

The Independent.

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

"BUT AS WE WERE ALLOWED OF GOD TO BE PUT IN TRUST WITH THE GOSPEL, EVEN SO WE SPEAK, NOT AS PLEASING MEN, BUT GOD, WHICH TRUTH OUR HEARTS."

VOLUME XXXIII.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 18, 1881.

NUMBER 1707.

The Independent.

"THIS IS THE TRUE LIGHT THAT
LIGHTENETH THE WORLD."

BY SUSAN COOLIDGE.

They spy it from afar,
The beacon's fiery star,
And storm-tossed birds, by fierce winds buf-
feted,
Bally with half-spent force,
And shape their struggling course
To where it rears its blazing, beckoning head.

Faintly the tired wings beat,
That rhythmical repeat,
Which was such joy in summer and in sun;
Glazed are the keen, bright eyes,
And heaved with panting sighs
The soft and plumed bosoms every one.

O'er the white, weltering waves,
Which yawn like empty graves,
Borne on the urgings of the wind, they fly;
They reach the luring glow,
They launch and plunge, and lo!
Are dashed upon the glass, and fall and die.

So through the storm and night,
Outwearied with long fight,
Our souls come crowding o'er the angry sea,
In North, in East, in West,
There is no place of rest,
Except, O kindly Light, except with Thee.

No cold, unyielding glass
Bars and forbids to pass;
Thy dear light scorseth not nor burns in vain;
The soul that finds and knows
Such safe and sure repose
Need never more go out or roam again.

Ah! steadfast citadel!
Ah! lamp that burns so well
Upon the Rock of Ages, founded true!
Above the angry sea
We urge our flight to Thee.
Shine, kindly Light, and guide us safely
through.

NEWPORT, R. I.

DEAN STANLEY'S FUNERAL.

BY THEODORE L. CUYLER, D. D.

A week ago yesterday, after the second service in Westminster Abbey, I went through to the door of the Deanery, to inquire after the Dean and to leave a message for him. No one felt any uneasiness about him, and a few moments previously Canon Farrar had told me that he was doing well. Just as we reached the door a bulletin was posted up that unfavorable symptoms had set in and grave apprehensions were entertained as to the issue. "Ah!" said Newman Hall to me, "our good, friend, the Dean, is going to die." The next night, before the clock struck twelve, he was dead!

The whole nation was shocked and saddened to the heart; for on many accounts Dean Stanley was the best-loved man in the Church of England. He was the personal friend of the Queen, the tutor of the Prince Royal, the advocate of cordial fellowship among all denominations, the most simple, modest, and affectionate great man in the realm. His genius everybody admired, but his pure, sweet character everybody loved. So, for a week past great preparations have been making to give to the good Dean's remains such a burial ceremony as should bespeak the nation's affection and be worthy of the guardian of the great Abbey. The services really began yesterday morning, with an eloquent sermon by Canon Farrar, in which he extolled the moral courage of the Dean in standing

by his honest convictions. In the afternoon I found the choir of the Abbey packed, and the adjoining transepts also. Presently Dr. Vaughan, the Dean of Llandaff and preacher in the Temple Church, ascended the pulpit so long occupied by his beloved friend, Stanley. Vaughan and Stanley were classmates at Rugby under Dr. Arnold, and their intimacy was very deep and cordial. It was a very trying occasion for Dr. Vaughan, and when he announced that he would preach on the very text that Dean Stanley had selected for his next discourse there he was very much overcome. It was a happy text for the hour: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." The famous preacher of the Temple is a fine, manly speaker and his style is almost perfect; so the discourse was a model funeral tribute. He happily said that Stanley had given perpetuity to Dr. Arnold's fame by writing his biography, and to Dr. Arnold's system of teaching by a living illustration of its beauty. In dwelling on the certainty of immortality, Dr. Vaughan exclaimed, with impassioned fervor: "Oh! what a wanton waste it were if such an intellect as Arthur Stanley's were destroyed!" The discourse was heard with deep emotion, and when it was through many of the audience, doubtless, said to themselves: "There stands the man to be the next Dean of Westminster." Probably he or Canon Farrar will be appointed.

To-day, at four o'clock, the funeral service took place. Around the Abbey a vast multitude had assembled; not merely attracted by curiosity, for the Dean was a great favorite with the working classes. Thousands had applied for tickets of admission, and by the kindness of Canon Farrar and the timely attentions of one of the subordinates I secured an excellent seat in the front of the gallery over the Poet's Corner. It commanded a view of the whole ceremonies. Immediately below me was the tomb of Lord Macaulay, with its well-known inscription: "His body rests in peace and his fame liveth forevermore." Sir Charles Trevelyan, the biographer of the great historian, was among the group of mourners. Beside Macaulay lie Campbell and Dickens, and upon them looks down the statue of Shakespeare.

The crowd in the Abbey was prodigious. Many of the guests climbed on the monuments, to witness the ceremonies. After long and patient waiting, we heard the funeral anthem sounding through the nave, and presently the procession entered. It contained the foremost living men of England. The heir to the throne marched in and occupied the pew of his old tutor, who was lying in the coffin before him. Upon the coffin were wreaths of "Immortelles," and white flowers from the Westminster School boys, and a handful of lilies from the Queen herself. The venerable Archbishop of Canterbury was in the line, and Cardinal Manning, and Lord Houghton, and Tyndall, and Browning, and the Bishop of Peterborough. The coffin was borne by the same hands that had carried the Dean's beloved wife, Lady Augusta, to her burial, in Henry the Seventh's Chapel. It was set down before the pulpit in which the Dean had stood a few days before.

By the foot of the coffin the most conspicuous figure was William E. Gladstone. He was called away before the service was over, and hastened to the House of Commons. (The pilot cannot leave the helm while the ship of state is off that Irish lee shore.) The funeral music to-day was sol-

emn and sublime. Its rich strains swelled and rolled among the lofty arches with prodigious grandeur. Then the deep tones of the "Dead March" were heard, and the procession formed again. The body of ARTHUR STANLEY was taken up and tenderly carried over those historic stones, which he himself had trodden so often and so long. He was to be laid among the great, in his death.

With slow and measured tread, they bore him past the tomb of Dryden. Old Spenser, and Ben Jonson, and the author of the "Elegy in a Country Churchyard" were sleeping close by. A little further on, they passed the tomb of Edward the Confessor. The heir to the Confessor's throne was in the procession, and the descendants too of many a great warrior who laid in silent stone effigy on those monuments. Gradually the line passed on and on among the columns, until it entered the door of Henry the Seventh's Chapel and disappeared from my view.

As I looked at the dark-palled coffin, with its weight of flowers, vanishing out of sight, I felt a peculiar grief; for the Dean had been to me a very kind and beloved friend. I had broken bread with him in his hospitable home; I had enjoyed with him a memorable visit to the Jerusalem Chamber; and on his last day in America he had gone with me to the tomb of my own beloved child, in Greenwood. A gentler, sweeter, and more unselfish heart I have seldom known; and no man has been laid to his rest amid more sincere lamentations in all this realm for many a year than Arthur Penryhn Stanley. Of him, too, it may be said that his body sleeps in peace; but his name doth live on forevermore.

LONDON, ENGLAND, July 25th, 1881.

A NEW ERA IN HOME MISSIONS.

BY LEONARD BACON, D.D., LL.D.

THAT great Home Missionary meeting at Chicago is one indication among many that the time has come for a reconsideration, and perhaps for a reconstruction of our arrangements for what we call home missionary work. Some thoughts have occurred to me which I may be allowed to give as a slight contribution to the required reconsideration. I do not understand and, therefore, shall not attempt to explain the obscure intimations, perhaps I should say half-suppressed growls of something like dissatisfaction with the administration of the American Home Missionary Society. Nor shall I at present inquire whether anything would be gained by removing the offices and management of that society from New York to Chicago. It may be well for us to take a wider view and to look below these superficial questions.

Let us begin by clearing our minds of a not unnatural illusion. A comparison is often made between the work of the American Board of Foreign Missions and that of the American Home Missionary Society, and the conclusion is drawn that we are doing much more for other countries than we are doing for our own. If the annual income of the A. B. C. F. M. is half a million or more, that of the A. H. M. S. is about three-fifths of that amount; or in a particular congregation the yearly contributions for foreign missions are a thousand dollars, but when the collection for home missions is called for the amount received is only half as much. Such comparisons are delusive. Let us remember what we mean by foreign missions

and what we mean by home missions. Our home missionary work, as we commonly speak of it, is only a small part of what we are doing for the Gospel and Kingdom of Christ in our own country. It is chiefly aid to feeble churches in the support of their pastors or stated preachers; or, more strictly, aid to ministers laboring in such churches. A few missionaries at large superintend the work in certain states or districts; and a few more to go to "regions beyond," preaching the Gospel and showing disciples how to gather themselves into churches, which in due time shall need no outside help. These are really missionaries—evangelists, and not pastors, nor pro-pastors—and their work resembles that of foreign missionaries till they shall have gathered churches, which they can serve as pastors and which can partly or wholly sustain them. The Home Missionary Society is really a church aid society. It aids churches in coming into existence, and till they have become self-supporting it aids in the support of those who serve them as pastors; but the Board of Foreign Missions undertakes the entire support of its missionaries, instead of helping to support them. It does much more. It establishes and sustains in every field a comprehensive system of Christian education, beginning with primary schools for children and culminating in seminaries for the competent education of teachers and of preachers. Some of its missionaries must do the work which is done in this country by professors in colleges and theological seminaries. Others must be translators and authors, as well as teachers and preachers, and must make much use of the press as a Christianizing and civilizing force. Converts are gathered into churches; but the missionary does not become a pastor, for native churches must have native pastors, and till they become self-supporting the Board of Foreign Missions does for them what the Home Missionary does for feeble churches in this country.

The comparison, then, which is sometimes made between what we give to foreign missions and what we give to home missions is altogether delusive. Add to the work of the American Home Missionary Society, first, all the work of "our co-operative societies" (the Congregational Union, the College and Education Society, the Congregational Board of Publication, etc.); next, all that we give for the home work of Bible and tract societies; and then all the diversified work of the American Missionary Association in the Southern States and in California. To balance all this, and much more that is of the same sort, put into the opposite scale the entire income of our Foreign Missionary Board. Add to it the few thousand of dollars appropriated to foreign lands by the American Bible Society and the American Tract Society, together with all that the American Missionary Association is doing in Africa, and the illusion vanishes. We are doing (and surely it is right that we should do) far more to save our own country from irreligion and barbarism than we are doing for all the world besides.

The American Board of Foreign Missions and the American Home Missionary Society are undenominational in their constitutions, and, therefore, not ecclesiastical. Founded on a catholic basis, they have never moved from that foundation; but, if we look at ecclesiastical organizations for similar work, we learn the same lesson. The Presbyterians, the Episcopalians, the

Methodists, and other denominations governed by national assemblies have their foreign missions and their home missions, and it may be that in some of them the contributions to their foreign missions are more than is given for the support of their home missionaries; but in every instance (I cannot doubt) it will be found that what the denomination or, as it calls itself, "the Church" is doing for its own extension and stability in the United States far exceeds all that it is doing for the outside world. The same is true of the Baptists, that great denomination of immersed Congregationalists. They have their foreign missions, some of which have been pre-eminently successful; yet all their foreign work is far less than what they are doing for their own country by their Home Missionary Society, by their publishing societies, by endowing their colleges and theological seminaries, and by various other methods of religious propaganda.

It may be assumed, then, that intelligent Christian men in this country, and especially those who are in some sort the constituency of the two great institutions abovementioned (the A. B. C. F. M. and the A. H. M. S.), are not forgetting the importance of the home field in their zeal for foreign missions. "Beginning at Jerusalem" implies no forgetfulness or neglect of the command: "Go, teach all nations." On the contrary, the sublimest and most inspiring view of our home missionary work, in all its extent, is that which regards it as a necessary and most efficient auxiliary to the greater enterprise of converting the whole world to Christ. Our home missionary work, in the large view of it, includes all that we are doing by associated effort to make our own country completely Christian. A new era of home missions—an era of new zeal, and larger plans, and more wisely-directed effort—must be, in spirit and effect, a new era of foreign missions.

The earliest missionary societies in this country (e. g., the Missionary Society of Connecticut, which arose in the closing years of the last century) were formed for missions to the heathen and missions to the new settlements. They did not think of aiding feeble churches in the older states. Missionaries from New England and from the Presbyterian Board of Missions were sent forth—some to the advancing frontier of civilization, others to Indian tribes not far from the same frontier. When the American Board of Commissioners had undertaken the work of foreign missions the Indians were held to be foreign tribes. It was not till a later period that the work of "building the waste places" in Connecticut and Massachusetts by organized effort was attempted. After the founding of the American Home Missionary Society, in 1823, the work of "building the waste places" and the work in "the new settlements" were undertaken by that Society as one work. Nevertheless, the distinction remains in fact, and cannot be obliterated from the minds of those to whom the Home Missionary Society appeals for aid. Home missionary work, so called in Connecticut, is as distinct from home missionary work in the Rocky Mountains and on the Pacific Coast as either of them is from the foreign missionary work in China. This distinction is one which cannot be wisely disregarded in any modification or reconstruction of our arrangements, if we are to have the new era which we hope for.

During the last financial year of the American Home Missionary Society the six New England states contributed for their own local work (each state having its own organization for that purpose) the aggregate amount of \$73,859.16. Not one of those states received a farthing of outside help for the building up of its waste places. In addition to all this and in addition to all that was done through "our co-operative societies," there was given from those states, to the American Home Missionary Society, for its work in other states and territories, a total of \$132,056.65—even Maine, which has great tracts of wilderness within its borders, contributing a surplus to be expended elsewhere. I learn these facts from the "55th Annual Report," as published in the *Home Missionary* for July. Doubtless, the contributions from the State of New York, including the two great cities of

New York and Brooklyn, were more than the expenditures within that state, but how much more I am not able to infer from the "Report." In Ohio, with such outlying districts as are included in the General Conference of that state, the excess of contributions over expenditures was \$998.38; but when we pass beyond Ohio, in any direction, the home missionary work, save in the great State of Illinois, is dependent on contributions from the East. In Illinois the contributions of the year were more than the expenditures. The surplus for work in the regions beyond was \$2,748. At present I make no inferences from these facts and offer no comments. I only say: Here is something to be considered by those who are planning the arrangements for a new era in home missions.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

THE OHIO CAMPAIGN ONCE MORE.

BY R. L. STANTON, D. D.

ALL parties have now their tickets in the field. A "third party" movement, in the interest of temperance, is fully organized, and its nominees and platform are before the public. As I had the unexpected honor of presiding over the State Temperance Convention, which on the 20th inst. put this third ticket in the field, and am familiar with the principles and aims of the new party, allow me, in a few words as may be convenient, to give the readers of *THE INDEPENDENT* a true idea of "the situation."

First, let me notice a paragraph reproduced in the Cincinnati dailies this morning. It is a dispatch to the New York *Times* from its Columbus correspondent, commenting upon "the Loveland temperance ticket." It says:

"The number of people in Ohio who are in favor of prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors is very large. The possible vote in the Fall election has been estimated as high as 10,000; and, as these come mostly from the Republican party, the presence of this third ticket in the field has given Gov. Foster's friends some uneasiness."

So far, well. But this correspondent adds:

"But it is very doubtful whether the heterogeneous and excited rabble which made the nominations on the Methodist camp-meeting grounds at Loveland really represents the sentiments of any considerable number of bona-fide temperance people of the state."

And then:

"The really earnest temperance people of Ohio will be pretty sure to repudiate the ticket set up by overzealous Methodists and disappointed politicians at Loveland."

What was the character of this recent State Convention? Not, certainly, a "rabble." A more intelligent, serious, and respectable body of men—ministers of the Gospel and laymen—never before assembled in a state convention or in any other capacity. Every congressional district in the state was represented, as well as every shade of sentiment, political and religious. Nor is it correct to represent this as a "Methodist" movement. I will say, however, as a Presbyterian, to the honor of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Ohio, that probably not one minister of that church in the state can be found who is not a total abstainer from intoxicating drinks and an earnest temperance worker; while in my own Church, to its shame be it said, there are ministers who take such "a calm view of temperance" that they feel at liberty to drink freely of intoxicants, and sometimes more than "moderately," and they are a clog to the temperance cause everywhere. But at this Loveland Convention Congregationalists, United Presbyterians, Baptists, United Brethren, Methodists, Presbyterians, Universalists, Quakers, and those of almost every other sect were present as members. When such men of the Congregational body as Dr. Twitchell, pastor of the Euclid-Avenue Church in Cleveland; Mr. Brand, pastor of the First Church in Oberlin, and others who might be named; Dr. French, for some fifteen years pastor of the United Presbyterian church, Cincinnati; Dr. H. M. Robertson, pastor of the Presbyterian church, Kenton; and Messrs. Morey, James, Mitchell, Crothers, and other Presbyterian pastors, to name no more; and when such honored laymen as would grace any convention unite with such a body of earnest ministers, it will not do to belittle

this Convention by calling it a "rabble," nor will it any more do to call it a "Methodist" movement.

Did this Convention represent the temperance sentiment of the state? The New York *Times's* correspondent, quoted above, deems it "doubtful," as to "any considerable number"—that is, in putting into the field a third ticket.

Let us "take a calm view" of this. Perhaps one-fourth (possibly a larger number) of the two hundred and more in the Loveland Convention preferred not to put up a third ticket. This was understood to be the view of many from the "Western Reserve" (including the Oberlin and Cleveland men), a part of the state where the Republican vote is usually the largest; but this division of sentiment on a question of method will not affect the main result in the October election. Those who are not in favor of the third ticket will "scratch" the Republican ticket, voting for some of its men, but in every case erase the name of Gov. Foster. This I learn from mingling with the men of the Convention; also from the tenor of several publications recently issued from Oberlin, embracing a circular signed by the president and professors in the college and by the pastors of the several Oberlin churches; and also from a sermon by Mr. Brand, pastor of the First Congregational church, Oberlin, preached and published immediately after the meeting of the Republican Convention, in Cleveland, in June, which put in nomination Gov. Foster. In this very able discourse Mr. Brand (who may be taken as a fair representative of those who are earnest for temperance and yet not favoring a third ticket) utters these ringing words: "My solemn conviction is this, that, with state prohibition as our ultimate and changeless end and aim, the time has come to take our stand, once for all, just here; that no man, from the governor down to town councilor, shall have our vote, in any party, who is not openly and fearlessly committed to some form of prohibitory legislation." "This policy of absolutely refusing to vote for any man not committed to temperance reform is forced upon us by the liquor men themselves." Mr. Brand, in a former part of his discourse, when speaking of the position of Gov. Foster and of the platform of the Republican Party adopted at Cleveland, shows that, upon the issue made in the above quoted sentences, both the platform and its candidate must be repudiated.

It appears, then, that the "third party" men and the other temperance workers stand together against the Republican ticket, so far as its head is concerned, and against every other man upon it "who is not openly and fearlessly committed to some form of prohibitory legislation."

Now, do these classes, taken together, embrace "any considerable number of the bona-fide temperance people of the state"? Unquestionably a very large number, but not all. Some good temperance men will vote the "straight" Republican ticket. So, too, it is believed some temperance Democrats will vote the Loveland "third-party" ticket. There were life-long Democrats in the Loveland Convention and its nominees are taken from the Republican and Democratic parties.

But still more. Bear in mind that the Loveland Convention did not embrace representatives from the "Old Prohibition Party" of Ohio—a party which has had its state ticket in the field regularly for many years past and has polled several thousand votes—from 5,000 to some 7,000, I think. The men of the Loveland Convention have never before taken an independent stand; but the mass of them have worked for temperance through the Republican Party. The "Prohibition Party" are to hold their state convention in August, and it is expected they will adopt the Loveland ticket; but, whether they do or not, their aggregate vote in the state in October will be added to the "third-party" vote and to the vote of those who "scratch" the Republican ticket, and thus help to swell the vote which Gov. Foster must overcome in order to be elected.

In the midst of this array of parties, what is likely to be the result in October? The Republican Party (or a portion of the ticket, including its head) is most surely

destined to be defeated and the Democratic Party will triumph. It is not my purpose here (space will not permit) to show how this will promote temperance. Suffice it to say that many temperance men and women of Ohio hope for nothing for their cause from either of the parties, Republican or Democratic, as such. The reasons for this I cannot now enter upon. I close by repeating my judgment that the result in October will be as above stated. Ohio, usually, as between Democrats and Republicans, is a close state. Last October, the year of the presidential election, up to the day before the state election was held, the best-informed Republicans, as the whole country knows, deemed the result doubtful. Mr. Hayes, one of Ohio's most popular governors, carried the state for governor in 1875, the year before he was elected President, by only some 2,000 or 3,000 majority. In 1877 the Democratic Party carried the state, electing Gov. Bishop by over 20,000 majority. Such fluctuations, from local or other causes, are common in Ohio. Such a cause—that of temperance, not local, but national (the cause of causes)—will defeat Gov. Foster in October by a majority that will astonish the country.

MADISONVILLE, O.

THE SOUTHERN BOARD ACTION.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM HAYNE LEAVELL.

[This article was written for a Baptist paper, but denied insertion.—ED. IND.]

The fact that the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention made and subsequently withdrew the appointment of Rev. John Stout and Rev. T. P. Bell as missionaries to China has afforded an opportunity for public comment that has been generally improved. The denominational papers that have printed anything on the subject have, with a solitary exception, given only a partial history of the transaction and, without meaning to do so, been unfair and unjust to the appointees, who have been marked as "heretics" by the Board.

The first-named gentleman was a classmate of mine in the seminary (then located at Greenville, S. C.), was subsequently pastor of the church to which my father belongs and in which I was ordained, and has been my friend these many years. My knowledge of him enables me the better to understand his position, especially as we have had private correspondence in reference to it, and my friendship for him leads me to make this effort to get before the Baptists of the North a correct statement of the action which has placed him in the light of a "heretic." It is in the interest of common Christian fairness that this is written and *The Watchman* asked to publish it.

The history of the case is briefly this: Rev. John Stout was successfully prosecuting his labors as pastor at Society Hill, S. C., without any thought of entering upon another work. He was recognized throughout the state as a man of learning, devotion, and breadth. His occasional articles in the denominational papers were in the interest of liberty of thought and action. While there was no blatant assertion of his views, he was yet by no means a man who "loved liberty but hated martyrdom." He honestly stood for his convictions. In connection with his duties as pastor, he was discharging the office of chairman of the Foreign Mission Committee for South Carolina, and had succeeded in raising the mission contributions to a sum larger than that contributed by any other state comprising the constituency of the Southern Baptist Convention. The Foreign Board, located at Richmond, Va., under whose commission he was laboring as chairman of the committee for South Carolina, came to feel the necessity of sending new missionaries to several of its fields in China, where the present laborers are growing old in the work and have no successors ready to take it up and carry it forward. The right men were not forthcoming. In this condition of affairs, the secretary was authorized to search out suitable men and learn their disposition in the matter. The men selected were Rev. John Stout and Rev. T. P. Bell, both honored pastors of regular Baptist churches in