality is different and the whole situation is different. E locates it in the wilderness of Horeb, while Moses was keeping the flocks of his father-in-law in Midian; the Lord there appeared to him in the flame of fire in the bush. P knows nothing of Moses ever having been in Midian, or having seen the marvelous spectacle of a bush burning with fire yet unconsumed; he reports the revelation as having occurred in Egypt. According to E the people believed Moses, when he brought them this message; but, according to P, they refused to hearken to him. In E Aaron was to speak for Moses to the people; in P he was appointed to speak for him to the king. In E the signs were done before the people; in P they were done before the king. In E a rod possessing miraculous virtue was given to Moses as the instrument by which his wonders were to be wrought, in J the rod was not the effective agent but the material of the miracle; it was itself converted into a serpent. Thus the different documents vary materially in their representation of the affair. And it is inferred that they must have followed diverse traditions of it. What the exact truth in the matter was, and how much of what is recorded really took place, and how much is to be placed to the account of legendary accretions, which had gathered in the lapse of from four to ten centuries intervening before the record was made, is left to be inferred.

In like manner there are discrepancies between the different documents as to the plagues sent upon Egypt to compel Pharaoh to let Israel go. These concern the number of the plagues, what the plagues were, the design with which they were sent, and the manner in which they were wrought. According to P the plagues were simply exhibitions of power with which the magicians of Egypt vie with partial success at first, but are finally discomfited. J and E make no mention of any magicians. In P Aaron with his rod works the miracles; in E it is Moses with his rod; in J no rod was used at all. There is only one plague that the three narrators, P, J and E, have in common. From all this it has been inferred that the several traditions represented by these documents agreed that certain traditional events preceded and facilitated the Exodus; but there was no agreement as to what these events were.

The same sort of discrepancy is alleged of the passage of the Red Sea, the transactions at Sinai and the wanderings in the wilderness.

According to the critical hypothesis, even in the most moderate bands, the situation then is this: The Pentateuch, instead of being one continuous and self-consistent history from the pen of Moses, is made up of four distinct documents which have been woven together, but which the critics claim that they are able to separate and restore as far as the surviving remnants of each permit, to their original condition. These severally represent the traditions of the Mosaic age as they existed four, eight and ten centuries after the Exodus. When these are compared they are found to be in perpetual conflict. Events wear an entirely different complexion in one from that which they have in another; the characters of those who appear in them, the motives by which they are actuated, and the whole impression of the period in which they live is entirely different.

It is very evident from all this why the critics tell us that the doctrine of inspiration must be modified. If these Pentateuchal documents, as they describe them, were inspired, it must have been in a very peculiar sense. It is not a question of inerrancy, but of wholesale mutual contradiction which quite destroys their credit as truthful histories. And these contradictions, be it observed, are not in the Pentateuch itself, but result from the mangling and the mal-interpretations to which it has been subjected by the critics.

On the critical hypothesis the real facts of the history are not what they seem to be to the ordinary reader. They can only be elicited by an elaborate critical process. The several documents must first be disentangled and carefully compared; the points in which they agree and those in which they differ must be noted. And from this conflicting mass of testimony the critic must ascertain as best he may how much can be relied upon as true, how much has a certain measure of probability, and how much must be rejected altogether.

Another element of precariousness enters into the critical attempts to distinguish what is reliable from what is not in the Pentateuchal narratives. By the confession of the critics themselves and by the necessity of their hypothesis, the documents which they fancy that they have discovered are by no means complete. By singling out the paragraphs and clauses which are regarded as belonging to each of the documents severally, and putting them together, they undertake the reconstruction of the original documents, which are supposed in the first instance to have circulated separately as distinct and independent publications, but to have been subsequently fused together into the Pentateuch as we now possess it by a series of compilers or, as they are technically called, redactors. First, the two oldest documents, J and E, were combined by a redactor, and the combination was effected, it is supposed, by the following method: Sections or paragraphs, longer or shorter, were taken alternately from J and from E and pieced together so as to form one continuous narrative. It was the purpose of the redactor to make the best use that he possibly could of these two sources at his command in preparing a history of the period of which they treat. In some cases he made full extracts from both his sources of all that they contained and preserved the language of each unaltered, making no additions or modifications of his own. Frequently, however, it was necessary to adjust what was thus taken from different works in order to make it read smoothly or to render it harmonious. Hence upon occasion he introduced explanatory remarks, or made such changes as seemed to be required in what he borrowed from J or from E. Sometimes his sources were so nearly parallel that it would lead to needless

repetition to repeat them both. In such cases, accordingly, he confines himself to the account given in one of the documents, either omitting the corresponding statements of the other altogether, or weaving in a clause or a sentence here and there when it seemed to him distinctive and important. Again, cases occur in which the narratives of J and E were in real or apparent conflict. Here he does the best that he can. He either undertakes to harmonize their accounts, where this is possible, by inserting some statement which seems to reconcile them, by so changing the order of the narrative as to relieve the difficulty, or by converting inconsistent accounts of the same event into two different transactions. Where none of these methods is practicable and reconciliation is out of the question, the redactor adheres to one of his sources and disregards the other.

D, which was composed some centuries after this union of J and E, existed for some time as an independent work, and was then combined with J E by a new redactor, who besides attaching D to this previously existing work, retouched J E in several places and introduced a number of passages from his own point of view, which was different from that of the older historians.

Finally the document P was prepared, at first as a separate publication, but at length it was interwoven by a third redactor, with the pre-existing triplicate treatise D J E, the process being substantially the same as has already been described in the case of J E.

This is in general the method by which the critics suppose that the Pentateuch was gradually brought to its present form. It will be seen at a glance how the complexity of the critical problem is increased by the successive editorial labors which are supposed to have been brought into requisition in the course of the construction of the Pentateuch. The several documents must not only be distinguished from each other, but also from the various redactional additions and insertions which have at any time been made.

Let us assume that this delicate and difficult analysis has been effected with unflinching accuracy notwithstanding the liabilities to error vitiating the result, which increase at every step. But waving this, what is the situation when the analysis has been accomplished? and what is its bearing upon the historical character of the Pentateuch?

The critics have undertaken to reproduce for us the documents J E D and P, which are our primary sources for both the Mosaic and the patriarchal history, and which date respectively four, eight and ten centuries after the Exodus. These documents are not only at variance with each other in their statements respecting numerous particulars, thus invalidating each other's testimony and showing that the traditions which they have severally followed are mutually inconsistent; but they are besides very incomplete. Numerous gaps and omissions occur in each. Matter which they once contained, as is evident from allusions still found in them, is now missing; how much it is impossible to tell.

But what is more serious, the parts that yet remain have been manipulated by the various redactors. The order of events has been disturbed; events really distinct have been fused together and mistaken for one and the same; and narratives of the same event have been mistaken for events altogether distinct; statements which are misleading have been inserted with the view of harmonizing what cannot in fact be reconciled; when traditions vary instead of being recorded in their integrity to afford some opportunity of ascertaining the truth by comparison, they have either been mingled together, thus disturbing both, or one only has been preserved, thus leaving no check upon its inaccuracies. All this and more, the critics tell us, the several redactors have done with their materials. No charge is made of dishonest intentions. But surely it is most unfortunate for the historical value of their work. There is no way of ascertaining how far these materials have been warped from their proper original intent by the well-meant but mistaken efforts of the redactors to correct or to harmonize them. That their meaning has been seriously altered in repeated instances, which are pointed out by the critics, created a very natural presumption that like changes have been freely made elsewhere which can now no longer be detected.

It is difficult to understand in what sense the redactors, whose work has been described, can be said to have been inspired. They certainly had no inspiration which preserved them from error, or even from making the gravest historical mistakes. They had no such inspiration, as gives any divine attestation to their work. The Pentateuchal history gathers no confirmation from having passed through their hands.

Upon the theory of the most conservative critics, for it is this with which we have been dealing, what dependence can be placed upon the historical statements of the Pentateuch? These are, as they allege, inaccurate and inconsistent with themselves not in the patriarchal period merely, but throughout the lifetime of Moses, when the foundation was laid of the Old Testament religion and those signal miracles were wrought which gave it undeniable divine sanction. The real facts are not those which appear upon the surface. They can only be elicited by an elaborate critical process which shall detect and remove the additions and attempted emendations of each of the redactors, and shall then restore the four documents to its pristine condition, so far as what remains of each will allow. This will put the critic in possession of a mutilated record of four variant traditions of the Mosaic age, as these existed four, eight and ten centuries after that date. And now it is by the help of such materials in the way of comparison, correction and elimination that he must sift out and ascertain the real facts. Must we not say that the history of the Mosaic age, if this be the only way of arriving at it, rests upon a quicksand? and that nothing of any consequence can be certainly known regarding it?

We have been able in the discussion of this evening to look in a hurried way at but one feature of the disintegrating work which is done in the name of Biblical Criticism. I do not speak of the destructive inferences drawn by critics who are avowedly antagonistic to supernatural religion. I have confined myself to the conclusions accepted by that class of critics who claim to be evangelical, and who occupy positions of honor and influence in evangelical Churches, such as the British scholars and divines, Drs. Driver and Cheyne, and the American scholars who affiliate with them. We have looked at but one phase of their work, even as respects the Pentateuch. Had we been able to consider their treatment of the Mosaic laws, our conclusion would have been yet more abundantly confirmed. Here is no question merely of the strict inerrancy of Scripture—of absolute accuracy in unimportant minutiae of precision in matters of science. This is not the issue raised by the theorizing of that class of biblical critics with which we contend. And it is no more question of the mode of inspiration. It is the question whether any dependence can be placed upon the historical truths of the Bible; whether our confidence in the facts recorded in the Pentateuch rests upon any really trustworthy basis; facts, be it observed, not of mere scientific or antiquarian interest, but which mark the course of God's revelations to the patriarchs. It is the certainty of facts which are vital to the religion of the Old Testament, and the denials of whose truth weakens the foundations on which the New Testament itself is built. The critical theory which we have

been examining, is destructive of all rational certainty of the reality of these truths; and thus tends to overturn the historical basis of the religion of the Bible. Our holy religion is an historical religion, based on a series of redemptive facts, in which God revealed himself to men and unfolded his will and gracious purposes. And to weaken the evidence of those facts, to cast doubt upon the reality of the historical occurrence, is to cast doubt upon the reality of that revelation which they embodied.

Those who hold these critical views which we have been considering may tell us that they believe in the truth of the Pentateuch, that they believe it to be inspired of God, that they believe it to be infallible in all matters of faith and duty. Of course, we do not question these statements of their personal faith. But this does not prove their critical theories to be harmless. It is well sometimes that men are inconsistent; that they who have adopted wrong principles or dangerous theories, do not always follow them to their legitimate conclusions. What we are concerned to know is not the personal faith of those who still cling to the creed in which they have been brought up in spite of their acceptance of a critical hypothesis which is antagonistic to it. What we are concerned to know is the legitimate tendency of the critical hypothesis itself. However some of its adherents may retain their faith in the historical truth of the Pentateuch and its divine inspiration and authority, this hypothesis, as has been shown, undermines them all. Its acceptance by those not so well grounded in these doctrines must tend to unsettle their faith. Its general acceptance must lead ultimately to the denial of its inspiration even in that qualified sense in which these critics profess to accept it now, as well as to the denial of its historical truth, as surely as the tree will bear fruit after its own kind.

It may be remembered that in the revision of the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church, which is now in progress, the proposition was made by the Committee appointed for that purpose to insert among the characteristics of Holy Scripture "The truthfulness of the history." And it may be remembered that this natural and appropriate emendation met with determined opposition in certain quarters. The animus and the motive of that opposition will sufficiently appear from the review of the attitude which this divisive criticism assumes towards the historical truth of the Bible. It is not Biblical Criticism properly so-called which antagonizes its truth, but what ought rather to be denominated "Anti-Biblical Criticism," since even in temperate hands and those which are most anxious to claim for themselves evangelical standing, it unsettles the verity of the sacred oracles and annuls the reality of their inspiration.

But a single word more. What must be the state of mind engendered toward the Scriptures by such speculation?

#### RELIGIOUS NOTES.

GENERAL BOOTH has sailed from Bombay for England.

...At a Roman Catholic convent in Fort Berthold, North Dakota, all the sisters, including the Mother Superior, are Indians, and the spiritual director is a priest of Mohawk descent.

...The St. John's River Conference of Congregational churches was organized in Norwalk, Florida, recently. The services were held in the Baptist Church, which was kindly conceded to the Congregational Society for the time being until they can secure a building of their own.

...The death is announced in Australia of the Rev. Dr. Kelynack, President of the Wesleyan Methodist General Conference, of Australasia. He was at the head of the denominational college in Sydney. He visited this country some years ago and preached to large audiences.

...The condition of the Pope's health continues to create anxiety. Last week he suffered considerably from a rheumatic catarrhal attack, which confined him to his bed; but toward the end of the week he was better and able to receive a number of prelates and heads of congregations.

...The Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Scotland addressed to Rome a document in favor of the temporal power of the Pope in which they assert that he "to whom is committed the supreme jurisdiction as well over kings as over their subjects, by Jesus Christ the Lord, ought to be subjected to no civil authority."

...The people of Tasmania propose in celebration of the 250th anniversary of the discovery of the island by the Dutch navigator Tasman, who named it Van Diemen's Land, in honor of the Governor of the Dutch East Indies, to complete St. David's Cathedral, Hobart Town. It will also be the jubilee of the diocese, the consecration of Bishop Nixon having taken place in 1842.

...To the long list of prominent ecclesiastics who have recently died is now added the names of Bishops Philpott, of England, and Down, of Ireland. The former was eighty-four years of age and a classmate and close rival in university honors of the late Duke of Devonshire. He was a prelate of the old school, and had no sympathy with the Conferences and Congresses of the present day.

...Dr. Barnardo, of London, has inaugurated a Young Helpers' League to assist him in his Homes for destitute children. After only a month it numbers 3,019 members, gathered from all over the world. The conditions are very simple. Boys and girls up to the age of eighteen are eligible, and all that is asked of them is that they shall do something for the assistance of the 4,300 gathered in the Homes.

...The Committee appointed by the Presbyterian General Assembly on a consensus creed for all Presbyterian and Reformed Churches was in session in this city last week. We do not understand that the Committee entered upon the work of preparing the proposed new creed, but only considered how a united effort of all Churches concerned could be secured for the purpose of formulating such a creed.

...The statement of the Archbishop of Canterbury at the recent Church Congress that nine-tenths of the population of Ireland are Roman Catholics of the most immovable type, has called forth the counter-statement that the Protestants in Ireland constitute fully one-third of the population and that so far from the Catholics being "immovable" the mission societies at work among them have been blessed with a remarkable measure of success.

...According to Dr. D. S. Monroe, Secretary of the Methodist General Conference, the ministerial vote on the

question of admitting women to the Conference is 5,000 in favor of admission and 5,151 against, leaving a majority of 451 in favor of the women. As a three-fourths majority is required to change the constitution of the Church the proposition fails. The lay vote was as follows: in favor of admission 235,148, against 183,094; majority in favor, 51,454.

...The statement has appeared in Boston papers that the Rev. Philip S. Moxom, who recently resigned his pastorate in Boston, had leanings toward Unitarianism. This Mr. Moxom earnestly denies, saying that while in sympathy with every form of faith that helps man, and while having many dear friends in the Unitarian Church who are loyal Christian men, he considers that system radically deficient in its conception of Christ in whose divinity he is a full believer.

...The Rev. Willard H. Robinson, of the First Baptist Church in Brooklyn, has resigned his pastorate and proposes to leave the Baptist denomination owing to a change in his views regarding immersion. He proposes to enter the Congregational or the Presbyterian Church. In his statement to the congregation he said that he had come to the conviction that immersion is not necessary to the validity of baptism and that insistence upon it is not in accordance with the mind of Christ.

...Professor Blaikie, who has been named for the moderatorship of the next General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, is in all probability the last of those who were prominent in the Free Church movement in 1843 who have that position. During these fifty years in only one instance has any one been appointed to that office who was not connected with that movement. As Moderator of the Free Church he will attend the Pan-Presbyterian Assembly, which is to meet next September, in Toronto.

...The Salvation Army, with the assistance of a Roman Catholic priest and a representative of a labor union, as well as several ministers of different denominations, has secured the right to march the streets at any reasonable time in Marlboro, Mass. In Newark, N. J., it has also been permitted to hold a series of meetings in Bethany Presbyterian church. In the conflict with the authorities in Eastbourne, near London, over their street services, they have carried the day, to the no small discomfort of the population of that quiet suburb, whose quietness has hitherto been its great attraction.

...The conflict between the Salvation Army and the police at Eastbourne, which has been decided in favor of the former, has aroused considerable discussion in the English journals, as to the wisdom or moral right, whatever the legal right may be, of intrusion by any religious body on the quiet of a community against the desire of that community. Most of the journals of different denominations unite in considering the course of the Salvation Army as extremely ill advised, to say the least, saying that undoubtedly they have rights, but so have other people, and among the dearest of those rights is quiet.

...In the Caucasus there are a number of scattered and banished communities of Molokans, a Russian sect that have endured much persecution. Jacob Dilikoff, a graduate of the Mission College of Urumia, has been an apostle to them and taught them more fully the Word of God. This devoted brother settled among them, and for two years past has gone on a mission to Siberia. He was kept in prison so much and was so sure to be banished, that he chose to go as a free man. God has blessed his work in Siberia and provided also for his family; and this last summer he returned six thousand miles westward to care for his children.

...At the annual meeting of the American Congregational Union it was voted to change its name to the Congregational Church Building Society, the purpose being to give the society a name which shall be descriptive and distinctive. When it was first formed the building of churches and parsonages was not thought of; it was rather intended that it should provide a basis for fellowship and meetings of good cheer among Christians; but by the persistence of one of those who had to do with its organization, a provision was put into its constitution allowing it to aid in church building, and this has now become its sole purpose. The corresponding Secretary, L. H. Cobb, D.D., reports the most successful year in the history of the society.

...Recent dispatches from Paris state that a movement has been started in that city to make Sunday a rest day. The honorary president of the society, M. Jules Simon, states that the aim is to secure for workmen a weekly rest day, and Sunday is naturally the day the society has chosen. The undertaking, however, proves to be a difficult one, as it runs counter to numerous customs and interests. It is not the aim of the society to forbid people to work on Sunday if they wish to do so, but to prevent them from forcing other people to work. The President, M. Leon Say, says the society is the outgrowth of a congress of social economists, held in Paris during the Exhibition of 1889. The society does not intend to ask for legislation but will depend entirely for success on the power of persuasion. It has already succeeded in having the hours of labor shortened in the post office, and is now laboring with the railroad companies.

...The Archbishops of Paris, Toulouse, Rheims, Lyons and St. Malo have issued a joint statement that the State has become atheistic. On the other hand a number of the leading Protestant clergymen, among them Dr. Thurber of the American Church, and the Rev. Mr. McAll of the McAll Mission, have expressed their views that Protestantism is gaining ground against both Roman Catholicism and atheism. Father Hyacinthe says that he does not think that one Frenchman in 10,000 is really an atheist, tho a good many think they are. The report that the Pope had sent a letter to Cardinal Richard advising the adhesion of the Church to the Republic caused a great deal of disturbance among the Royalist Deputies, a large number of whom threatened to retire if it should prove true. The