

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, FEBRUARY 23, 1893.

NUMBER 2308.

The Independent

For Table of Contents see Page 10.

FOR A MEMORIAL TO JOHN KEATS.

BY BLISS CARMAN.

STAND there, John Keats, in marble, in Hampstead over the sea!
But live in our hearts wherever the race of the English be!
Live on, thou captain of beauty, till the last self-thrall is free.

This from thy vagrant fellows in the western land and far,
With the love that knows not alien from brother, nor star from star—
The love of a man for a man wherever the English are.
Bravest and gentlest and best of the elder land and dear,
Thou spirit of earth and morning, until the morning appear
Ride with us on together into the dark with a cheer!
WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE VISION.

BY MARY DARMESTETER.
(A. MARY F. ROBINSON.)

SOMETIMES when I sit musing all alone
The sick diversity of human things,
Within my soul, I know not how, there springs
The vision of a world unlike our own.

O stable Zion! perfect, endless, one,
Why hauntest thou a soul that hath no wings? . . .
I look on thee as men on mirage-springs,
Who know the desert bears but sand and stone.

Yet, as a passing mirror in the street,
Flashing a glimpse of gardens out of range
Through some poor sick-room open to the heat;

So in our world of death and doubt and change
The vision of Eternity is sweet!
The vision of Eternity is strange!
PARIS, FRANCE.

THE BROOK.

BY FRANK DEMPSTER SHERMAN.

THROUGH the fields and woods he goes;
Melody is all he knows!
Listen! he is singing now
To the bird upon the bough,
Teaching her new tricks of song
That shall gladden us ere long.
Minstrel of the meadows he;
All he knows is melody!
O'er his path the grasses green
Day and night in rapture lean;
And the lilies tall and white
Tremble with his song's delight;
Now and then a happy limb
Drops a leaf to honor him;
You may often see them lie
On his breast as he goes by,
Singing something strangely sweet
Which the winds alone repeat.
Song for him is everything;
He's a poet, and must sing!

NEW YORK CITY.

THE NAMELESS PROPHET.

(I KINGS XIII.)

BY THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF RIPON.
(WILLIAM BOYD CARPENTER, D.D.)

WE all know the story of this intrepid prophet who dared to face King Jeroboam in the midst of his great men, and tell him the truth that a religion founded on moral unreality was foredoomed to failure. We do not know his name, but that is of little moment; we see him clothed in courage and armed with faith; we hear him deliver his message. The light of truth from his lips has shone in the darkness. That is enough; his task is done. His duty is to return, leaving no memory except that of his heroic and lonely witness on behalf of pure morality and pure religion.

He is a noble-minded man, ready for duty, and courageous to do it alone: he is strong enough to hold himself in rein, yielding to no suggestion of pride or pitilessness, of vanity or of advantage. He is an example of that strong, chivalrous devotion to duty which is untarnished by the little selfishness which so often mars the noble deeds of men.

But the story shows the weak place in his harness. None are free from temptation, and temptation success fully repelled may return to find the spirit slumbering.

Notice the conditions in which the temptation overtook him. He had done his task. The strain is over. Physical fatigue unnoticed before begins to make itself felt. He is tired; he dismounts; he sits down. He is alone, and alone after a scene of exceptional excitement, interest and triumph.

The temptation comes in a seductive form. It comes with that flattering deference which, always grateful, is never more so than when it is the approving admiration of the old for the young. An old man joins him; he has come in pursuit of him: he has been filled with admiration for what the prophet has done; he can approve if others cannot. His venerable locks carry an artful flattery. His gray hairs commend the prophet's young and vigorous zeal. And yet more, what he brings is the sanction of religion. "I am a prophet as thou art." Can the younger man resist such an emissary? All that the old prophet says harmonizes with his own feelings of the moment. Here is one who invites him to rest and take refreshment. It is no offer of hospitality from those who were steeped in the base principles of the new régime. It is the deferential, kindly invitation of an appreciative sympathizer. It is true that the prophet's instructions were neither to eat bread nor drink water in the place. But now a voice which claims a divine sanction presses upon the prophet the sustenance and sympathy for which he has craved. Why should he resist the claim of greater age and experience than his own?

But a man's conscience is his own, and once a man surrenders his conscience into the hands of another his conscientiousness is gone. It is a true saying that we need a conscience for our conscience. It is fatal to make another man's sense of right the measure of our own. When the voice speaks clearly and decisively to us, no other voice, however specious and sweet, can be God's voice to us. The fatal resting upon another has betrayed many a man from life's higher and holier way. In carrying out life's purpose and work, we must be prepared to be alone, and to be content to be alone, resting on no man's approval, but only on that which made the Apostle strong; "Our testimony is this—our conscience." By forsaking the clear guide of his own soul the prophet stepped aside from the splendid way he was traveling.

He listened to the old prophet; he yielded; he went back with him. "He did eat bread in his house, and drank water." But over that meal there hung a gloom—neither the host nor the guest was quite at ease. The one knew, and the other could hardly avoid feeling that all was not right. At last the old prophet could keep silence no longer. A power greater than his own plausible persuasiveness forced from his reluctant lips the truth. He had succeeded in his ambition; the coveted guest sat at his table. He could boast, if he would, among his neighbors, that the hero of the startling incident at Bethel had broken bread in his house; but the success was turning to ashes in his mouth. The shadow of falsehood and wrong brooded in his heart. The sword of retribution hung over the scene. The old prophet knew and felt that this was the case. Silence became intolerable, and at last the words are spoken. He who

deceived God's servant is compelled to speak the doom of the man whom he deceived. He cried unto the man of God that came from Judah, saying: "Thus saith the Lord, Forasmuch as thou hast been disobedient unto the mouth of the Lord, and hast not kept the commandment which the Lord thy God commanded thee, but camest back, and hast eaten bread and drunk water in the place, of the which he said unto thee, Eat no bread and drink no water; thy carcass shall not come unto the sepulcher of thy fathers."

The voice of warning and of doom was spoken. There is no need for delay. Indeed, how can the man of God linger any longer under the roof of the old prophet? As soon as the meal is over the man of God left, the old prophet saddling his ass for him. Swiftly the end came. Rumor soon spread in the city that a man had been slain by a lion. The old prophet knew what the rumor meant. He went forth sadly, and he came back laden with the dead body of the man he had tempted and betrayed.

Such was the mean and mournful close of a deed which was noble and heroic. Such was the witness against the weakness in a character which in much was courageous and magnanimous.

This story tells its own lesson. The real force of a man's character must be measured by its weakest place. It is the story of the weak link in the chain; the strain must ultimately fall on the feeble link. Temptation, like a bird of prey, falls upon the weak spot. The arrow shot at a venture will one day smite where the harness joints are at fault. As a fact, the severity of the tests to which in life we are exposed is so great that it is not wise to leave much to chance; it is wise to tighten and close up the loose joints, and stand so that everywhere we are incased in the armor of purity, and righteousness.

The weak place in the case of the nameless prophet is clear enough. He fell before a danger which is common enough. He accepted a religious sanction for doing that which his conscience knew was wrong. There are hundreds who accept such a sanction to their soul's peril. The voice speaks in the name of the Lord. How can it speak wrongly? Yet if it speak against simple right it is not the voice of the Lord. Religious sanction has been pleaded over and over again as a plea for doing wrong. Religious sanction was not wanting in the day of St. Bartholomew; religious sanction was not wanting for the fires of Smithfield or the burning of Servetus. The man of God allowed himself to believe that the voice of the old prophet was the voice of God, tho the inward voice of his own conscience spoke a different language. So many persuade themselves and silence the real voice of God for the sake of the pretended voice. True religion can never cross the conscience. Whatever ignores moral right, by whatever name it may call itself, is not true religion. The most fatal failure of religion is seen whenever it seeks to be above or independent of morality. Unethical religion is false religion. "Thine own self be true." Never sell your conscience to any man, however old, experienced or venerable. Never dream that his voice can be more God's voice to you than is the inward voice of your own conscience.

RIPON, ENGLAND.

LIBERTY IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

BY WILLIAM HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D.,
PROFESSOR OF OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS IN PRINCETON SEMINARY.

IT is obvious from utterances in certain quarters that apprehensions are felt by some of our brethren lest the cherished liberties of Presbyterian ministers and people are imperiled. If this be the case, every true friend of the Presbyterian Church would rise up in their defense, and in rebuke of bigotry and intolerance. Freedom of thought and of speech is not to be repressed. Scholarly investigation must be suffered to range at will over all subjects which present themselves for inquiry. No fetters must be placed upon the human understanding in its search after truth. The sacredness of the subject is no bar to the most thorough search, if it be conducted in a reverent spirit, with candor and impartiality, and without the assumption of false principles or the employment of wrong methods. The historical truth of the Scriptures and the genuineness and canonical authority of the several books are not to be excepted from rigid scholarly examination. The basis of our faith and the foundations on which revealed religion reposes are not only open to scrutiny, but the momentous interests at stake demand that the scrutiny should be of the most searching kind.

Here, if anywhere, it is of the utmost consequence that the exact truth should be known, that positive certainty should be attained, that nothing should be accepted which will not bear examination, that no doubt or obscurity should be suffered to remain which can by any means be removed.

Biblical criticism, which is an inquiry into the facts concerning the Bible, the circumstances of its origin, the authorship of its several books, and their literary form and contents is not only a legitimate study, but it is one of special value and importance, and it should be untrammelled in its investigations, unwarped by prejudice, and fearless in its quest of truth. It has an open field, and should be allowed free course. Every attempt to interfere with the freedom of inquiry in this subject as in every other should be frowned down, from whatever quarter it may proceed or by whatever motive it may be actuated. The truth is not to be upheld by timidly forbidding the application to it of even the sharpest tests. If it be genuine, it will come forth unharmed and with clearer evidence from the severity of the trial. If the truth as it is commonly apprehended have an admixture of error, free discussion will discover the fallacies and weak points, and remove them, leaving the truth in its integrity. Vigorous threshing will free the pure grain from the worthless chaff.

But while scholarship has its rights which must not be infringed, it also has its duties for the neglect or violation of which it may be properly challenged. There is a Christian scholarship and an unchristian scholarship. There is a biblical criticism and an anti-biblical criticism. In the history of the Christian Church it is evident that the doctrinal controversies through which it has passed have in the end tended to clearer views and to more lucid and exact statements of the truth. It is thus that the great historical creeds have been built up and gradually formulated in their present precision. The antagonists of the faith have contributed to this result by their assaults, compelling its advocates to strengthen their defenses, to re-examine their ground, and to discriminate more sharply between the true and the false, the essential and the non-essential. And both biblical criticism and biblical interpretation have been largely indebted to the scholarly researches of those who were foes to evangelical truth. We thankfully accept the gathered stores of learning contributed by their labors to the benefit of our common Christianity; but we are not prepared to surrender the ark of God to their custody.

It is not to shackle investigation or to muzzle the free utterance of opinion for the Presbyterian Church, when summoned to do so in a proper and lawful manner, to pronounce upon the question whether certain opinions are in accordance with her Standards, or whether she must in fidelity to the truth which she is set to maintain, withhold her sanction from their promulgation.

And here it is important to be observed that the case which has been appealed to the next General Assembly is not an abstract question *in thesi*, but it is asked to determine a particular matter, viz.: Does the Inaugural of Dr. Briggs, interpreted by itself and by his views set forth in his other writings, which are here gathered up and expressed, transcend the limits allowable to those who have received their authority to teach and to preach from the Presbyterian Church? It is not a question of a more rigid interpretation of the Standards than heretofore. It is simply a question of the application of the Standards in their well-known and accepted sense to the case in hand. It is a well-understood principle among us that a rigid adherence to every word and letter of the Standard is neither demanded nor expected, but simply a full and cordial acceptance of the system of doctrine therein contained, and an approval of the form of government and discipline. No one would be subjected to censure in the Presbyterian body unless convicted of what were esteemed grave departures from the faith. There is no disposition among us to make a brother an offender for a word, or to magnify trivial differences of opinion into grounds of serious charges.

It should also be distinctly stated that there is no suggestion in this case of any restraint upon the liberty of opinion and expression conceded at the reunion of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church, when each "recognized the other as a sound and orthodox body according to the principles of the Confession common to both." The tenets, in regard to which the action of the Assembly is invoked, have no affinity with those which were entertained in the New School branch any more than with those of the Old School; and agree no more with those maintained by the founders and taught by the early instructors of Union, Auburn and Lane Seminaries than with those held at Princeton, Allegheny and McCormick. The matters complained of are at war, not only with the common faith of Presbyterians of every name, but of evangelical Christians in general.

It is further to be borne in mind that, while the current faith of the Presbyterian Church adheres to the doctrine uniformly held by the Westminster divines of the infallible inspiration of Holy Scripture in its original form, the question to be brought to the decision of the General Assembly, is not abstract but concrete, not general but particular. It is not whether every minister, who is unable to affirm positively the absolute inerrancy of the original inspired autographs in every detail, while cordially receiving the Bible in all its parts as the infalli-

ble and authoritative rule of faith and practice, must abandon the ministry of the Presbyterian Church; but it is whether Dr. Briggs, denying this inerrancy, as he avowedly does, on the grounds that he does, and to the extent that the principles to which he has committed himself necessarily carry him, has not passed beyond the limits that can be safely allowed. One man looks through a microscope and imagines that a speck or two of sand may be perceived in the marble of the Parthenon, and he cannot make up his mind whether these have become attached to it since the building was erected or were contained in the stone from the beginning. His view of the matter is certainly very different from that of one who contends that large portions of the edifice were composed of sandstone. There is a vast difference between a denial of inerrancy upon grounds which must result in setting aside the historical truth of large and important parts of the Sacred Volume, and a hesitation to affirm absolute inerrancy on the part of one who is perplexed by some discrepancies in matters which are utterly insignificant. The particular case which is to be brought to the Assembly for decision is not of the latter but of the former sort. And the judgment of the Assembly in its disposition of the actual case in hand cannot with any propriety be taken as an index of what the will of the Church would be in regard to the other and far less flagrant departure from its commonly accepted faith.

However guarded Dr. Briggs may be in his formal statements on this subject, every careful reader of his writings is aware of the importance of ascertaining the sense which he attaches to his terms, in order to understand his meaning. When he commends "the best scholars of our time" for their willingness "to recognize any error that might be pointed out by Historical Criticism," and adds that "these errors are all in the circumstantial and not in the essentials," he has been thought to mean simply that a few statements of Scripture in regard to trivial and unimportant matters are not in harmony with the established facts of history; and many have been disposed on this ground to think that the question at issue was of slight consequence and scarcely worth disputing about. But how far in his view does the area of "the circumstantial" extend? and what is the style of "Historical Criticism," which he adopts, and how numerous and how serious are the errors, which it claims to discover in the Scriptures? When it is seen that his critical views completely revolutionize the history of the Old Testament, and transfer institutions and legislation which are expressly ascribed to Moses to a much later date, making that to be the growth of centuries, which is positively declared to have been directly communicated of God to the great legislator, and discovering discrepancies and inconsistencies at every turn, which have no existence except as they are created by the critics themselves and result from their arbitrary partition and misinterpretation, it is not so harmless after all. It is destructive of all confidence in the historical truth of Scripture, and of necessity brings into suspicion the entire body of revelation, which is indissolubly linked with it. How much he is prepared to surrender at the bidding of the Higher Criticism may be learned from the following extraordinary statement.

"If we should abandon the whole field of providential superintendence so far as inspiration and divine authority are concerned and limit divine inspiration and authority to the essential contents of the Bible, to its religion, faith and morals, we would still have ample room to seek divine authority where alone it is essential or even important, in the teaching that guides our devotions, our thinking and our conduct."

As if the historic truth of Scripture from first to last could be given up, and the historic revelation which it records would remain intact.

So in respect to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and the unity of the book of Isaiah, it is not a case *in thesi*, with which the Assembly will be called to deal, but one particular instance with all its special characteristics and peculiarities. The question which it will have to decide is by no means the general one, whether no minister, who finds himself perplexed by critical arguments and is unable in consequence to satisfy himself absolutely whether Moses did in actual fact write the entire Pentateuch, and so cannot make a positive and unqualified affirmation to that effect, should be allowed to remain in the Presbyterian ministry, even though he firmly believes its historic truth and its divine inspiration in every part. But it is whether Dr. Briggs's denial that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, coupled with the grounds on which he puts it, and the extent to which he carries it, and the consequences which he deduces from it, does not so directly contravene the explicit statements of Scripture, and the authoritative testimony of our Lord, as well as the faith of the Church which is founded upon it, as to overpass the bounds which can be safely allowed.

It is undoubtedly the current belief of the Presbyterian Church that the New Testament gives its infallible sanction to the traditional belief of the Jews that the Pentateuch is the work of Moses. Yet he who does not so understand the words of our Lord and of the inspired penmen, does not directly and conscientiously reject their authority in questioning it. But the affirmation of

Christ himself and of the inspired writers of the New Testament that Moses was the giver of the Law is too explicit to be misunderstood or explained away. The statements of the Pentateuch are direct and explicit that the whole Law in all its parts was either committed to writing by Moses or was given by God to him. These positive statements are directly contravened, when it is affirmed ("The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," p. 123) that only "certain laws" of Deuteronomy were in existence before Josiah, and those but a small part of the whole and not the most characteristic; and that only "certain laws" of the ceremonial institutions were in existence before Ezra, and those of the most rudimental kind (*ibid.*, pp. 158, 159), while the great mass was post-Mosaic practice and chiefly post-Solomonic practice, and not given by God to Moses at all. The patriarchal history, moreover, and even the Mosaic history is reduced to variant and uncertain traditions (*ibid.*, p. 75-80), while the laws are represented to be conflicting and mutually inconsistent (*ibid.*, 101, etc.). The allegation that the laws are post-Mosaic destroys the truthfulness of the history in which they are embedded, and which specifies the occasion and circumstances under which they were given to Moses. Must not criticism, which is at open variance with direct biblical statements, be denominated anti-biblical; and can scholarship, which directly antagonizes the teachings of our Lord in a matter so vital as the origin of the law which he came to fulfill, and which even deprecates the introduction of his authority into the discussion of a subject on which he made positive affirmations (*ibid.*, p. 29), be called a loyal Christian scholarship?

No one questions the Christian character of Dr. Briggs, his sincerity, his motives, or the purity of his life. The sole question at issue is whether the sentiments of his Inaugural are in conformity with the Standards of the Church to which he belongs. It is manifest that all the sentiments that are complained of spring from one root. The low view of predictive prophecy, the errancy of the Bible, the undue exaltation of reason, and the undervaluing the Holy Spirit's agency upon the souls of believers at death, all are the offerings of a rationalistic Higher Criticism. Whether these extremes and radical sentiments are compatible with the pledges which every minister assumes at ordination, and whether the Church can continue to give its sanction to one who is industriously propagating them, is a point to be settled not by a local presbytery, but by the collective voice of the entire Church through its supreme court, which is in an orderly manner and by due process called upon to adjudicate it.

ENGLISH NOTES.

BY JAMES PAYN.

It has been a perpetual reproach to the French people that they take no interest in, and have no knowledge of, matters that take place out of their own boundaries. This is especially the case with foreign literature, the very existence of which seems to be unknown to them. The great excitement caused in England by the death of Tennyson has compelled them, however, to give a momentary attention to his poems. The Paris *Figaro*, a journal, it is true, not much given even to the poetry of its own countrymen, informs that the "Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington" was so successful, that

"after its appearance Tennyson never suffered a single good Englishman to die without singing him in many verses. . . . His poems satisfied the longing for home, for tea, and for ethereal poetry which lies in the bosom of every Englishman or woman who has past forty. . . . The English official world have wept over his grave, but the chromo-lithographic poems of Tennyson will long have been forgotten when Rossetti, Browning and Morris [the two final "ss" denoting perhaps both the poets of that name] are still spoken of."

For pure silliness, absolute and utter ignorance of the subject it deals with, this is perhaps as bad a criticism as ever was written.

It is curious how our modern authors seem to take it for granted that it is a new thing for genius to be depreciated. When a writer has made his mark in the world, we forget, or perhaps have never read, the depreciatory view that was often taken by his contemporaries. Even Shakespeare had his contemporary detractors; and though we are apt to consider the whole course of Walter Scott a triumphal march, this was by no means the case. In the height of his fame, and when he was bringing out his best works, he was attacked by many pens. If we look in *The Month* and other periodicals of the time, they have scarcely a good word to say even for "Ivanhoe." As to the ancients, even the most famous of them bespattered one another with mud. Naucrates accuses Homer of plagiarism; Socrates was described by Athenians as illiterate; Theopompus charges Plato with lying; Cicero and Plutarch tell us that Aristotle has "forgotten nothing that can tend to show his ignorance and his vanity"; and Virgil is described by Pliny and Seneca as "destitute of invention." Under these circumstances one would think that our modern authors might bear depreciatory criticism with more equanimity.

The crusade against the advertisers is from one point of view eminently satisfactory, since it proves that there are, after all, a good many people in the world with nothing much the matter with them. They can have