

# 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 XL.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1889.

NUMBER 2140.

## The Independent.

For Table of Contents see Page 10.

### A NIGHT-SCENE FROM THE ROCK OF CASHEL, IRELAND.

BY S. M. B. PIATT.

AND this was, then, their Cashel of the Kings,  
As babbling legends fondly call it; oh,  
The Cashel now—certain other things;  
Come, look by this blurred moon, if you would know.

From darkness such as hides the happier dead,  
On the wet earth-floor grows a ghastly flame;  
A woman's wasted arm, a child's gold head,  
Shrink back into the wind-stirred straw for shame.

Through the half-door, down from the awful Rock,  
The death chill from some open grave creeps in—  
The skeleton's fixed laugh is seen to mock  
The cry for bread below. Oh, shame and sin!

Warm only with the fire of its starved eyes,  
In one grim corner, crouches a black cat.  
Night moans itself away. The sun must rise  
As it has risen—spite of this or that.

And look! In meadows beautiful, knee-deep  
In bloom for many a shining mile around,  
The undying grass is white with lambs and sheep  
And wandering cattle make a pleasant sound.

CORK (QUEENSTOWN), IRELAND.

### "BUT FOR A MOMENT."

BY ELIZABETH AKERS.

I WILL not think of thee as gone afar  
To some invisible and distant shore,  
Unreached by human eye or earthly lore,  
Farther from me than the remotest star  
Where undiscovered constellations are  
The sparkling dust of Heaven's eternal floor;  
But rather say, "Why should my heart be sore?  
After the long day's tumult, toil and jar,  
Thy work is done a little while before  
My own, and thou hast entered, gladly free,  
Into another room, and left the door  
Of its calm peace and rest unclosed for me  
To follow soon—and in a moment more,  
My darling, I am coming after thee!"

### SUNSET.

BY HERBERT BASHFORD.

LIKE some huge bird that sinks to rest,  
The sun goes down—a weary thing—  
And o'er the water's placid breast  
It lays a scarlet, outstretched wing.

TACOMA, WASH.

### WHAT SHALL THE COLUMBUS CELEBRATION BE?

BY THE REV. THOMAS S. POTWIN.

In the lively dispute as to where the Columbus celebration shall be, the question what it shall be seems almost left out of account. This is to be unmindful of the fact that what a thing *shall be* is a most essential preliminary to determining where it *should be*.

The well-worn expedient of a World's Fair, and the much older story of "a tower whose top may reach unto heaven and make us a name," seem to exhaust the possibilities of the case if we may judge from current discussions.

Few stop to think what it is that we are to celebrate; the only idea is to have a great time.

But the country has seen many celebrations during recent years and had many good times; so that the first need now is to recognize the fact that we have in the present an opportunity for something more than a mere celebration, and certainly for something more than a mere display of civilization. In civilization we have been but imitators or partners of the older nations whose search for gold and "spicery" finally carried them over the waters which were so wide to them but have become so narrow since.

The world is now to have its opportunity for a truly secular commemoration of what the ages have brought forth for the welfare of mankind in their highest inter-

ests and relations. But, if we fail to come up to it the world must wait another century before its adolescence shall yield a consciousness of what it has become.

Greatly as the material aspect of life has changed in four hundred years, it is not herein that the real progress of mankind has occurred. Indeed, in some respects we have not to-day the luxury and magnificence of the Roman Empire.

The real progress of the world has been in the political and social status of humanity, and to this new condition no event has contributed so much as the discovery of America by the Europeans. Here then is found what we have chiefly to celebrate. And fitly to do this there must be first of all a goodly assemblage of representatives of all the races and nations concerned, of those who brought civilization and Christianity to this continent, of those races to whom they were brought, and of the race who were brought here to meet civilization and Christianity. The marshalling of such an assembly would of itself be a most inspiring ceremonial. Then let the gifts of oratory, essay, music and poetry be drawn upon to set forth what the wisdom and will of man and the goodness of God have wrought.

1. The celebration, then, must be first of all historical, a renewal of our knowledge of those noble days. And besides, an impulse should be given to research which will add to that knowledge by drawing upon original and yet unworked sources, which are by no means wanting, and thereby bringing into the light much that is obscure or wholly unknown.

2. It must be ecclesiastical. When we think what the Church was in 1492 and what it is to-day, it is easy to understand that the discovery of America was equal in importance to the rise of a Luther.

3. It must be political. What was human liberty in 1492? We know what it is to-day, and we recognize that God's great gift to mankind was a new continent, on which to "try again."

4. It must be social, and for all the people to exhibit the development which the individual man and woman has reached in millions upon millions.

5. It must be industrial. And here come in the World's Fair and the tower. We have some things that Rome and Egypt did not have, and let us spread them out to view and light them up with our electric lights, and let the world see what America has produced through her Franklins and her Edisons. And the tower will give no end of amusement to the boys and girls, tho precisely how it is proposed to connect it with the events of 1492 has not yet transpired. Perhaps it is hoped, if it be built high enough, to get a sight of Columbus himself, or, at least, to get a bird's-eye view of all the Americas. If not, it will certainly serve to illustrate how Columbus *did not* discover America.

For all this the learning, eloquence and art of the world must be enlisted. University faculties, learned societies and all scholars will recognize their opportunity, and will gladly improve it. Music and the drama must do their part. Let the musical talent of the world be assembled as it has never been before, and do their grandest. Let historical plays be put upon the stage such as all can approve and enjoy.

Then let the Government generously publish and distribute to all the libraries of the people the literature to which the occasion shall have given rise for the education of the present and future generations of our youth.

Then, and then only, shall we have celebrated, as we ought, the birth of the New World.

HARTFORD, CONN.

### THE TRIALS AND TRIUMPHS OF THE EDITOR.

BY CHARLES EMORY SMITH,

EDITOR OF THE PHILADELPHIA "PRESS."

I AM asked to write of "The Trials and Triumphs of the Editor." I suspect my friend, Murat Halstead, as on the eve of distinguished honors he finds himself suddenly haled and halted by the ghosts of old manifestoes which once in cold type will never down, could tell us something of the trials, as he certainly knows much of the triumphs of his craft. The free lance has its risks as well as its rhapsodies. In a different way there is no more plaintive yet humorous revelation of the trials of the editor than is contained in the recently published letters of Horace Greeley to Mr. Dana. Mr. Greeley was the powerful editor; Mr. Dana the accomplished journalist.

Mr. Greeley was all politics; Mr. Dana all news in its broadest sense. Mr. Greeley had no interest in the drama, and when he piteously protested to Mr. Dana as managing editor against leaving out Greeley's most important political article to make room for Fry's eleven-column dramatic review and against embarrassing him by printing a violent assault on his best friend in Congress, he gave us an illustration at once touching and amusing of some of the vexations of the editor. Mr. Greeley had his trials in many ways; but in spite of them all, how splendid and impressive the triumphs of the greatest and grandest editorial career in this or any other country!

These will answer for introductory surface indications; beneath them are deep mines of suggestion with veins of difficulty and of advantage running in every direction. Journalism both as a business and as a profession has been revolutionized within thirty years. Before that time it had very little of the profit of the one or of the rank and character of the other. As a vocation it was limited and precarious; as an intellectual exercise it was narrow and unexciting. Neither in its rewards nor in its achievements taken as a whole did it rank at all with the pulpit or the law or medicine. Outside of the few who became political oracles and who were more politicians than editors, it offered no positions worthy of any ambition. Now all this is completely changed and there has been no such marvelous progress in any other field, unless it be in railroading and one or two other lines of development which combine intellectual and material requirements. As a business journalism has become a great enterprise with vast capital, heavy expenditures, an army of workers and large profits, and requiring the best business management. As a profession it has immeasurably broadened in its scope, attractions, demands and opportunities. The old journalism was little more than political pamphleteering; the new journalism is the comprehensive epitome of the world's life, and the leader and reflex of human thought and activity. The one generally involved party servility and limited careers; the other offers individual independence and the most splendid pecuniary and personal prizes.

The great change has come partly through interior evolution and partly through exterior conditions. Each reacted on the other. The momentous issues and intense stress of the War produced a demand for the earliest possible news over the widest possible territory. That feverish, importunate demand bred the enterprise of the field and forced the ingenuity of the press-room. With the invention of fast printing-presses, the multiplication of stereotyped plates, the development of world-wide enterprise, the lavish use of the telegraph, the cheapening of paper, the growth of population and the education of the people in newspaper reading, has come the possibility of great newspaper circulations; and great circulations carry almost unlimited possibilities as a business. When Greeley and Bennett disputed as to whether the *Tribune* or *Herald* printed the more papers, the trial showed that the maximum was about 18,000. Now we have several newspapers with a daily or weekly circulation of nearly 200,000, and every large city counts a number of journals with circulations varying from 50,000 to 150,000. The difference between the old maximum and the new is the difference between a small income and a bonanza. When we reflect that a single penny on a circulation of 100,000 means a thousand dollars a day, we can realize the import of the figures. The elder Bennett plumed himself in a leading editorial on his approaching marriage and a profit of \$40,000 a year; now the paper of corresponding position makes an annual profit of not less than three-quarters of a million, and scores of papers can be named that carry \$100,000 a year and upwards on the right side of the ledger.

With this mechanical and material development—partly as the cause of it and partly springing from its increasing resources—has come a great intellectual growth. The brain equipment of the metropolitan newspaper has, indeed, relatively advanced beyond the physical equipment. As already suggested, the old journal was little more than a political handbill. Its range was narrow, its discussions limited, its news meager, and its interest restricted and ephemeral. It was for the most part the product of one mind. If he was a Weed or a Greeley, he made a potent political organ. If he was not a giant he made a dull paper and a poor living. The great modern newspaper, on the other hand, springs from no single Jupiter, but shines with a whole constellation of stars. The chief may be as able as the masters of the past, but

It earnestly asks all its ministers and congregations to establish and maintain good German-English parochial schools wherever it is feasible, in order to stop the anglicizing process going on everywhere.

"In those places, however, where the establishment of such parochial schools is impracticable, and English catechetical instruction and English preaching cannot be avoided without losing our young people, our ministers should not delay such instruction and preaching, but should keep our children in our Church, even if this can only be done by giving up the German language.

"In order, however, to evade as much as possible the inconvenience necessarily arising from a mixture of languages, the anglicized members shall, as soon as practicable, be gathered in purely English congregations, and as such shall be served apart from the German congregations.

"As soon as nine English congregations have sprung up they shall constitute an English evangelical synod, separated from the German, but standing in a filial relation to it.

"In order that such congregations may be supplied with competent ministers, the Synod provides that such students of theology as wish it shall receive such training in the English language as will enable them to use it successfully in preaching and teaching.

"The Directory shall be empowered to appoint, in the theological seminary, a fourth professor who is proficient in the English language."

Finally, the Synod institutes the publication of a suitable English catechism, and provides for the translation of the constitution of the Synod, but leaves the production of other English Church books to the future English evangelical synod.

For the training of parochial teachers, which has thus far been carried on in special classes in the college at Elmhurst, Ill., a separate institute shall be established at Hoyleton, Ill., where the evangelical synod, as legal successor of a New England colony, has inherited a building and five acres of land and \$2,500.

The Synod, which has thus far consisted of thirteen districts, was augmented by two, by dividing the Kansas district comprising formerly the whole far West. These fifteen districts are strictly districts, not synods that work together only in some things, our organization being more compact and centralized.

The following resolutions were passed:

"WHEREAS, in consequence of the present extension and steady increase of the Synod the work connected with the presidency requires the whole time and energy of one man, the president shall henceforth not serve a congregation in addition to his presidential work.

"The salary of the president shall be \$2,000 a year, which amount, with traveling expenses, is to be paid out of the synodical treasury.

"The General Conference is of the opinion that the term of the president should in the future be indefinite, and it asks all the districts to consider this question till the next General Conference."

This virtually means tenure for life, if no serious reasons demand a change.

"The following shall be the duties of the president:

"(a) To supervise the Synod with all its institutions.

"(b) To watch the literary activity of the Synod and to engage himself in it as much as possible.

"(c) To superintend and guide the home and foreign missions of the Synod.

"(d) To further the welfare of the Synod through preaching and lecturing at special occasions."

The Rev. J. Zimmerman, of Burlington, Ia., the former president, was re-elected unanimously.

The attention of the assembly was called to the proposal to erect a magnificent church in remembrance of the Protestant at Speyer in 1829, to be built on the spot, now lying waste, where once was raised the ever memorable protest against the suppression of religious liberty. This led to the adoption of the following resolution:

"The General Conference, etc., express their gratification to their fellow-believers in Germany at the erection of a memorial church at Speyer as an exceedingly timely undertaking where-with they eloquently give evidence of the revival of their Protestant consciousness; and the General Conference recommends its ministers and congregations to collect contributions for the erection of this memorial church."

ELDERFELD, IND.

By the will of the late J. Warren Merrill, of Cambridge, Mass., the American Baptist Missionary Union gets \$50,000; the American Baptist Home Mission Society gets \$2,500; the American Baptist Publication Society, \$10,000; Colby University, \$10,000; Newton Theological Institution, \$20,000; Conference of Baptist Ministers, \$10,000; Massachusetts Baptist Convention, \$5,000; Trustees of the Daniel White Charity, \$5,000; Brown University, \$10,000; Vassar College, \$10,000.

...At the anniversary of the American Sabbath Union in the Broadway Tabernacle, this city, December 10th-11th, Dr. Arthur Little, Boston; the Rev. E. K. Bell, Cincinnati; Drs. W. W. Atterbury and MacArthur, of New York; Dr. Charles E. E. Knox, of Bloomfield, N. J., Judge Fancher, and others will deliver addresses. A fine meeting is expected.

...A Congress of Christians will be held in Boston December 11th and 12th, to consider the relation of the Secret Lodge system to Civil Liberty and the Christian Religion. A. J. Gordon, D.D., will preside at the opening meeting, and Dr. A. A. Miner, Dr. O. P. Gifford, Dr. I. J. Lausing, Dr. D. McAllister, and Pres. Charles A. Blanchard are to speak.

...Mr. D. L. Moody will speak in the Brooklyn Young Men's Christian Association Hall, on Saturday evening, December 7th, at 8 o'clock, on the "Use of the Bible," and on Sunday afternoon, December 9th, at 4:15, on some subject of special importance to young men.

...The main business of this life is not merely to frame theories and speculations on any subject, but to act wisely and well for both worlds, in the practical duties which God has imposed upon us.

The Sunday-school.

LESSON FOR DECEMBER 15th.

SOLOMON'S FALL.—I KINGS, II, 4-13.

NOTES.—"Solomon was old."—Somewhere over fifty years.—"His wives."—He had seven hundred or more, which he had taken to cement political alliances with neighboring heathen kingdoms.—"Not perfect."—Not steadfast, not whole. His inner nature had lost its divine trend.—"As was the heart of David his father."—David was by no means perfect in our sense of the word; but his aim was always true; his heart was always directed God-ward, no matter how often he fell. Solomon was led astray from his ideal. In that he lacked perfection.—"Ashdoreth."—Probably at Zidon this goddess, corresponding to the Greek Venus, was worshiped mostly under the form of a fish. She was the woman's deity, and adored with indecent ceremonies.—"Milcom."—This was the Moloch of Milton, the Moloch of the Ammonites, who dwelt to the east of the Red Sea, north of the land of Moab. Its victims were human, and they were burned to death in its brazen arms heated to a white hotness.—"Chemosh."—The Sun God and the War God of the Moabites.—"The Mount that is before Jerusalem."—The Mount of Olives to the east. The spot traditionally known as the "Mount of Offense," where the altar is supposed to have been erected, is the southern peak of this hill.—"Molech; see Milcom, verse 5.—"The Lord was angry with Solomon."—Indignant. A righteous wrath is not a passion.—"Appeared unto him twice."—At Gibeon and at Jerusalem.—"Thy servant."—The bitterest humiliation possible to proud Solomon, to amass for a slave!

Instruction.—Age cannot be guaranteed as a safeguard. Social dignity exempts no man from sin. History reeks with the facts; the most exalted have been among the most abandoned debauchees and darkest criminals. Vice betrays the most eminent when the armor has a flaw. The permanency of a high aim, the everlasting clinging to the highest ideal man has yet had presented to him—Christ, can alone insure salvation.

Neither is mere wisdom security for righteousness, if the knowledge of right precludes the doing of it, then the knowledge of sin also necessitates the practice of evil. Sin is so subtle in its power that it is most to be dreaded when it allures its victim in the full consciousness of his unreasonable act. Shakespeare says out of his own bitter experience:

"When my love swears that she is mate of truth I do believe her, tho' I know she lies."

Substitute for love any particular temptation (to which) you are in the habit of yielding to your own disgust, and the mirror of the unreason of sin is held before your eyes.

It is a wonder that Solomon was not a great deal more distracted than he was with a retinue of seven hundred wives to pull him hither and thither. We are not surprised that the sum and substance of the whole became vanity to him. When American men and women marry they make the best husbands and wives the globe affords. But it is not at all necessary to have been an accomplished flirt to make a faithful spouse. Young people are apt to think that seven hundred sweet-hearts, more or less, are a necessity to education. If the time that is spent gadding about evenings could only be concentrated upon some noble occupation that is elevating, the heart would not be so easily "turned away" and disjointed. The future home will become tender and helpful in proportion as one's previous life was held too precious to be dissipated over frivolous pursuits.

Perfection in the sense this lesson uses it, means wholeness of heart. The soul must be full of a great aim, to merit the term, perfection. In such significance a life need not be faultless to be perfect. There are backward ripples on a huge, advancing wave. A fall does not mean destruction of nobility. Such disasters often serve to refine character. He who aims at perfection need never experience discouragement if his eyes are honestly and intently fixed on Christ.

It is not hard to see that Solomon's main fault lay in his liberal spirit of toleration. "One God has as much right as another God to worship," he argued. His spirituality became sapped when he was negligent in exactly defining what toleration meant and did not mean. It takes no great scholar to discover the difference of meaning between license and liberty. License whether high or low must not be tolerated any more than a nuisance should be borne. We may tolerate anything that is within the strict boundaries of right. All else must be firmly crushed. Rum and Mormonism are samples of the intolerable. But a man may worship Christ any way he pleases. Who shall dictate how another shall love his Master? Toleration has its breadth but also its stern limits.

God hates sin with an untiring energy. He adores the good. God is love. It is natural that, according to our imperfect and as we hope approximately true estimate of God, he should have been thoroughly indignant with Solomon for his wholesale and indiscriminate idolatry. It is consistent with the nature of God, as we understand it and according to the law of just compensation, that Solomon should have been severely punished for his gross sins. Any one of us would have made the king thoroughly miserable during his lifetime, as part payment. But God is gentle beyond our conception. Who dare say to what extent he punishes? Who shall measure the decrees of the Almighty? God's mercy is a quality this generation is beginning to comprehend. It takes time to grow to God.

"For David thy father's sake." It seems that God may forgive sin for the sake of another's sinlessness. Nay, he does. In Solomon's day it was David. In ours it is Christ. For his sake we are pardoned when we might have been condemned.

THE REVISION OF THE CONFESSION OF FAITH.

BY FRANCIS L. PATTON, D.D., LL.D., PRESIDENT OF PRINCETON COLLEGE.

[Read before the Presbyterian Social Union, New York City, December 2d, 1889.

THE Presbyterian Church is organized on the twofold basis of doctrine and polity. Both are essential to the preservation of her identity, but doctrine is the more important of the two. We maintain that our form of government is agreeable to the Word of God and we disallow the claims of prelacy; but we have no *jure divino* warrant for the details of our polity, and it is very commonly held among us that organization is not of the essence of the visible Church. The Westminster divines may have valued polity more than doctrine—it is a matter of no moment; they were wrong if they did, and the Presbyterian Church is wise in not following their example. Her habitual conservatism regarding her doctrinal symbol is seen in the fact that while the Form of Government has been repeatedly amended and the Book of Discipline has been rewritten, the Confession of Faith—save in the case of marriages of affinity—has remained unaltered since its adoption in 1788.

It is a serious thing to change the formularies of a Church that have been hallowed by long use. It is particularly serious to do this when they constitute the Church's doctrinal standards and are the pledge of her corporate perpetuity. Great care should be taken when such changes are contemplated to see that they are demanded by the prevailing and deliberate sentiment of the Church, and that the proper constitutional provisions have been so fully complied with that they can be made peacefully and without danger. No great harm could come from the continued use in unaltered form of a symbol which for two hundred years has been associated with the theological learning and pulpit eloquence, the spiritual life and practical zeal, the heroic endeavor and consecrated service of that body of Christians in Great Britain and America who have believed in the theology of the Westminster divines. Great harm, however, would come if the demand for revision should stir up strife or end in litigation. Is it clear that no danger is to be apprehended from the Revision movement? Has the matter been entered into with the caution that should be expected and with a proper appreciation of the serious nature of the undertaking? I fear not.

1. In the first place, there is no general agreement in the Church regarding the mode in which a revision should be effected. There is no reason to doubt the binding force of the Adopting Act which requires the consent of two thirds of the presbyteries; but it is maintained by some that the Confession can be amended under the operation of the rule in chapter xi, §6, of the Form of Government, requiring the consent of only a majority of the presbyteries. The General Assembly has appointed a committee to consider the question concerning the mode of amending the constitution; and it would be well for the Church to see to the report of that committee before entering upon the work of Revision.

2. There is, moreover, a difference of opinion in the Church regarding the legislative power of the General Assembly. It is held by some that subject to the approval of the requisite number of presbyteries the enacting power is lodged in the General Assembly; by others it is held that the General Assembly has no other function in respect to constitutional amendments than that of receiving the votes of the presbyteries and announcing the result.

It can hardly be doubted that in a matter so serious as the revision of the Standards these differences will reveal themselves. It would be better, therefore, to defer the work of revision until a better understanding is arrived at regarding the legislative powers of the General Assembly. The short and easy method which some have of appealing to the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of the Walnut Street church as settling all questions that may be raised regarding the constitutionality of the Assembly's proceedings is not safe.

3. The Adopting Act clearly states that before a change can be effected in the Confession of Faith it must be demanded by two-thirds of the presbyteries and enacted by the Assembly. It is not the province of the Assembly, therefore, to initiate the movement for a revision of the Standards. If, however, it be held that according to chapter xi, §6 of the Form of Government, the Assembly has the power to propose changes in the Constitution, it is of the utmost importance that these changes be carefully stated and fully discussed by the Assembly before being submitted to the presbyteries. But the last Assembly sent down its overtures with little or no debate. It may be said, of course, that the pending overtures are intended to test the mind of the Church and secure material for the framing of overtures to be submitted to the Presbyteries by a subsequent Assembly. But it was an error for the Assembly in its time of theological unrest to throw open to the Church at large the entire area of dogmatic theology by the comprehensive invitation of the second overture. The most generous construction of the implied powers of the Assembly can hardly justify it, interded as it is to be "the bond of union, peace, correspondence and mutual confidence among all our churches" in promoting an agitation throughout the whole denomination respecting the doctrinal symbols. Were there no other reason for voting against the overtures this would be sufficient.

But the subject of Revision must be dealt with on its merits, and I have referred to these Constitutional matters only by way of preface. The Confession of Faith was made by fallible men and is fallible. Infelicities of expression, defects and excesses of statement as well as faults of emphasis, are justly chargeable to it. It was written under polemic conditions, and was designed to meet the theological exigencies of the time. Hence its strength and its weakness: its strength, for its dogmatic statements were forged in the fires of controversy, and its definitions speak

to us in every word of the Church's fight with error; its weakness, for there is a change of perspective in the course of a few generations, and the controversies of one period lose their relative importance in the periods succeeding. A confession of faith seems after a time to lack balance and proportion of parts, for old topics lose some of their prominence from the fact that each generation has its own problems to deal with. It is not denied that the Confession could be improved. Some of the space now given to the Pop<sup>e</sup> might very well be devoted to that modern compound of Hegel and Schleiermacher known as the doctrine of the Christian consciousness. It might profitably be stated that the witness of the Spirit is not intended to justify and give countenance to rationalistic subjectivism in dealing with the inspiration of the Scriptures. Alongside of the Roman Catholic doctrine of justification might be placed that of the moral influence theory, which resembles it and is just as bad; and the neo-Romanism that speaks of future probation and the believer's incomplete sanctification at death would find its appropriate place in an amended section on Purgatory. But a revision of the Confession is not desirable to serve even these important ends. When we consider the danger of unsettling opinion, of disturbing old anchorages, and of being obliged, when the work begins, of going further than we intended, it is better to act upon the maxim, *Quæta non movere*. There is nothing in the conditions under which we are living that calls for a new creed or a revision of the old one. We are living through a period of theological unrest; but there is nothing epoch-making in the books that men are writing or the events that are happening. There is no dogmatic crisis upon us that calls for the reconstruction of theology and new definition. Dogmatic theology, on the contrary, is neglected. It is not denied that there are men among us who, by making free use of the materials already existing in the Confession, are abundantly equal to the task of preparing a more compact, a more logical, and in some respects a more satisfactory Confession. But they cannot write two hundred years of history into it. They cannot secure for it the veneration that is accorded a symbol that tells the story of our civil and religious liberty. Think of what went into the making of that symbol. Think how that symbol has gone into the making of this land, and remember that the Protestant Reformation, the Long Parliament and the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers are events that are not likely to be repeated.

These are *a priori* reasons against Revision. They are reinforced by the fact that the Confession of Faith is not a formulary in common use and intended as a manual of devotion. It is not imposed upon the people. It is received and adopted by the ministers and elders of the Church as the Confession of their Faith. These presumptions against Revision are further strengthened by the terms of subscription. The Confession is not accepted *in ipsissimis verbis*; if it were it might be necessary to give relief to burdened consciences by a declaratory statement or by a revision of some of its parts. It is received and adopted as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Word of God. There is no need of misunderstanding here. No one doubts that the Confession teaches a system of doctrine. Every one knows what that system is. To accept the Confession of Faith in the terms of the ordination vow is to say that the Calvinistic system is taught in the Word of God. In accepting the Confession one is not simply assenting to the doctrines common to all Christians, nor is he accepting any one phase of Calvinistic doctrine as distinguished from some other phase. The general practice of the Church, the negotiations that led to the Reunion, the decisions of the Assembly and the subscription formula itself all show that subscription to the Confession implies (1) acceptance of the Calvinistic system, and (2) freedom of belief within the limits of that system. There is no doubt that there is an area of tolerated divergence from the Confession of Faith. How large that area is will depend upon the degree of readiness there may be in the Church to move the ecclesiastical courts, and upon the decisions reached in the court of last resort. Historical students may tell us what the Church has thought upon the subject, and dogmatic theologians may tell us what the Church ought to think; but it is only as the General Assembly decides concrete cases in appellate jurisdiction, and the principle of *stare decisis* may be supposed to govern subsequent deliverances that the area of tolerated divergence can be defined.

It is possible, however, that in spite of these presumptions to the contrary the statements of the Confession are so false or so unsuited to the demands of modern life that some revision of it is imperative. This will be said undoubtedly by many, but in estimating the value of such a statement some regard must be paid to the doctrinal attitude of those who make it. Those who advocate Revision can perhaps be comprehended in three classes:

1. Those who are Calvinists and who ask only for a few changes and for such as do not impair the integrity of the Calvinistic system.
2. Those who whether consciously or unconsciously are not Calvinists and who make demands for a revision which would impair the integrity of the Calvinistic system.
3. Those who whether Calvinists or not are Comprehensiveists who are ready in the interests of Catholicity to see the Confession superseded by a shorter creed, or its doctrinal area greatly contracted.

Let us consider these classes separately.

#### I.

Those who belong to the first class desire to have the Confession amended (1) by making a more definite statement concerning God's love, and (2) by omitting or modifying such statements as those concerning (a) elect infants, (b) the preterition of the non-elect, and (c) the salvation of those not professing the Christian religion.

As the love of God, unlike the composite authorship of the Pentateuch, is not a recent discovery, the defect of the Confession in this regard, conceding it to exist, is best explained by supposing that the Westminster divines were able to distinguish between an exhortation and a summary of doctrine. There is not a specific section devoted

to the love of God in a single confession of Christendom, the reason being that love is one of the divine attributes, and is considered usually along with God's justice and holiness in the chapter that treats of God. It has its proper place in the Westminster Confession, but was not discussed for the attributes were not discussed. It was not denied, and therefore there was no need of setting it forth in antithesis to error. In considering doctrinal ratios in a confession of faith or body of divinity, the critic needs some other unit of measurement than a thousand ems. But "the Confession does not neglect the divine mercy," as Dr. Briggs very correctly remarks in his recent book. "This is clear," he continues. "from the following statement where, if anything, the divine love is magnified above justice; 'most loving, gracious, merciful, long suffering, abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin; the rewarder of them that diligently seek him.' . . . There is no neglect of the divine love here. The statement 'most loving' refers to the proof text 'God is love,' and the proof-texts for the rest of the definitions are the classic passages where the divine mercy is magnified. Here the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins is set forth in all its grandeur as the outflow of the divine love, grace and mercy." I should infer from this that Dr. Briggs would see no need of a revision of the Confession in order to secure a proper recognition in it of the divine love, and in this matter I am of his way of thinking.

Nor is there any reason for amending the Confession by omitting or modifying the passages already referred to. It can be done, however, without affecting the integrity of the Calvinistic system. So far as these passages are concerned Revision is unnecessary because.

i. The sentiments contained in them are legitimately involved in the Calvinistic system.

There is the statement concerning "elect infants." It has not been shown that the Westminster divines meant to teach in the Confession that any infants dying in infancy are non-elect; nor can the citation of passages from their writings or the debates of the Westminster Assembly affect our interpretation of the Confession. The language of the Confession is plain and our interpretation must conform to the fundamental legal principle that requires us to find our materials for the construction of a document within the four corners of the document. A great deal of most valuable historical research becomes useless so far as the question of confessional interpretation is concerned in the light of this principle. The Confession teaches that only the elect will be saved; that those of the elect who are capable of faith are saved by faith; that those of the elect such as elect infants dying in infancy who are incapable of faith are saved without faith. The antithesis is not between elect and non-elect infants, but between elect infants that die in infancy and elect infants that do not die in infancy. It is true that the Confession does not dogmatically say that all who die in infancy are among the elect; but neither does it say that any who die in infancy are among the non-elect. Those therefore who say that the Confession teaches or was meant to teach infant damnation do so without warrant; and I am unwilling to see our Church make a concession to her enemies by striking out of her Confession a statement that is strictly true.

It is said that the doctrine of preterition, or reprobation as they prefer to call it, should be stricken from the Confession. It is said to be distinctively supra-lapsarian; but this is a mistake. Calvinism teaches that God elects individuals to eternal life out of his mere good pleasure. Now if men are saved because they are elected, and God elects some, certainly some must be left. We may say that God passed them by, or reprobated them, or did not save them. The statement of the Confession is simply an affirmation of the laws of thought touching the simple process of subtraction. It is said that logic does not apply to such matters. But if we are ready to take an agnostic position in a matter so fundamental as that the whole is greater than its part, we shall soon need a revision of the Confession, more radical than has hitherto been dreamed of.

Complaint is also made because the Confession teaches that men not professing the Christian religion cannot be saved in any other way, "be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of Nature and the law of that religion they do profess." If good Calvinists choose to indulge in a charitable hope regarding a few exceptional men among the heathen no one will interfere with them. But it will be difficult to show that the Confession of Faith has said anything on this subject that is contrary to Scripture. Does not Paul argue that all, both Jews and Gentiles, are under condemnation? that there is no salvation by works? and that justification is by faith in Christ? Does he not preach the Gospel to the heathen because the heathen are in peril? Why then unless we are prepared to find fault with Paul, do we find fault with the Confession? It would be a great mistake in these days of awakened interest in Foreign Missions to amend the Confession by striking out what, after all, is one of the strongest pleas for missionary endeavor.

But a revision of the Confession, so far as these passages are concerned, is unnecessary also because:

ii. The objections based upon them are really not to the ideas specifically embodied in these passages, but to the Calvinistic doctrines that underlie them.

If we believe that God has elected some to everlasting life we do not make the doctrine less obnoxious, because in stating it we omit the logical sequel, which says on the authority of Romans ix that he passed by the rest. If only the elect are saved, and we know that adults are saved by faith, we cannot find fault with the Confession for saying that those of the elect who die in infancy are saved without faith, without baptism, and by the renewal of the Holy Ghost. If we believe that God intends to save only some, we need not be angry with the Confession for telling us that is God's plan to bring his elect to the knowledge of Christ by the preaching of the Gospel. We should give our enemies credit for very little discernment if we supposed that they would regard the omission of these passa-

ges as a liberalizing of our Confession. The better way to handle this matter is to take hold of the big end of the question. If we can face the criticisms urged against fundamental Calvinism, we need not be concerned about those that are based upon the inferences that follow from it.

It is to be feared, however, that whether they are aware of it or not, some who advocate Revision are not Calvinists; it is not strange, therefore, that their desire for Revision should assume a form that is disastrous to the integrity of the Calvinistic system.

#### II.

It is not strange that some are finding Revision to be no simple matter, and that when the process of amendment begins it is hard to know where it should end. There is reason to think that some are slowly but surely awakening to the discovery that they are Calvinists no longer. Revision can be accomplished without danger to our doctrinal system, as I have already said. Modify the chapters on the decrees and on effectual calling, and Calvinism would remain in the Confession "rigid, militant and menacing" as ever. But such a revision would not satisfy those whose quarrel is with sovereign, unconditional election. The discussion of the pending overtures has brought to light the fact that some who advocate revision do not believe the pivotal doctrine of the system that is taught in our Standards. They go on speaking of election on the ground of holiness, or election on the ground of foreseen faith, and are unconsciously using the Shibboleths of Arminianism in advocating the cause of the Westminster divines. It must amuse the theologians of the Methodist Church to notice that Presbyterian office-bearers are trying to persuade the Church that honors Charles Hodge and Henry B. Smith as its great dogmatic theologians to go over bodily to the platform of the Remonstrants. There is need that we ask ourselves what we mean by Calvinism. Protestantism revolts from Rome, let us remember, on the basis of infallible Bible, private judgment, and justification by faith. Protestantism takes on two forms; the Lutheran and the Reformed. Lutheranism is anthropological and sacramental; the Reformed churches are theological and predestinarian. Lutheranism emphasises total depravity and baptismal regeneration; the Reformed churches emphasise the divine purpose and find deliverance from original sin in sovereign regeneration. Discussions regarding the divine decrees among the Reformed theologians end in the separation of the Romanstrant or Arminian party; Calvinists holding that election is of individuals to everlasting life out of the mere good pleasure of God; Arminians that election is of individuals to everlasting life on the ground of foreseen faith. Arminians, then, may be regarded historically as belonging to the Reformed family; but they are not Calvinists. It is of the essence of Calvinism to affirm that election is sovereign. The Calvinistic system is capable of very definite statement. There are varieties of it. There is supra- and sub-lapsarianism, and there is the Calvinism of the Salmurian school. There is the Calvinism that explains original sin by heredity, as well as that which explains it by realism or by federal headship. There is among Calvinistic theologians a difference of opinion regarding the extent of the atonement as well as one regarding the sinner's inability. But there is a broad, generic, well-defined and well-understood body of doctrine that underlies and is common to all these varieties, and it is to it that reference is made when we speak of the Calvinistic system. Starting with depravity, which all Protestants believe in, we have the problem of redemption solved in sufficient grace for all according to the Arminians; baptismal regeneration according to the Lutherans; and sovereign election according to the Calvinists. Sovereign regeneration leads logically to sovereign election, just as sovereign election leads to sovereign regeneration, each being deducible from the other, and each being inductively ascertained from Scripture. National election, the election of individuals to external privileges only, and the election of individuals to eternal life on the ground of foreseen faith, are all anti-Calvinistic. Calvinistic election is of individuals, to everlasting life, on the ground of God's sovereign love. Now I ask: Shall we have gained much if we omit the section on preterition and leave this doctrine of election? I think not. This is why I say that the doctrine of reprobation may be omitted without affecting the Calvinistic system. This is why I also say that it is hardly worth while to amend if we intend to leave the doctrine of election where it stands. This explains the fact that some find that the task of revision is growing on their hands. They would like to eliminate the doctrine of sovereign, unconditional election, and they find that, like the figure of Minerva in the shield of Achilles, it is so woven into the Confession that it cannot be eliminated without destroying the symbol. Is the Presbyterian Church ready to undertake a revision so far-reaching as this? I think I do not misjudge her when I say that she is not.

It can hardly be denied that the Church has the constitutional right to revise her creed even to the extent of eliminating her Calvinism. If, therefore, so large a proportion as two-thirds of the Presbyterian Church should ask for such a revision, it is not likely that any legal obstacle could be placed in their way. The fraction that might remain faithful to the men whose wealth, on the one hand, had endowed our theological seminaries, and whose learning, on the other, had made these seminaries a salient feature in American civilization, would have to say whether it would be wiser for them to remain quietly in the broad church that without doubt would generously tolerate them, or whether they should ask for a modest share of the estate, that they might go out and set up for themselves.

I am confident that within twenty years after a Reunion when acceptance of the Confession in "its historical, that is to say, its Augustinian or Calvinistic sense" was a universal sentiment the Presbyterian Church has not outgrown that sentiment. I am sure that within the same quarter of a century that has seen the publication of three great systems of dogmatic theology—I refer to the works of Charles Hodge, Henry B. Smith and William G. T. Shedd—

the Presbyterian Church has not found herself in readiness to turn her back upon the Creed which is expounded with such force and fullness, with such explicitness and boldness in each of these systems. Hobbes said once that "Thought is quick"; but it is hardly as quick as such a revolution of opinion would imply.

The fundamental doctrines of Calvinism—I have named election as one; there are others that I might have named—are not determined as to their meaning by the way in which they are systematized. Separate dogmas must be separately supported by Scripture. How the doctrinal units are manipulated may change the look of the system, but it does not change the doctrines. We may begin with sin or with predestination or with the person of Christ. We cannot change the doctrines by adopting one rather than another style of theological architecture. It is important to say this because some seem to think that they can keep their Calvinism and at the same time get rid of its hard features by adopting a Christocentric method in theologizing. They are mistaken. The Presbyterian Church intends to keep her Calvinism because she believes that Calvinism is true. Men may be kept out of our Church because they do not like our doctrines. But if the condition of receiving them be our repudiation of those doctrines it is better that they should join other Communions. But why should our doctrines keep men out of our Church? They are not asked to accept them. It is even said that they may worship in some of our churches a long time without hearing them. It is also said that some of our best and brightest young men turn away from the Presbyterian ministry because they cannot accept our hard doctrines. I am sorry for these young men—sorry that they miss the great opportunity that our Church would afford them of serving God and doing good. But the Church can better afford to do without the services of these brilliant young men than sacrifice the truth. Besides, I do not believe the allegation. That skepticism prevails there is no doubt; but that skepticism is apt to take the form of doubt respecting the authority of the Bible rather than difficulty of understanding what the Bible says. When a man believes the Bible he will find nothing in the science or philosophy of to-day to make doubt the Calvinism of the Bible. It is hard to see how a scientific man who believes in supernaturalism can help believing in Calvinistic supernaturalism. When one learns from physics and biology to believe in this uniformity of Nature, the solidarity of the race, the significance of character and the influence of heredity he is not far from Calvinism. It only remains for him to say whether he will enthronate a purposing God or accept the everlasting grind of antecedent or consequent as his theory of the universe. Calvinism is the only philosophy of religion that will stand the double test of science and Scripture. Henry B. Smith was right: "One thing," he says, "is certain, that infidel science will rout everything except thorough-going Christian orthodoxy. All the flabby theories and the molluscous formations . . . will go by the board. The fight will be between a stiff thorough-going Orthodoxy and a stiff thorough-going Infidelity. It will be, e.g., Augustine or Comte, Athanasius or Hegel, Luther or Schopenhauer, J. S. Mill or John Calvin. Arianism gets the fire on both sides; so does Arminianism; so does Universalism."

Calvinism may be a hard system but it is Scriptural. Paul taught it. Many who reject it in spite of Paul admit that Paul taught it. It has its hard features, I allow. But the Christian does not find it hard to say that his faith is the gift of God; that he is kept by the power of God; and that nothing shall separate him from the love of God. He sings with Faber:

"Oh, gift of gifts, oh, grace of faith  
My God, how can it be  
That thou who hast discerning love  
Shouldst not give that gift to me."

He sits at the communion table and sings with Watts:

"Why was I made to hear his voice  
And enter while there's room  
While thousands make a wretched choice  
And rather starve than come.

"'Twas the same love that spread the feast  
That sweetly forced me in,  
Else I had still refused to taste  
And perished in my sin."

It does not occur to him, perhaps, that while he says this he is by implication accepting the Calvinistic doctrine of election and reprobation. But he is. There is a hard side to Calvinism. It is the doctrine that some are chosen to salvation and others left

to suffer the punishment of their sins. It is the doctrine that that punishment is endless suffering. I do not wonder that men search the Scriptures in the hope of finding deliverance from that doctrine. I do not wonder that some find peace, as Rothe did, as Milton, Constable and Edward White have done, in the sinner's gradual annihilation.

They will find it hard to defend their view on adequate exegetical grounds. But there is no doubt that it gives them the basis of a rational theodicy; and the survival of the fittest thus becomes a parable of Redemption.

III.

Believing Calvinism to be true, the Presbyterian Church will refuse to eliminate it from her Confession of Faith unless she has ceased to believe that it is her duty to be a witness-bearing Church. But this is itself a very important question. May it not be that we have outgrown the era of Confessionalism? May it not be that a shorter creed written under the inspiration of the synthetic and irenic conditions of to-day would be better suited to the practical demands of our aggressive Church? Would it not be easier to make a new creed than to revise the old one? These questions must be discussed in connection with the present debate. Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth. It was not supposed that a proposition to change a section of the Confession in regard to the sovereignty of God and the free will of man would open the whole question concerning the wisdom of perpetuating denominationalism. Out of such little beginnings, however, do revolutions come. It looks now as though conservative men would need all their strength in order to keep the Church from throwing the Confession overboard altogether, and as though in the presence of the larger question it were not wise for them to be divided in reference to smaller matters. Whether we desire it or not we cannot avoid facing the question whether there is any future for the Presbyterian Church. It is the demand for Christian unity; it is the anti-confessional drift; it is the growing spirit of comprehension that is giving momentum to the movement for a moderate revision. The smaller question is only a form in which the larger question happens to be presenting itself. In the presence of this larger question the demand for a moderate revision of the Confession loses much of its importance. Let the Church omit the clause in the Confession if that is thought best. There is no reason for doing so, and it will do no good. Let her append to the Confession a declaratory statement to the effect that she believes it to be the duty of the Church to evangelize the heathen. The best declaratory statement in my opinion is the Board of Foreign Missions. The best confession of the duty to propagate the Gospel is her annual contribution which I fear is not likely to be increased by this unfortunate discussion. But it is a mistake for the Calvinistic advocates of moderate revision to weaken the hands of those who like themselves believe in the witness-bearing duty of the Church, by meanwhile swelling the ranks of the Comprehension party. It is a mistake for them to suppose that by timely concessions in unessential points they can satisfy the craving for change. I am surprised that so many seem willing to debate the question regarding the wisdom of making the Confession speak more voluminously upon the love of God, as though that were a matter of much moment, and remain blind to the fact that the real question in the minds of some of our leading men is whether the denominations have not outlived their usefulness. I feel disposed to say to such, in Browning's words:

"You take ship-carpentry for pilotage.  
Stop rat-holes, while a sea sweeps through  
the breach—  
Hammer and fortify at puny points?  
Do, clamp and tennon, make all tight and  
safe!

'Tis here and here and here you ship a sea;  
No good of your stopped leaks and littleness."

It would be easier to make a new creed than to pare the old one down to the size that would suit the Comprehensionists. But the Presbyterian Church is under constitutional obligations to keep the Confession of Faith as her dogmatic symbol. The Basis of Union declares that the "Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received and adopted as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures."

If, then, in the interests of Comprehension the work of revision is to go on, where will it stop? Shall we strike out everything but what is common to evangelical Christians? That seems to be a feasible thing. But is any body prepared to state the consensus or evangelical doctrine? Any one who attempts it will find it a hard thing to do. Will you widen your doctrinal area until

the profession of Christian faith becomes the only condition of ministerial fellowship? Will you accept, for instance, the Apostles' Creed as your ecclesiastical symbol? That is a good one, but in what sense will you have it accepted—in *ipsis-ipsis verbis* or as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Word of God? In the latter sense, probably, so as to clear the consciences of those who object to the *descensus ad inferos* or who have peculiar modes of viewing, stating and explaining the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. And what would be the result? We should gain in numbers but lose in moral power. We give up doctrine. What is to save the denomination from disintegration? Clearly we must emphasize polity or the sacraments, probably both. We must become high churchmen and sacramentarians. And having ceased to witness as she has done for the whole of God's revealed truth, instead of building colleges and endowing theological seminaries, instead of training men to preach a full orbed Gospel, instead of being the mother of theologians and exegetes, the Presbyterian Church would thenceforth say to the world, God has sent me to baptize and to preach the gospel of the ruling eldership. This would be the outcome of comprehension. We should be no nearer the re-union of Christendom. Episcopacy would still be on our right, Congregationalism on our left; and for the sake of a Utopian scheme of visible unity that has no support in Scripture and no analogy in experience, we should have lost the glorious heritage of three hundred years.

But are we sure that we should have reached the limit of this minimizing tendency when we had made the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments the basis of ministerial fellowship? Is it proposed to keep the doctrine of Inspiration and affirm the binding authority of the Old and New Testament? This would be the wish of the greater portion of our Church, undoubtedly. But is it not a doctrine that is also very often doubted? There are Christian men who do not hold to any very high theory of inspiration, and it is hard to see why this doctrine that also rests on argument and is an induction based upon a large number of facts, should be retained when other doctrines are eliminated on the ground that they are matters about which Christians differ, and are maintained by the application of logical methods. Is it not as important to believe what the Scriptures teach as to know how the Scriptures were produced? The logic of comprehension will require us to tolerate loose views respecting the authority of Scripture. And it would not be long before the Presbyterian Church would be as broad as the Church on the other side of the sea that tolerates Ritschl and Lipsius, Biedermann and Luther; that chooses Caftan as Dorner's successor and allows Caftan and Pfleiderer to lecture in the same university. We should outgrow our sensitiveness respecting the new theology and the higher criticism, and when Robert Elsmere applied for ordination, if that word still possessed a meaning, we should ordain him without debate. This is not the scheme that any one proposes to day. But this is the logical outcome of Comprehension.

And now I ask, is it a Church like this that is fit to cope with Romanism? Can such a Church prove a breakwater to the floods of infidelity?

Let me not be misunderstood. I believe that there is a common work of evangelization in which the denominations can cooperate. I believe that the Presbyterian Church, by the conditions of Revision, must be as broad as generic Calvinism will allow. I believe that Christians of different Churches should love each other more and understand each other better. But the Re-union of Christendom, as that phrase is commonly understood, I do not believe in. It is quite true that the doctrines that Christians hold in common are more important than those which separate them. But the way to conserve that which is common to all, is for each to be jealous of the doctrine that is peculiar to itself. Defend the out-posts if you wish to defend the citadel.

And it is because of my interest in maintaining the common faith of all Christians—I do not say all Protestants, but all Christians, Roman Catholic and Protestant—as well as because of my desire to see the Presbyterian Church stand true to her glorious history that I am opposed to the proposition to revise her Standards. I am sorry that the agitation has occurred; but I trust that God in his good Providence may make it the occasion of a more emphatic avowal of that system of doctrine in the maintenance of which our Church has been so greatly blessed. I do not anticipate a storm

—only a little breeze that will shake the folds out of the old blue banner of the Covenant and set it fluttering with the promise of new achievements as it heads the advancing column of the Calvinistic forces, who, do not doubt, will keep the fame already won of being among the bravest and the best in the sacramental host of God's elect.

Ministerial Register.

BAPTIST.

- GOODWIN, L. D., Colby, accepts call to Ellis Kan.
- HARE, J. M., inst. December 4th, Phoenixville, Penn.
- HAWKINS, E. P., Cedar Creek, Ga., resigns.
- HUTCHINSON, J. M., Waterville, accepts call to Utica, N. Y.
- JONES, J. S., Germantown, Penn., resigns.
- NEAL, THOMAS, inst. December 1st, Messiah ch., Philadelphia, Penn.
- REED, D. D., inst. December 1st, Plainville, Conn.
- SHERMER, W. H., Philadelphia, Penn., called to Elizabeth, N. J.
- STODDARD, D. W., Morris, called to East Marion, N. Y.
- TAYLOR, D. B., Norwich, Conn., resigns.
- WEBSTER, J. A., East Poultney, called to Hydeville, Conn.

CONGREGATIONAL.

- ASHBY, JOHN H., Wacousta, Mich., resigns.
- BELSEY, GEORGE, Keane, Penn., accepts call to Dayton, O.
- BROWN, J. NEWTON, Owantonna, becomes assistant editor *Northwestern Congregationalist*, Minneapolis, Minn.
- BURB, HANFORD M., Lowell, accepts call to Park ch., Springfield, Mass.
- COLLIER, C. W., Newark, O., accepts call to Williamstown, Mass.
- DAVIS, DVID E., Sprague, Wash., resigns.
- DINGWELL, JAMES, inst. December 3d, Rockville, Conn.
- HESS, CARL, Davenport, Ia., resigns.
- KERR, ROBERT, inst. December 2d, Tacoma, Wis.
- LOUGRE, SAMUEL F., East Alstead, N. H., resigns.
- SANDERS, FRANK P., New London, O., accepts call to East Chicago and South Hammond, Ind.
- SOHRENSEN, MARTIN, died November 23d, Council Bluffs, Ia.
- WALKER, THEODORE, C., Keosauqua, Ia., resigns.
- WHEELER, WILSON C., Alma and McFarland, Kan., resigns.

PRESBYTERIAN.

- ALEXANDER, S. D., Phillips ch., New York, resigns.
- BATES, ALFRED K., Cedar Rapids, Ia., called to Cadiz, O.
- BOGGS, J. H., inst., November 25th, Lawndale ch., Philadelphia, Penn.
- BRED, W. P., Jr., Fairview, accepts call to Milton, Penn.
- CARRINGTON, JOHN, becomes Missionary in Siam for the Am. Bible So.
- CLEVELAND, WM. N., Utica, called to Chaumont, N. Y.
- DILLON, EDWARD, Woodbury, N. J., called to Millintown, Penn.
- HOBBS, J. H., Greenwich, Conn., called to Jamaica, N. Y.
- JOHNSON, WALTER, Gladstone, Mich., accepts call to Verona and Bellville, Wis.
- JONES, E. CANFIELD, ord. December 2d, Lincoln, Penn.
- KERR, D. R., Omaha, Neb., resigns.
- LUCKS, WELLINGTON E., inst. December 4th Camden, N. J.
- MACCAULEY, H. B., Bound Brook, N. J., called to Port Jervis, N. Y.
- MCGOWAN, J. W., Jamestown Center, Wis., called to Spring Grove, Minn.
- MURRAY, JOSEPH A., D. D., Carlisle, Penn., died November 27th, aged 74.
- PATERSON, J. G., Erie, Penn., resigns.
- PHRANER, WILSON, D. D., Elmira, N. Y., resigns.
- POMEROY, JOHN J., Chambersburg, Penn., died December 1st, aged 55.
- ROSS, HERBERT C., inst. December 5th, First ch., Erie, Penn.
- SFEWARD, HARLEY J., Newport, Ky., called to Westminster ch., Cincinnati, O.
- SPRYKER, PETER R., Minneapolis, Minn., called to Thirty-fourth St. ch., New York, N. Y.
- WALL, BLOOMFIELD, Howard, Minn., resigns.
- WINDER, JOSEPH W., Ellendale, S. D., accepts call to North La Crosse, Wis.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL.

- CLAIBORNE, R. R., Sligo, Md., accepts call to Youngstown, O.
- FLANDERS, J. C., Manchester, accepts call to Montpelier, Vt.
- HAYDEN, CHARLES O., Gloucester, Mass., accepts call to Mount Holly, N. J.
- LEWIS, A. N., Westport, Conn., resigns.
- PARSONS, A. T., East Hadden, accepts call to Thomaston, Mass.
- WATKINS, WILBER F., Jr., Shamokin, Penn., accepts call as assistant, Emmanuel ch., Baltimore, Md.

MISCELLANEOUS.

- ADRIANCE, HARRIS E., Reformed, Poughkeepsie, called to Walkill, N. Y.
- BARTHOLOMEW, O. E., Luth., Ringtown, Penn., accepts call to Phillipsburg, N. J.
- CONDON, HENRY N., Univ., Chatham, N. Y., called to Shelburne Falls, Mass.
- GORDON, MALCOLM R., Reformed, inst. December 4th, Shaghticoke, N. Y.
- GRAEFF, I. E., D. D., Tamaqua, accepts call to Harrisburg, Penn.
- HARVEY, LEON A., Unit., Harvard, accepts call to Cincinnati, O.
- HILL, W. E., So. Pres., Covington, Va., resigns.
- HUNT, F. D., So. Pres., ord. November 26th, Charlotte, N. C.
- MANHART, E. P., Luth., inst. November 26th, All Saints ch., Philadelphia, Penn.
- PIERCE, GRANVILLE, Unit., Dublin, Ireland, called to Lebanon, N. H.
- STECK, THOMAS, Luth., Bridgetown, Pa., resigns.