

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 XLII.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1890.

NUMBER 2164.

The Independent.

For Table of Contents see Page 10.

THE SLUMBER OF KING SOLOMON.

BY A. MARY F. ROBINSON.

THE house is all of sandal-wood
And boughs of Lebanon,
The chamber is of beaten gold
Where sleeps King Solomon,

With thirty horsemen to the left
And thirty to the right,
Upon their mighty horses set
To guard him from the night.

They watch as silent as the moon,
Drawn sword and gathered rein;
They will not stir till Solomon
Shall rise and move again.

And whiter than their white armor,
Brighter than spear or sword,
Four Angels guard the dreaming King,
Four Angels of the Lord.

Four Angels at the four corners,
And burning over head
The Glory of God, the great glory
That never shall be said.

Sleep well, sleep well, King Solomon,
For He that guardeth thee,
He neither slumbers, nay, nor sleeps,
Through all eternity.

Sleep well, sleep well, King Solomon,
Lapped soft in silk and nard;
For the Angels and the Archangels
Are both thy body-guard.

With thirty horsemen to the left
And thirty to the right,
Sleep well, sleep well, King Solomon,
Through the eternal night.

PARIS, FRANCE.

RIVER-DAWN.

BY ARCHIBALD LAMPMAN.

UP the dark-valleyed river stroke by stroke
We drove the water from the rustling blade;
And when the night was almost gone, we made
The Oxbow bend; and there the dawn awoke;
Full on the shrouded night-charged river broke
The sun, down the long mountain valley rolled,
A sudden swinging avalanche of gold,
Through mists that sprang and reeled aside like smoke.
And lo! before us, toward the East upborne,
Packed with curled forest, bunched and topped with pine,
Brow beyond brow, drawn deep with shade and shine,
The mount; upon whose golden sunward side,
Still threaded with the melting mist, the morn
Sat like some glowing conqueror satisfied.

OTTAWA, CANADA.

"WHY NOT ENDOW OUR CHURCHES?"

BY W. S. RAINSFORD, D.D.,

RECTOR OF ST. GEORGE'S P. E. CHURCH, NEW YORK CITY.

THE question of Church Endowment is only one part of a larger question, a question to which the most confident may well hesitate to believe that as yet they can supply any adequate answer, namely, How shall we fit a Church machinery, "received by tradition from the fathers," to the modern conditions of our time? Out of some positions we have been forced, protest as we may. Few intelligent people any longer believe that the Christian Church is primarily a society for the discussion of religious truths. The preaching, singing, pew-renting church is fast becoming obsolete. Men no longer are interested in a church that exists chiefly as an assembly, as an audience. A tide of better views, of more intelligent conceptions, is bearing us away from this miserably inadequate conception of the Church, deeply rooted as this idea has been amid the best Puritan Christian elements of our land. For all intents and purposes, this conception seems once to have answered well enough. It is now utterly unsuited to modern spiritual needs, as unsuited as the old flintlock musket to the equipment of the modern sharpshooter. The defense of texts and creeds is all well enough; most necessary in its true place; but it is not here that the battle is to be decided.

The one question is, Can the Church grow with her duty? Can she shield and inclose, so that, shielding and inclosing, she may foster and develop, not by want of wise expansiveness squeeze to death, the truth that is her most sacred charge? Is she a tree-bark or an earthen pot? If the first, she will grow and not split; if the second, she will split and not grow. Can she take her true place, the place of a leader in human society? Can she be to all the wondrous possibilities of our national life a nursing mother?

These are the questions or some of the questions that confront the Church to-day. I say, the question of Church Endowment is only one part of these larger questions; and it seems to me in considering it, it is essential, first of all, resolutely to face the fact, that before she can do her duty, changes nothing less than radical must pass on the Church herself. Such as she is, the modern Protestant Church has allowed herself to be driven from that field which the Church, in ages past, proved to be specially her own.

There is something, to my mind, downrightly scandalous in the Church of the Living God, the pillar and stay of the truth, presenting to the public the spectacle it does in New York to-day, moving up-town as fast as her members grow rich, and leaving, as she moves, vast spaces in ignorance and vice, churchless, Christless; and, worst of all, all this done to the sound of ecclesiastical hosannas. How has she excused to herself this movement? Her single excuse has been, that as with the bulk of her forces she moves off the field, she leaves the sorry outpost of the mission chapel to hold her lines. Now the mission chapel is a wretched compromise for the church. The chapel is only half a church. At present, the chapel is little more than the weaker half of the preaching, singing, pew-renting establishment, up-town. All it pretends or tries to do is to establish a small church where once there stood a big one; support a second-class preacher, where the very best preaching is above all things needed; and a comparatively poor and mean edifice, just where poverty and meanness need to be uplifted and enlightened by all that Christianity can offer of what is rich, generous, beautiful and strong. It is hard to have patience with the smug Philistinism that spends hundreds of thousands of dollars on its costly preaching house, closed all the week, that fills its windows with beautiful glass, and crowds its floors with luxurious sittings, while from its membership and revenues it scarcely draws funds or workers enough to support the cramped religious charity established down-town.

It may be truly said, however, in extenuation of this policy: "I wot, brethren, that in ignorance ye did it." It is a policy well meaning, a policy that has been supported with munificent liberality by a few; but I hold it is a fatal policy, and one that has proved itself unwise, impractical, inadequate and ill-adapted. It is poor economy; it is a hand to mouth policy. It has failed and must fail. It is responsible for the spectacle so often afforded to us, that we have failed to notice the tragedy of it, the pitiable death-struggle of a dying church! It is the story of increasing opportunities and diminishing powers of meeting them, of a brave front presented to an overwhelming foe by a broken and weakened rear-guard. The mission chapel feature of our modern Christianity is failure from beginning to end, and failure in spite of the most heroic efforts and self-denying labors of multitudes of earnest Christian folk, who have been left without the support that was their due.

What is needed? How shall we do the work the mission chapel has failed to do? It must be done by large, thoroughly equipped churches, and not by small and weakly equipped ones. From the very nature of the case, the church situated among tenement and boarding house populations, that stretches out its hands and offers its worship to these, must be a more costly church to support, than churches planted where rich people dwell. It is not necessary, surely, to enlarge upon the manifest advisability of providing, for those whose lives are necessarily spent amid sordid surroundings, a worship that in its completeness and beauty, tends to lift them above these.

The great city church should, therefore, have ample provision made for orderly services and beautiful music. The man who from its pulpit speaks to the people must have the power to draw and to hold. He needs, in short, to be a preacher; for never can the preacher speak to empty pews. And fully important as these considera-

tions, is the need of surrounding the church with all those agencies for supplying that which is lacking in the life to which it ministers. Oh, for open spaces for the children to breathe in! swimming-baths and gymnasiums to aid the young people to escape the temptations of vice; clubs and societies, reading-rooms, etc.! All cost money, and money in plenty. I take it that the Roman Catholic Church has practically proved in this country that the large church is of even more importance among the poor than among the rich; and should she ever add to her present wonderfully organized system of down town churches, much larger—shall I call them more human?—measures as these I suggest, her power among the swarming parts of our cities would be truly immense.

Thus hurriedly I have glanced at part of this great question, suggested in rough outlines a plan of Christian work. Let me ask any one, how is such a plan, or anything like it possible without endowment? When I plead for endowment for our churches I need scarcely say I do not advocate endowment for all. There are instances in this city where endowment have pauperized naturally strong churches, but these were not among the poor. It seems to me idle to talk of maintaining the sort of church that ought to be maintained, amid a poor population, without endowment. Here and there superhuman efforts may do it for a time; but it is too great a strain to last. The death of one generous giver may mean the surrender of some point that is of vital importance to the whole line of work. It must always add a veritable load of care to the self-denying men who refuse to take posts in up-town churches in order to obey what they believe to be the call of God.

It seems to me only fair and reasonable, that this question should rather be put: "Why not endow our churches?" We endow universities, hospitals, libraries, foreign missions, and some men spend their whole time in endowing their children; and yet it has not yet occurred to the religious intelligence of our land, to any great extent, to endow that organization which we all believe to be the real witness and mainstay of all that is best in all of these. An endowment so great that it would paralyze all effort is, of course, not desirable; but this might be fairly left to the wise direction and management of Christian men of experience. I am very sure, that three or four great down-town churches, open and free, placed where populations are densest, managed and served not by one or two clergy, but by half a dozen, and each, say, endowed with a million, would do more to leaven and tincture with real Christianity the life of our city, than all the down-town missions of all the churches put together. But such churches as these, of course, I know well, will not be possible, till the religious common sense of all has pronounced them essential, and has forever thrown overboard and cast aside as utterly inadequate, the present too often popular conception of the duties of the Church to our social, municipal and natural life.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE GERMAN NOVEL.

BY PROFESSOR H. H. BOYESEN.

II.

THE first book which appeared in Germany to which the title of romance was given was the famous tale "Amadis"; and romance (*Roman*) is, as every one knows, the German equivalent for the English "novel." Originally the name was given merely to indicate that the book was translated from a Latin tongue, or rather from two, as the French version proved to be a translation from a Spanish original by Vasco le Sobeira. The *lingua romana* was the common Roman vernacular from which Italian, French and Spanish have sprung, in contradistinction to the *lingua latina*—the classical Latin. The German word *wälsch* is used as a collective term for these languages, and *wälsche Mähre* was formerly a common term for a fantastic, extravagant tale. Likewise the word *Roman* (*romant*) was soon applied even to indigenous tales which described love and chivalrous adventures in a high-flown and exaggerated style; and in the course of a century, as the memory of "Amadis" was obliterated, *Roman* became the generic term for all prose fiction. So great was the fascination which the book exerted upon the German public in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, that not only were editions

petition and unchecked struggle for existence within itself. A great deal of the socialistic declamation which we hear meets this argument on a completely even footing, and concedes all its effect. The declaimers do not see it, because they have not thought out the matter as well as the old slave-holders had. In fact, there is an indisputable element of truth in it. That is this: Liberty of labor is not a social finality. It is not a definitive solution of the social organization. It only alters the forms of the problems. It alters nothing of the social forces. It sets free some personal interests which were not free before. In so far, it adds to the internal warfare and confusion of society. It does sharpen and intensify the competition of life. The struggle of the forces rises in intensity, develops more and more heat, puts stronger and stronger strain upon political institutions, subjects the sober sense, the high self-control of men to severer tests, demands more intelligent power of criticising dogmas and projects. The men who supposed that, under liberty, they were going to soar away from the irksome limitations of earthly life, find that the restraints have changed their form, but are as heavy as ever.

The master of a slave or a serf secured the subject person against all the grossest calamities of human life; but he made the slave pay him a high insurance rate for that security. The master carried all personal and social risk for the slave. This element of risk is one of the leading phenomena of social organization. In a barbarous society, where there is scarcely any organization, each person carries it for himself, and it produces no social problem, because, so long as it turns out well for the individual, he makes no complaint. When it goes against him he perishes. It is with advancing organization that the risk element becomes distinctly differentiated, becomes an element of status or contract, and enters into the rights and duties of the parties as they are related to one another in the organization.

It is one of the few things which are, I believe, agreed upon by all, that it is the function of capital to carry the time delay, and to bear the risk. It is an interesting question, however, whether the laborer has to pay the employer for carrying the risk. Lasalle demanded that the employé should be admitted to a share in the risk, because it is, as he assumed, only through the risk that the great gains come, and, therefore, on that view, the employé, if excluded from the risk, had no chance of the great gains.

The wages system is undoubtedly a high and intense organization, involving strict discipline upon all its members, as well employers as employés. It is therefore an intense constraint upon personal liberty. Some of the phrase-makers wax indignant at the notion that the laborer is viewed and treated "as a ware." Such indignation serves easily the purposes of rhetoric and declamation, but, in the cold light of fact and reason, it is only ludicrous. The Greeks called a laborer an "ensouled machine," which may be regarded as a more or less offensive figure of speech than the other, but neither of them is anything else than a figure of speech. Such figures aside, the fact is that the laborer binds himself by a contract. His time and service are the subject matter of the contract, which binds his liberty. The employer is also bound by a contract. He is bound to furnish means of subsistence, according to the terms of the contract, whether the enterprise in which he and the laborers are jointly engaged is successful or not. Every man who earns his living is bound in contracts of this sort. Employers and laborers, as we use those words technically, are only special cases. Our whole organization is held together by contracts, and we are all wares, if anybody is. If the name is offensive, we may change it to some other, but we shall all stand just where we do now; viz., under the necessity of subjecting our individual wills and preferences, that is, our liberty, to the conditions of the contracts by which we hold our places in the organization. The term "labor" cannot be taken in any narrower sense than that of contributions of any kind to the work of society, and, in that sense, we see that when we labor we set aside our liberty for the sake of some other good which we consider worth more to us under the circumstances.

The advantages of the wages system are that the man who has nothing makes a contract which throws the risk on capital, and is able, reckoning on a fixed and secure income, to make plans for the accumulation of capital under his circumstances, whatever they are, without any element of speculation. The defects of the wages system appear in so far as the wages income is not fixed and secure, and in so far as the laborer does, in fact, find himself involved in the business risk. I am of the opinion that the path of improvement and reform lies in the perfection of the wages system in these respects, and not in any of the pet notions which are propounded for supplanting the wages system by some other.

Therefore we find that, in the historical development of the industrial organization there have been in the forms and modes of laboring and of combining ourselves for greater power in supplying human wants, changes in status and relation; but that the necessity of working for a living has been and is a thralldom from which there is no escape. The century which has seen slavery as an institution cease to exist almost throughout the

whole human race, has easily come to believe in an ideal state of things in which existence should cost no pain or self-denial at all. Emancipation provided that a man should only work for himself. It is very evident that many are enraged, and declare liberty all a delusion, because they had persuaded themselves that liberty meant emancipation from the need of working at all, or emancipation from all the hardships of the struggle for existence. Hence the denunciations of "wages slavery." But we have seen that liberty is not, and never can be, anything but an affair of social institutions, limited by their scope, and never reaching into any field of poetry or enthusiasm. It can never make toil cease to be painful, or sacrifice cease to be irksome. It can never be enthroned above contracts, as a regulator of the relations which are necessitated by the social organization, because it is on the same plane with contracts and exists only by and in connection with them. There could never have been any abolition of slavery and serfdom but by capital. The rise and development of capital have forced higher and more stringent organization. This means new and in some respects more irksome restraints on individual liberty, in order to acquire greater power and win more ample sustenance for society. The socialist program consists in resolving that we demand the liberty we dreamed of, and the easy security we used to have, and all the new capital and wealth, while we declare that we will work only eight hours a day for it, and will not study for it at all.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

THE BRECKINRIDGES OF KENTUCKY: A CHRONICLE OF LOYALTY.

BY ETHELBERT D. WARFIELD,
PRESIDENT OF MIAMI UNIVERSITY.

"How do we come to have a Breckinridge on the right side of the line?" That is the question which the Washington correspondent of THE INDEPENDENT quotes herself as having asked on seeing Gen. Joseph C. Breckinridge in uniform at a White House reception. The natural response to such a question is: Was there ever a time when a Breckinridge was not to be found conspicuously on the right side since the nation began to be? If such a palpable truth is growing dim, it may be worth while briefly to recall the part the Breckinridge family have played in the history of our Union.

In the old days of the French and Indian war, Col. Robert Breckinridge was King's Lieutenant of the County of Augusta and Colonel of the county levies; as such he was the friend and fellow-soldier of Washington. Before the Revolution came he died, leaving a family of half-grown boys to breast the storm. The two older sons, Alexander and Robert Breckinridge, sons of his first marriage, entered the army as company officers, were captured, and lay for many weary months in a prison ship in Charleston harbor. Of the children of his second wife, Lettice Preston, a sister of Col. William Preston, John was chosen, in 1780, a member of the House of Delegates, the only nineteen years old, and at the time of his election a student at William and Mary College. The House set his election aside twice on account of his youth. But the electors of Fincastle persisted and twice returned him, and he was finally seated. A younger brother, James, entered Colonel Preston's rifle regiment, in 1781, at the age of sixteen, and served under General Greene.

Alexander and Robert Breckinridge moved to Kentucky immediately after their release from prison and became prominent on the loyal side of Kentucky's struggle for autonomy. Robert was one of the three Kentucky delegates who voted in the Virginia Convention in favor of ratification of the Constitution, and he aided George Nicholas in the framing of Kentucky's first Constitution after the pattern of the national document. For the first four sessions he was speaker of the Kentucky House of Representatives, and during those years and many previous and subsequent ones, General of the State Militia, which was in that generation no holiday soldiery but an organization which had to fight for life with the Indians and then for arms and justification with the Government, both State and National. In days of storm and stress, of plot and conspiracy, of public and private schemes of disorganization, he was in the field and council hall the very embodiment of hardy manhood and unshaken loyalty.

When in 1793 John Breckinridge left Virginia for Kentucky, he was member elect for the Charlottesville District in the third Congress. He rapidly rose through the Attorney-Generalship, the Legislature and Speakership in the House to be Senator in Congress in 1801 and Attorney-General in Jefferson's Cabinet in 1805, in which post he died in 1806. Meanwhile James Breckinridge remaining in Virginia became a member of the legislative body, and in the great struggle of 1798 we have a spectacle which is characteristic of the fortunes of this family.

In the Kentucky Legislature of 1798, John Breckinridge introduced the famous "Kentucky Resolutions." He had prepared, as I believe, this series of resolutions with the advice of Mr. Jefferson, and he passed them with all the vigor of his oratory and all the weight of his personal influence. A similar set of resolutions, the "Virginia Resolutions," prepared by James Madison

and offered by John Taylor, of Caroline, were presented in the Virginia Legislature in December. A noble little body bitterly fought the passage of these resolutions, conspicuous among whom was James Breckinridge. So brave and able was the fight, that he became the standard-bearer of Federalism, and in the next year ran against James Monroe for the governorship, and was only beaten by three votes.

There is no reason to lay South Carolina nullification and the dark crime of Secession at the doors of the Kentucky and Virginia Legislatures; but it is worth noting that if one brother assisted the extreme legitimate extension of "States' rights," another championed the far dearer cause of indestructible unity.

The Breckinridges were Scotch-Irish, of good old Covenant stock, and when the war was over, and another generation was coming on, John Breckinridge, probably by Madison's advice, sent his eldest son to Princeton College. This was Joseph Cabell Breckinridge. He married the daughter of President Samuel Stanhope Smith, and thus his only son, John Cabell Breckinridge was the great-grandson of President John Witherspoon, the Signer. Joseph Cabell Breckinridge died at an early age, full of promise; his only public services being as Speaker of the Kentucky House and Secretary of State. The three younger brothers who came to maturity, John, Robert Jefferson and William L. Breckinridge, were all celebrated as divines and educators, and all stood staunchly by the Union. John, the eldest of this group, after graduating at Princeton, became tutor in the college, professor in the seminary, and filled other important posts, before death, in 1854. His only son, Judge Samuel M. Breckinridge, of St. Louis, was one of the truest of Union men during the War, and United States District Judge by Lincoln's appointment; and a daughter gave her life for the Union in the hospital service.

Robert J. Breckinridge was, however, the member of the family who embodied its loyalty. Born in 1800, he studied at Princeton and Union Colleges, practiced law at Lexington, served several terms in the Legislature, and bade fair to reach eminence as a lawyer and politician of Whig proclivities. But shortly before attaining his thirtieth year he determined to abandon his profession and enter the ministry. He was already committed to an anti-slavery course and in the ministry for many years at Baltimore, in the presidency of Jefferson College at Cannonsburg, Penn., or wherever and however engaged, he remained until the final outbreak of the "irrepressible conflict," the representative of the aggressive type of the Southern anti-slavery feeling which made gradual emancipation its aim. In 1849 he, as the spokesman of the emancipationists of Central Kentucky, appealed to Henry Clay to make the race for the convention called to meet in the autumn of that year to draft a new Constitution for the State; but Mr. Clay declined, and in his letter urged Dr. Breckinridge to take the place which he himself refused. Reluctantly he entered the contest, but once in it he conducted it with the fiery zeal which marked his every act. The pro-slavery element became incensed against him. He was refused the public halls of Lexington for the purpose of an election speech, and was threatened with mob violence if he spoke. At last the market house having been secured, he began amid the angry mutterings of a vast throng an oration which men who heard it have described as the most stirring they ever listened to. At its close there were no flashing, and few dry, eyes, and at the polls the bold champion of liberty received nearly double the vote accorded his fellow candidates, but still too few by a small number to elect him.

In 1860 he had a celebrated gun-maker make him a gun of peculiar workmanship, as an example to the people to arm themselves—a gun known throughout Kentucky as "the voice from the pulpit." His "fast-day" sermon was a bugle blast, giving no uncertain sound; and like a tower of strength he stood throughout the War, fearless under threats, unbroken by the deepest personal sorrows, in all things the active public man, the wise counselor, the loyal citizen. Many and many a time have I seen General Burbridge, in the trying times of military rule, come to ask his advice on some perplexing question; many and many a time did he point the way to a reconciliation of the dignity of law with the exercise of mercy. To no man more than to him was it due that Kentucky remained true to the Union. To him more than to any man Mr. Lincoln looked for a just estimate of the condition of public sentiment in his native State. He was chairman of the Convention at Baltimore which nominated Mr. Lincoln for his second term. In his precinct three men voted for the Lincoln electors that fall. One man, whose name I have forgotten, went early, armed with a rifle, and cast his vote; a young kinsman, Benjamin Peters, full of the good old loyal blood of the Henrys, Merediths and Breckinridges, slipped up when the way was clear, and cast his first vote for "the first American"; "Old Bob Breckinridge" alone ventured unarmed and alone to approach the polls when the throng of voters surrounded them, and not a few brave and generous opponents, trembling for his safety, had gone there to protect him.

His eldest daughter of all his children most resembled him in person, and in vigor and brilliancy of intellect, and to her was intrusted the early training of the chil-

dren who were still infants at their mother's death in 1845. Two of these were boys, and both were Union soldiers. The eldest, now General Joseph C. Breckinridge, Inspector General, volunteered in 1861, being only nineteen years old and but recently graduated from the University of Virginia. He served in Kentucky and Tennessee, in Florida, and the Atlanta campaign, being repeatedly promoted for gallantry, until in one of the minor actions at the end of July, 1864, before Atlanta (generally included under the fight at Peach Tree Creek), he was taken prisoner with his battery in a cavalry charge. By one of the strange fortunes which follow internecine wars, he fell into the hands of his own brother, Col. Wm. C. P. Breckinridge. It is hard for one who sees Representative Breckinridge of Kentucky, and General Breckinridge of the Army, side by side in the Washington of to-day, to picture the former charging at the head of a troop of Confederate cavalry upon the battery of the latter upon one of the battle-scarred hills before Atlanta, and bearing away to a long and languishing captivity him whom the same mother had borne upon her bosom, and who had been the playmate of his boyhood.

The family fortune from the first set one against another. John C. Breckinridge, following what he believed was the true political tradition of his father and grandfather, debated with vigorous opposition, even as a college boy, with his uncles; and as his political fortunes advanced, came more and more into open conflict with them, till baffled and beaten he carried his noble talents into the service of the Confederacy, leaving his State and his country under the policy espoused by the elder generation. As a General in the Confederate army he commanded a large part of the front at Cold Harbor. Here a few weeks before the battle of Peach Tree Creek another little family drama was played to a fatal end.

Laetitia Breckinridge, the eldest daughter of John Breckinridge, the elder, had married Gen. Peter B. Porter, of Niagara Falls, Secretary of War to John Quincy Adams. The only son of this marriage was Peter A. Porter, and he had married his cousin, a daughter of the Rev. John Breckinridge, the younger. This son, educated at Harvard, Heidelberg and Berlin, one of the founders of the Century Club, and yet remembered by many for his literary and social gifts, raised a regiment and entered the service in 1862. His regiment was consolidated with the Eighth New York Heavy Artillery, of which he took command. For a long time he was assigned to the difficult task of keeping Baltimore in good humor, but at last, at his urgent request, he took the field with Grant in the Wilderness campaign. The War records tell the story of the way his regiment bore itself. One regiment alone on either side equaled its total losses. At last the fatal day, the 3d of June, 1864, found Colonel Porter's regiment lying in front of the breastworks of Breckinridge's brigade. When the order was given to prepare to storm the works, several officers of regiments stationed near by declared their belief that their men, conscious of the impossibility of the feat demanded of them, would refuse to obey the order to charge. Colonel Porter, in his quiet way, remarked: "I think my men will follow me. I shall not ask them to go without me." When the charge was sounded he reversed his cap that his men might recognize him by the gleam of the arms upon it, and led them to the assault. No one failed to follow where he led; but when he fell within a few feet of the breastworks his men rolled back like a reflux wave, save those who lay dead beside him under the shadow of the wall. That night the guns of Breckinridge's brigade kept a grim watch over the body of one of the bravest and noblest of his race.

The youngest son of Thomas J. Breckinridge, Captain Charles Henry Breckinridge, was at West Point till the War was over. He was stationed at Mobile after the War, and in the summer of 1867 he was leaving the post, on his way, under leave of absence, to be married, when it was announced to him that yellow fever had broken out in the garrison. He at once returned to his post, and in a few days fell a victim to the disease and died. No sacrifice of love and life on the altar of duty was ever more complete than his.

I might follow this theme much further, and tell many an incident to illustrate how true the men and how brave the women of this family have been under the promptings of loyal hearts; but I trust enough has been said to show that there has never been wanting "a Breckinridge on the right side of the line." I pray God, there may never be! And I trust that I have not too greatly colored the narrative of the chronicler with the gratitude of the man for a mother's instruction in love of country and of a freedom which is for all men alike, and not for a privileged class.

WHILE all Europe is talking of Prince Bismarck, few know how the great Chancellor and his ancestors got their name. Bismarck is the name of one of those ancient castles a short distance from Stendal, on the road from Cologne to Berlin, in the center of the old Marquisate of Brandenburg. The castle had this name because it defended the "Marca," or the line where the river Biese formed a boundary in former times, or mark of defense against intruders. Hence the name Bismarck.

THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D.

I.

THE Revision movement in the Presbyterian Church is demanding a thorough study of the Confession in all its parts and in all its bearings. One of the most interesting questions in connection with this study is the use that the Westminster Confession makes of the Word of God in its citation of proof texts. I give a table of the proof texts of the Confession and a study of the use of the New Testament and the Psalter in the volume recently published entitled, "How shall we Revise the Westminster Confession of Faith?" I now propose to give a study of the Old Testament in the Confession.

There is a very general opinion in the minds of the Christian public that the old Puritans made an excessive use of the Old Testament. We doubt whether there is any good ground for this opinion. It is probably based upon the fact that they looked at the hard and stern side of religion. The Westminster divines cite the Pauline writings 667 times, the Gospels 248 times, the other New Testaments writings 247 times, the entire Old Testament only 431 times. The Confession is built on the theology of Paul rather than on the Old Testament, or the Gospels, or the other Apostles. It presents the Pauline type of theology. It is not comprehensively Christian. It is not comprehensively biblical.

1. THE HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The Hexateuch is cited 105 times, all the other histories only 61 times. Judges is not used at all. Ruth is used but once and Esther but twice.

1. The first chapter of Genesis is used to prove the Westminster doctrine of creation as follows:

"It pleased God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, for the manifestation of the glory of his eternal power, wisdom and goodness, in the beginning, to create or make of nothing the world and all things therein, whether visible or invisible, in the space of six days, and all very good."

"After God had made all creatures, he created man, male and female, with reasonable and immortal souls, endued with knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness, after his own image," etc.

But the first chapter of Genesis does not teach the doctrine of creation out of nothing. The creative work begins with a primitive waste and formless chaos. The doctrine that the world was created in the space of six days is not there, for the first day's work was the creation of light. The creation of the heavens and the earth, so far as the primitive chaos is concerned, was not included in the six days' work.

The only other passages of the Old Testament cited to prove the doctrine of creation are Job xxvi, 13; xxxiii, 4, to prove the agency of the divine Spirit; Ps. xxxiii, 5b, civ, 24, to prove wisdom and goodness in the creation; and Gen. ii, 7; Eccl. xii, 7, to prove the creation of man with reasonable and immortal souls. Ps. xxxiii, 5b, is omitted from the American list. But the splendors of the doctrine of creation as brought out in Job x, 8-11, xxxviii; Ps. viii, 3-6; xix, 1-6; xxxiii, 7-15; civ, 1-23; cxxxix, 13-16; Prov. viii, 22-31; Is. xl, 12-28; Amos ix, 6, and many other passages are altogether neglected. The Westminster doctrine of creation is a reproach to the Presbyterian Church of the nineteenth century. The revision movement has only brushed against this chapter thus far, but ere long it will overflow it with irresistible tide.

2. In chap. iv the only verses cited are 4, 5. These are used in the Confession, XVI, 6, 7, to prove that good works are accepted in Christ and that works done by unregenerate men cannot please God because they proceed not from a heart purified by faith. The propriety of this use of these verses may be questioned. But the important passage, Gen. iv, 7: "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin coucheth at the door," with its doctrine of the genesis of sin in the individual; and all other corresponding passages in the Old Testament, as to the origin and development of sin in the individual, are neglected by the Confession, which is too much absorbed in the doctrine of original sin.

3. Gen. xv is in some respects the most important in the book. It is not used at all in the Confession. These fundamental passages for the doctrine of redemption are overlooked:

"Fear not, Abram; I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward" (1). "And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness" (6). Alongside of this may be placed the neglect of Luther's famous passage: "But the just shall live by his faith" (Hab. ii, 4).

4. Exod. iii, 15, gives an account of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt. It presents many important doctrines. The only uses made of these chapters are the following:

(a) Exod. iii, 14, is cited (Conf., II, 7) to prove that God is "most absolute." The Revised Version is: "And God said unto Moses, I am That I Am: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I Am hath sent me unto you." This passage proves that God is the ever-living or the eternal God, or that he is a God ever with his people, as it is variously explained. But

it does not teach that he is "most absolute." (b.) Exod. iv, 24-26, the story of Zipporah circumcising her son, is cited (Conf., XXVIII, 5) to prove that it is a great sin to neglect the ordinance of baptism. (c.) Exod. xii, 48, is used (Conf., XXVII, 1), to prove that the sacraments put a visible difference between those that belong to the Church and the rest of the world. (d.) The only other use of these chapters is the citation of vii, 3; viii, 15, 32, which tell of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart (Conf., V, 6), to prove that "the wicked harden themselves, even under those means which God useth for the softening of others." All these hard features of the narratives are picked out; but the gracious dealings of God with Israel, his long-suffering with Pharaoh and the Egyptians, and his wonders of redemption escape attention. Our Saviour cites Exod. iii, 6 (Luke xx, 37), to show that God as the living God of the fathers was not the God of the dead but of the living. And the spirits of the blessed, in the Apocalypse of John, sing the song of Moses and the Lamb, with hearts and minds filled with Exod. xv. But the Westminster Confession has no room for these words of life and this hymn of redemption.

5. Exod. xix gives the Sinaitic covenant, which is cited again and again in the Scriptures, and presents several golden threads which are entwined throughout the Bible. The following words in their historic importance outweigh fifty hard texts that have been cited in the Confession. "Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice, indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me from among all peoples; for all the earth; is mine and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Exod. xix, 5, 6).

6. Exod. xxiv gives us an account of the covenant sacrifice, which justifies the name of old covenant as applied to the Old Testament institutions, and which in the New Testament is again and again contrasted with the New Covenant sacrifice of Calvary; and yet not a word of it is in the Westminster Confession.

7. Exod. xxxiii, 30, seq., presents the doctrine of atonement and forgiveness of sin without sacrifice. This and many other kindred passages find no recognition in the Confession.

8. Deut. x, 12-19, is a wonderful passage, setting forth the love of God and exhorting Israel to love their God. This is all passed over and verse 20 alone is used (Conf., XXII, 1), and that is cited simply to prove "a lawful oath as a part of religious worship."

9. Deut. xxx is a magnificent chapter. It is cited by Paul in Romans x. But the only use made of it by the Westminster Confession is of verse 6 (Conf., X, 1) to prove "renewing their wills, and by his almighty power determining them to that which is good," which is rather a heavy weight to place upon the clause "The Lord God will circumcise thine heart"; and verse 19 (Conf., IX, 1) to prove the natural liberty of the human will in its power to choose life.

10. The song of Moses, Deut. xxxii, and the blessing of Moses, Deut. xxxiii, both splendid pieces of poetry and full of rich doctrine, are not used at all in the Confession.

11. There is no use of the song of Hannah (I Sam. ii, 1-10) which filled the mind and heart of the blessed Virgin when she sang her Magnificat.

12. The covenant with David (II Sam. vii; I Chron. xvii) is at the basis of the theology of the Psalmists and the Prophets. There is no reference to it in the Westminster Confession.

II. THE POETICAL BOOKS.

1. The precious doctrine of divine discipline in Job vi, 17-27, is ignored by the Confession.

2. The only use made of Job xiv, is an effort to prove from "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one" (4), "that death in sin and corrupted nature is conveyed to all the posterity of our first parents" (Conf., VI, 3).

3. Chap. xix, 26, 27, is incorrectly cited (Conf., XXXII, 2) to prove the doctrine of resurrection. These verses really teach communion with God in the middle state, a doctrine which is set forth in many passages of the Old Testament and the New, but which in most cases is overlooked by the Westminster divines.

4. The following precious psalms are not used at all—i, viii, xxiii, xxvii, xlii, xliii, xlvi (Luther's Psalm), xlviii, lxiii, lxvii, lxix, lxx, lxxx, lxxxiv, lxxxv, lxxxvi, lxxxvii, xci, xcvi-xcix, cviii, cxviii, cxx, cxxi, cxxiii-cxxix, cxxxix, cxlviii-cl.

5. The Praise of Wisdom (Prov. i, 7-9) is one of the most important writings in Old Testament theology. There are but four citations from it in the Confession: (a.) i, 20, 21, 24 and viii, 34 are used (Conf., XXI, 6) to prove worship in public assemblies, which is a curious misinterpretation and abuse of these passages. The American edition omits i, 20, 21, 24. It ought to have crossed out viii, 34, likewise; (b.) ii, 17, is cited (Conf., XXIV, 1) to prove the unlawfulness of polygamy. It certainly had nothing whatever to do with this subject. (c.) viii, 15, 16, is cited (Conf., XXIII, 2) to prove the lawfulness of the civil magistrate. These are the only uses made of the magnificent inspired writing by our Confession of Faith.

6. Ecclesiastes is used twelve times; but five of these uses are of the single verse vii, 29: "God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions."