

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 XLI.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1889.

NUMBER 2098.

The Independent

For Table of Contents see Page 10.

A RONDEL FOR FEBRUARY.

BY LOUISE CHANDLER MOULTON.

*And the second month of the year
Puts heart in the earth again.*

—PHILIP BOURKE MARSTON.

ALREADY the feet of the winter fly,
And the pulse of the earth begins to leap,
Waking up from her frozen sleep,
And knowing the beautiful spring is nigh.

Good St. Valentine wanders by,
Pausing his festival gay to keep—
Already the feet of the winter fly,
And the pulse of the earth begins to leap.

To life she wakes; and a smile and a sigh—
Language the scoffer holds so cheap—
Thrill her with melody dear and deep,
And spring with its mating time is nigh:
Already the feet of the winter fly,
And the pulse of the earth begins to leap.

BOSTON, MASS.

PÈRE LA CHAISE.

BY FRANCIS TURNER PALGRAVE.

THE field of death at Paris.
You might think it a fold from afar;
Like flocks the white tombs scattered
That green inclosure star.

There statesman, financier and poet,
Love, glory, ambition and guile,
Are laid 'neath their pompous inscriptions,
And the stranger says "Who?" with a smile.

And some more proudly mock-modest
Rest under their names alone;
And all they will soon inherit
Is but the name and the stone.

There the passionate heart of de Musset
Keeps itself tranquil and pure;
There Béranger, Heine, Bellini,
Lie 'mid the brilliant obscure:

He, whose melody echoes the music
Of the old Sicilian shore;
And they—in their lifetime too famous
To be famous forever more.

But from the white mausolea
The eye turns wearily soon,
Drawn by the dark fascination
Of the dreary *Fosse Commune*.

Had these no story of passion?
Had these no passion for fame,
No deeds for remembrance or glory,
Who lie without hillock or name?

They shovel them in by fifties,
And bid them lie down with a grin,
Who could not buy a "concession"—
Sons of starvation and sin!

Here at last, by Mortality's favor,
Fraternal and equal they lie:
And the child in vain seeks the mother
With its cross to crown her, and die.

In this best of worlds, O my brothers,
Is surely something amiss!
Songs of advance and culture,
Is your ultimate triumph this?

Is the soul's heart-hunger abolished,
While agnostics their litany cry,
Or Science says, "matter to matter,"
With a smile that lurks in a sigh?

The homage and incense of Paris
On the famous and wealthy are shed;
But love and sorrow are kneeling
O'er the undistinguished dead;

And the orphan sobs and wanders
O'er the dust that will hide it soon
From the wolfish strife for existence,
In the dreary *Fosse Commune*.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY, ENGLAND.

UNNECESSARY APOLOGIES.

BY THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON.

THE newspaper critics seem to me mistaken in attributing the favorable reception of Mr. Bryce's admirable book on the "American Commonwealth" to a diminished national sensitiveness. It is certain that this sensitiveness has greatly diminished, and certain also that Mr. Bryce gives us plenty of praise. But the main difference seems to lie in this, that Mr. Bryce treats us as a subject for serious study and not as a primary class for instruction in the rudiments of morals and grammar. The usual complaint made by us against English writers is the same now as in the days of Dickens, that they come here chiefly to teach and not to inquire. No man had so many foreign visitors in his time as the late Professor Longfellow, and there never lived a man in whom the element of kindly charity more prevailed; yet he records January 16th, 1847, in his diary his surprise that so few foreigners apparently desire any information about this country, while all have much to communicate on that subject. The reason why every one reads with pleasure even the censures of Mr. Bryce is because he has really taken the pains to learn something about us. There is probably no American author who has traversed this continent so widely and repeatedly; there is perhaps no one who has made so careful a comparative study of the state governments; and there is certainly no one who could reinforce this comparison by so careful a study of popular government in other times and places. To say that his book will supersede De Tocqueville is to say little; it is better for the present period than was De Tocqueville for any period; because it is as clear, as candid, and incomparably more thorough.

All this refers to the main theme of Mr. Bryce's book; but there is one criticism yet to be made upon it. It is to be regretted that he was ever tempted from his main ground, where he is so strong, to a collateral ground, where he is weaker. It was not, perhaps, necessary that he should treat of American literature at all; at any rate it is safe to say that his chapter on this subject has a perfunctory air; it seems like the work of a tired man, who feels that he ought to say something on that point, yet does not care to grapple with it as with his main question; and so puts us off with vague and needless, tho kindly apologies. He is so ready to find good reasons for our doing no more, that he takes no pains to analyze or weigh what we have done; and unfortunately the habit of colonial deference is still so strong among us, that we are more disposed to be grateful to such a kindly apologist than to question his words. I do not wish to weary the readers of THE INDEPENDENT on this matter; but it is a lifelong conviction with me that the injury done to American literature by the absence of a copyright law is a trivial thing compared with the depressing influence of this prolonged attitude of dependence; an attitude which has disappeared from our political institutions, but still exists in regard to books. To test it we have only to reverse in imagination the nationality of a few authors and critics, and consider what a change of estimate such an altered origin would involve. Let us make, for instance, the great effort of supposing Emerson an English author and Matthew Arnold an American; does any one suppose that Arnold's criticisms on Emerson would in that case have attracted very serious attention in either country? Had Mr. Gosse been a New Yorker, writing in a London magazine, would any one on either side of the Atlantic have seriously cared whether Mr. Gosse thought that contemporary England had produced a poet? The reason why the criticisms of these two Englishmen have attracted such wide-spread notice among us is that they have the accumulated literary weight—the *ex oriente lux*—of London behind them. We accept them meekly and rather reverently; just as we even accept the criticisms made on Grant and Sheridan by Lord Wolseley, who is, compared to either of them, but a carpet knight. It is in some such way that we must explain the meek gratitude with which our press receives it, when Mr. Bryce apologizes for our deficiencies in the way of literature.

Mr. Bryce—whom, it is needless to say, I regard with hearty admiration, and I can add with personal affection, since he has been my guest and I have been his—Mr. Bryce has a chapter on "Creative Intellectual Power," in which he has some capital remarks on the impossibility of saying why great men appear in one time or place and not in another—in Florence, for in-

stance, and not in Naples or Milan. Then he goes on to say that there is "no reason why the absence of brilliant genius among the sixty millions in the United States should excite any surprise," and adds soon after, "It is not to be made a reproach against America that men like Tennyson or Darwin have not been born there." Surely not; nor is it a reproach against England that men like Emerson or Hawthorne have not been born there. But if this last is true, why did it not occur to Mr. Bryce to say it; and had he said it, is it not plain that the whole tone and statement of his proposition would have been different? It occurs to him to specify Darwin and Tennyson, but the two men who above all others represent creative intellectual power, up to this time, in America, are not so much as named in his whole chapter of thirteen pages. Of course it is too early for comparison, but it is undoubtedly the belief of many Americans—at any rate it is one which I venture to entertain—that the place in the history of intellect held a hundred years hence by the two Americans he forgets to mention will be greater than that of the two Englishmen he names. Greater than Darwin's, from the intrinsic superiority in permanence of literary over scientific eminence. Darwin was great, as he was certainly noble and lovable, but he was not greater, or at least held greater, than Newton:

"Nature and Nature's laws lay hid in night,
God said, 'Let Newton be,' and all was light."

More than this could surely not be said for Darwin; and yet how vague and dim is now the knowledge, even among educated men, of precisely what it was that Newton accomplished, compared with the continued knowledge held by every school-boy as to Pope, who wrote these lines. The mere record of Darwin's own life shows how large a part of man's highest mental action became inert in him. He ceased to care for the spheres of thought in which Emerson chiefly lived; while, on the other hand, the tendencies and results of Darwin's thought were always an object of interest to Emerson. When we turn to Tennyson the comparison must proceed on different grounds, and takes us back to Coleridge's fine definition of inspiration, given half a century ago in his "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit." "Whatever finds me," he wrote, "at a greater depth than usual, that is inspired." It is because Emerson in his way and Hawthorne in his way touch us at greater depths than Tennyson that their chance for immortality is stronger. Form is doubtless needed in the expression; but in Hawthorne there is no defect of form, and the frequent defects of this kind in Emerson are balanced by tones and cadences so noble that the exquisite lyre of Tennyson, taken at its best, has never reached them. I do not object to the details of treatment in Mr. Bryce's chapter, and it contains many admirable suggestions; but it seems to me that he might well preface it, in a second edition, by some such remark—addressed to some fancied personification of American Literature—as Enobarbus, in "Antony and Cleopatra," makes to Pompey:

"Sir,
I never loved you much; but I have praised you
When you have well deserved ten times as much
As I have said you did."

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

DEMONIACAL POSSESSION.

BY S. C. BARTLETT, D.D., LL.D.,
PRESIDENT OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE.

THIS topic has already come up in the Sunday-school lessons, and will naturally present itself more than once again. In the valuable Sunday-school notes of THE INDEPENDENT for January 3d, the instance occurring in Mark i, 21-24 is treated thus:

"Whether the man was simply a lunatic, with a spark of intuitive consciousness in him, or whether an actual spirit had taken up his abode in him, is a matter of difficult criticism. Perhaps it never can be satisfactorily settled. There is no doubt that disease was misunderstood in those days, especially lunacy. It is a common thing to-day, in most superstitious and ignorant tribes, to attribute mental aberration to the immediate influence of evil spirits."

This is, no doubt, a common mode of disposing of the subject; but it surely is well that a great circle of readers, like that of THE INDEPENDENT, should know that there is a different view, and the reasons for it. Its adherents do not find anything "difficult" in the "criticism" or interpretation. The fact of demoniacal pos-

Religious Intelligence

THE NEW THEOLOGY IN THE ANTIPODES.—
THE END OF THE CONTROVERSY.

BY PROF. BENJ. B. WARFIELD, D.D.

SOME account of the outbreak of the "New Theology" in southern New Zealand, was given in the *Religious Intelligence* column of THE INDEPENDENT for August 9th, 1888. Readers of that account will be interested to know the issue to which the discussion, whose beginning was there chronicled, has been brought. What may be called the public side of the controversy—that prosecuted in the press as distinguished from that carried on in the ecclesiastical courts—has been pushed with great vigor. Since the columns of the Church organ, *The New Zealand Presbyterian*, had been opened to the discussing by the publication, in its June number, of two adverse reviews of Dr. Salmond's disturbing pamphlet—the one by the editor, Prof. Michael Watt, and the other by the Rev. James Chisolm, of Tokomairiro, every number has contained communications on the subject, among which an especially sound paper by the Rev. W. Douglas, of Hokitika, supplied a needed caution to certain somewhat rash concessions which Professor Watt seemed inclined to make. The secular press has taken its full part in the debate. Especially a number of able papers on each side have been printed in the leading journal in Otago, the *Dunedin Daily Times*, and some interesting notices of Dr. Salmond's pamphlet from the competent hand of the Rev. Andrew H. Stobo, appeared in the *Southland Times*. An interesting feature of the discussion has been the important part which laymen have taken in it, renewedly illustrating the familiar experience of Presbyterian Churches, that it is in their sound eldership that they must in all times of danger put their chief trust. There have not been lacking elders, indeed, who have shown sympathy with the latitudinarian tendency, as, e.g., the writer of a brief letter in *The New Zealand Presbyterian* for July, and Mr. Keith Ramsay (a co-Presbyter with Dr. Salmond himself in the First Church of Dunedin), who spoke so rashly on the floor of Presbytery as narrowly to escape being disciplined. But in the main, they have stood firmly for the truth, and have shown themselves prepared to defend it with both learning and vigor. Among these defenses may be mentioned a sermon by one of the pioneers of the Church, Mr. James Adam, of Milton, published in *The Protestant Ensign* for August 30th, an anonymous pamphlet entitled, "What Saith the Scripture?" which very tellingly tests the doctrine of the universal fatherhood of God (see pp. 22 sq.) by the testimony of the Word; and, above all, a most able pamphlet by Mr. Adam D. Johnston, of Kaihika, entitled "The Two-Edged Sword," which, for balance of judgment, instructiveness, fairness and general value, strikes us as altogether the best piece of writing which this unfortunate controversy has called out. Like Dr. Macgregor, in the pamphlet mentioned in our former account, but with far more judiciousness, Mr. Johnston seeks the center of the controversy in the doctrine of God—his character and our relation to him as fallen creatures (p. 12). Nothing can surpass the clearness with which he shows how "a false god can be made as surely by a mental conception as by a turning lathe" (p. 14), and elucidates the scriptural teaching as to God's relation to mankind on the one hand and to his children among men on the other—to the latter only of whom does he represent himself as standing in the endearing relation of father. It is to these Scriptures that both of these lay-writers lead Dr. Salmond as to his Waterloo. "Our author," says the writer of "What Saith the Scripture?" "has lost sight of the awful truth that God hates sin. . . . After speaking of the child of depravity, with disease in its bones and nerves, trained to vice and impiety, he says: 'Yet God is its Father!' . . . Surely Jesus knew who are the sons of God. . . . Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love Me.' . . . Paul says: 'For as many as are LED BY THE SPIRIT OF GOD, THESE ARE SONS OF GOD.'" Mr. Johnston prints a careful tabulation of all the passages in which the Scriptures use the correlative terms Father and sons or children, arriving at a like conclusion.

The ecclesiastical proceedings growing out of the publication, early in April last, of Dr. Salmond's pamphlet, began by the appointment of a Committee by the Dunedin Presbytery, at its meeting on May 2d, to examine the pamphlet and report. This report was made at the next meeting (on June 6th), in a temperate paper which sets forth the teaching and evil tendency of the pamphlet. After several hours' discussion in private, action was postponed until the next meeting. Accordingly, when the Presbytery was convened, on July 5th, the paper was once more brought up and, after having been discussed, clause by clause, was adopted. In order to give effect to this condemnation the following further action was taken:

"That the Presbytery appoint a committee to meet with Dr. Salmond with a view to represent to him the judgment of the Presbytery on the pamphlet, 'The Reign of Grace,' as expressed in the report adopted this forenoon, and ask him, in view of that judgment, to suppress the pamphlet; to remonstrate with him regarding the way in which he speaks of the public teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ; to endeavor to bring him to a better state of mind concerning this most important matter, and to persuade him, if possible, to express deep regret for the terms in which he had characterized the utterances of Him who is the 'faithful and true witness,' and who himself has testified, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away'; to admonish him to be more careful in the future not to pronounce so dogmatically on subjects which the Father has reserved in his own power, and in his sermons and publications to refrain from teaching doctrines which are contrary to the standards of the Church, and which are fitted to wound and grieve the hearts of many ministers and members."

When, however, the Presbytery came together again August 1st its committee (the convener of which was Professor Dunlap, Dr. Salmond's successor as Professor of

Theology) could only report that Dr. Salmond had declined to meet with them and that their only communication from him was a brief letter to that effect, in which he expressed himself as thinking that he could not withdraw his pamphlet from circulation. In a spirit of great forbearance, the Presbytery simply enlarged its committee and adjourned until the 15th of August; even then, however, there was little satisfactory to report. Dr. Dunlap reported that the Committee had done its best to bring about an understanding, with what result would appear from the letter from Dr. Salmond which the clerk would read. In this letter Dr. Salmond avoids all promises, and can only say "that the Presbytery may rest assured that no new edition of the pamphlet will be issued." He avoids, also, all retractions of opinions and only asserts that he has been much misunderstood, and especially that he has not meant to speak disparagingly of Christ. He confesses the right of Presbytery to pass judgment on his religious teaching, and his duty to act on its judgment "as far as is consistent with honor and veracity." He closes with an odd sentence: "In the present case no formal promise could secure to the Church any more than will as a matter of fact be secured, nor express my deference to adverse opinion and my desire for the edification, peace and welfare of the Church more sincerely than I now express it." This could scarcely be looked upon as other than a refusal to conform to the Presbytery's wishes; but the Rev. Mr. Will moved at once "That the Presbytery being satisfied that Dr. Salmond has sufficiently implemented the resolutions of the Presbytery regarding the pamphlet entitled 'The Reign of Grace,' deems it expedient, in the interests of all concerned, that the consideration of this case should now terminate." This, of course, provoked much discussion; but it was ultimately carried, and thus ended the Presbytery's dealing with the case.

It is not to be wondered at that widespread dissatisfaction was felt at this conclusion; and it was to be expected that the case would emerge again, in some form, in the Synod. The Synod convened in the First Church, Dunedin, on the evening of October 30th, and the strength of the parties was tried in the appointment of the ordinary Record's Revision Committee before whom the minutes of the Presbytery of Dunedin would come for review. Here the party of quiet at any cost outgeneraled those who were bent on disciplining Professor Salmond, and their victory was the pledge of what was to be expected throughout. The Record's Revision Committee did not report any exceptions to the proceedings of the Presbytery of Dunedin. But the matter was brought before the Synod in two ways: first on the second day of the Synod, by the presentation of three overtures from the Presbyteries of Clutha, Damaru, and Dunstan, reciting the presence of anxious inquiry in the community, "regarding the season of grace for sinners" and asking the Synod to issue a pastoral address "in accordance with the testimony of this Church as to the teaching of Scripture regarding the said subject"; and secondly, on the fourth day of the Synod, by the presentation of three memorials calling the attention of the Synod to the unsatisfactory nature of the action of the Presbytery of Dunedin, and contemplating synodical interference in the case. It is obvious that the order in which these matters came up was illogical and prejudiced fair dealing with the case; after the "pastoral address" was issued, it could be easily pleaded that the Synod's skirts were clean and that no need remained for reopening the subject.

This is the exact course that was actually taken. Immediately on the reading of the overtures, it was moved that they "be adopted; that the Synod issue a partial address in terms of the overtures, and appoint a Committee to draft this address and submit it to the evening sederunt to-morrow." This motion called out very little discussion and was almost at once agreed to, and a representative committee appointed. Time could not be had for reporting the address, however, until Friday (the fourth day), when it was at once moved and carried that it should be adopted and printed and a day fixed on which it should be read from the pulpits. The address as officially printed, covers about five duodecimo pages and is devoted "to the doctrine of the finality of the present life in connection with the Gospel offer of salvation, namely, that that offer is to be made only in this life, and that at the day of judgment the wicked 'shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.'" The wording is far from lucid; but it apparently is intended as a strong, exegetical, historical and practical statement of the ordinary Church doctrine.

Immediately after this address was adopted the memorials looking toward the reopening of Dr. Salmond's case were taken up. But an effort was at once developed to prevent all action. The motion was made and passed "that inasmuch as this synod has now resolved to issue a pastoral, setting forth the views of this Church on the matter under review, and which views should also guide their ministers, the Synod further resolves that it is not necessary or expedient to proceed further in discussing the matter brought forward by the memorialists." A protest entered by the Rev. Messrs. Clark, Stobo, Macgregor, Inglis, Sutherland and Mr. Begg was received by the Synod, but not answered. Even to this extreme was the policy of silence pressed.

It will be a matter of congratulation to all who love the truth that the Synod by its pastoral address, adopted without dissent, has declared itself set for the proclamation of divine truth in the matter of salvation. But beyond question, it has left itself in an untenable situation. As Mr. Stobo clearly expressed it, the Church has thus dealt with the pamphlet satisfactorily, but has refused to deal satisfactorily with its author. The Church thus proclaims a truth to be of sufficient importance to demand so solemn a procedure as the issuing of a pastoral address admonishing all its people against perusal of it, and yet refuses to discipline one of its ministers for rejecting it. Is its pastoral letter intended to be obeyed? Is it supposed to be able to compel obedience without sanctions behind it? It may be ominous that when it was

proposed to add to the pastoral address a clause "charging ministers and office bearers to guard against in any way advocating or countenancing the doctrine known as 'the larger hops,' and assuring all ministers that the advocacy of such doctrine could not be tolerated within the Church," the proposition was at once objected to and not pressed. Certainly the Church proclaims it to be the teaching of Christ and his apostles, and of the whole Church of all ages, that the fate of all is fixed at death, she does yet tolerate in her ministry one who asserts the opposite who has taught it in the most offensive form and who defiantly refuses to offer any promises or pledges for the future. This inconsistency cannot be permanent. We may expect to see advance in one way or the other at no distant day.

PRINCETON, N. J.

It is exceedingly difficult to secure reliable statistics to determine which of the two great rival confessions, Protestantism or Roman Catholicism, is the better conservator and protector of public morals. And yet such statistics are now more timely and welcome than ever, as the Roman Catholic writers do not tire of declaring Protestantism to be source and fountain-head of revolutionary thought in Church, State and society, and offer as a panacea for all the ills of modern days the return to the Church of Rome. In view of such claims the recently published official statistics of Prussia are instructive. No other country on the globe collects these social data as carefully as does Prussia, principally because Prussia and Germany, ever since the days of the Reformation, have been the classic battle-ground of the two great principles struggling for the control of public life, and workers have there had a better opportunity fairly and squarely to exhibit their strength and their weakness. The Government has published the statistics for 1886, and these corroborate what the issues of previous years taught, namely, that the Roman Catholics furnish relatively a larger contingent to the criminal classes than does Protestantism. In Prussia the Protestants constitute 62.1 per cent. of the inhabitants and the Roman Catholics constitute nearly 36 per cent. Yet of the criminals only 57 per cent. were Protestants, while more than 39 per cent. were Roman Catholics in 1886. In all the classes of criminals, except a single one, the Roman Catholics were represented in a percentage exceeding their percentage in the number of inhabitants. In the little kingdom of Wurtemberg, where the relative population of the two Churches is about the same as in Prussia, recent statistics show the same facts. Under circumstances like these social statistics become an instructive moral science.

.... A Conference of the Lutheran pastors and members of Church councils of this vicinity was held recently to consider "whether the time has not come to make an effort to bring about, if not a union, at least a better understanding and more fraternal intercourse between the Lutherans themselves." The attendance was large. President Jacob F. Miller, of the Martin Luther Society, presided. In his opening address he spoke of the want of harmony and co-operation among Lutherans, and of the reasons that moved the Martin Luther Society to invite such a Conference of pastors and Church councils; and requested a full exchange of views in regard to the desirableness of a closer union among the Lutheran churches of New York, Brooklyn and vicinity. Ministers and laymen both spoke freely—all in the English language, tho most of the speakers were Germans. A resolution was adopted in favor of a closer union, and then organic union was proposed; but it was deemed best to have further conferences before taking action in that direction. The pastors present represented both the General Synod and the General Council. Two pastors of the Missouri Synod were also present. These Missourians are extreme confessionalists. Being called on, these pastors said that they had little confidence in many of the professions of sound Lutheranism made by members of the General Synod and General Council. Missourians could have nothing in common with Lutherans who fraternized with the sects, encouraged such bodies as the Young Men's Christian Associations, and received into church-membership those who belonged to secret societies. Union was possible on but one basis, and that was the solid ground of honesty and truth. Another Conference is to be held February 26th.

.... Last year the General Conference of the United Brethren in Christ, a Methodist organization, made provision for submitting to a vote of the church-members the Confession of Faith and Constitution as amended by the Commission appointed for the purpose; also the question of lay representation and of secret societies. The vote was taken in November, and the result shows that the Constitution, Confession of Faith, lay representation, and the section on secret combinations were approved by large majorities. The vote on the revised Confession of Faith was 51,023 for, and 3,309 against; on the amended constitution, 50,638 for, and 3,658 against; on lay representation 48,780 for, and 5,631 against; on the section against secret societies 46,947 for, and 7,297 against.

.... Mr. Moody announces that on April 4th he will open in Chicago a convention of Christian workers similar to those he holds in Northfield in the summers. The meetings will continue from thirty to sixty days. The mornings will be devoted to study of the Bible and its application to the wants of this age; afternoons and evenings to "Applied Christianity." No pains will be spared to bring the workers face to face with the masses who have renounced, or are ignorant of the Gospel. All ministers, Sunday-school workers, city missionaries, students and others who are engaged in Christian work, or are preparing for it, and are interested in this conference are invited.

.... Cardinal Ledochowski, formerly Archbishop of Posen and Primate of Poland, is dead. He was imprisoned under the Falk Laws, but was released on condition that he go abroad. Therafter he resided in Rome. Pope Leo showed him great kindness and consulted with him.

.... Dr. Henry Y. Satterlee, of Calvary Protestant Episcopal Church, this city, has been elected Bishop of Eastern Michigan, to succeed the late Bishop Harris.