

Vol. 70

Sept. 12, 1900

No. 37

THE PRESBYTERIAN

. CONTENTS .

EDITORIALS	3
The Church Treasurer—Unanimity—Christ's Marching Orders—Is it Truly Representative? —The Character-Determining Principle, etc.	
LARGE STATEMENTS AS TO PRESENT DOCTRINAL OPINION WITHIN THE "AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH"	8
By Rev. Dr. Willis G. Craig.	
A LAYMAN'S VIEW OF THE REVISION OF THE CONFESION	10
By A. H. Marr.	
THE H-COURT BORE	11
By Rev. Calvin Dill Wilson, D.D.	
THE BISHOP'S PROPOSITION TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY	20
By Rev. Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D., LL.D.	
Editorial on the Proposed Changes in the Church News and Special Missionary and Lit-	

PHILADELPHIA
NEW YORK

THE PRESBYTERIAN

Vol. 70

Philadelphia, September 12, 1900

No. 37

The Church Treasurer.

There is an office in every Presbyterian church that has little recognition and seldom any remuneration. The praises of pastor, elders, trustees, Sabbath-school workers, and all other Christian helpers are sounded and due credit is given them for the growth and success of the church. But there is another man, not often mentioned, whose services are so essential that without them the whole machinery will stop. This is the church treasurer who gathers in the funds and guards them, and pays the bills. He is very near to the people, has his finger on the pulse of the congregation and knows the real condition of the church better than any other one in it. The first sign of languor or disaffection reveals itself to him, and he first discovers the growing strength of the church, both financially and spiritually.

The treasurer is a man of power. The pastor is often helpless in his hands. He can fan the spirit of discontent till it bursts into a blaze. He can annoy the pastor till he is forced to retire in sadness and discouragement. On the other hand, the treasurer can do more to strengthen a pastor than any one else. He may be thoughtful of his interests and be in full sympathy with him in his work. He may see that settlement of salary is made at the proper time and kindly urge all to their duty. He can, when he is so disposed, arouse the languid, soothe the offended, quiet the disaffected, and settle rising difficulties. As troubles first reach his ear, he can do wonders in suppressing them and preserving the peace of the church and guarding the welfare of the pastor. There is no more able assistant of the pastor in any church than the treasurer when he is his sincere friend.

An ideal church treasurer was thus described by one who knew him well and was a member of the same church: "He is the most useful man in our church. He does not work in the Sabbath-school, nor help in the prayer-meeting, but no elder, nor even the pastor, does more to promote the interests of the congregation. When he finds one growing delinquent he seeks a personal interview with him, explains the importance of promptness in all payments, quiets his complaints if he is a murmurer, removes his hard feelings and soothes his spirit if disaffected over anything. When one has become determined to square up his accounts and leave the church for some grievance he has been known to talk him out of it, dissuade him from his purpose and send him home well contented."

Here is reliable testimony of the value of the service of one who magnified his office. The work of the man was more than to merely count money; it was the Lord's work as truly as that of the minister in the pulpit and just as essential to the welfare of the congregation. Many do not realize the very great importance of such labors, often labors of love, hard and self-denying. If the elder who rules well is worthy of double honor, the treasurer who does his part well is worthy of four-fold honor.

Who should be a church treasurer? One who has not only ordinary business qualifications, but a man well settled in religious convictions. He will soon find out more about the inside working of things in a congregation, than any one should know who is not well settled in the faith and a true friend of the church. He may learn things of professing Christians in this close acquaintance with them that would otherwise drive from him all interest in religion.

A lady once maintained that her husband had been greatly injured spiritually by serving their church in this capacity. He was cashier of the bank in their town, and though not a professing Christian kindly offered to aid the church, by serving as its treasurer. But to his astonishment, he discovered that some who seemed prominent in the church, helpers in the prayer-meeting and apparently active Christians, were very mean and unbusiness-like in their dealings with the church, prompt to meet all other payments except church dues, and even ready to repudiate these altogether. This was a sad revelation to him. Some of these were pillars in the church and very decided as Christians, and the effect on his mind was disastrous. He said to himself, "These men are insincere; they pretend to love the church, while they do not care for it." He soon came to a further conclusion, that all religion was a pretense, and lost faith in everything.

This may seem to be an extreme case, but it contains a warning to churches in the selection of treasurers. There should be a further lesson drawn from it, that no one in the church be a stumbling-block in the way of another. There should with all Christians be a special conscientiousness in payment of church dues. Expenses must be met in some way, and the fair and honorable method is for every family to do its share and according to its ability. When obligations are entered into, they should be more sacred even, than other debts. This will lighten much of the burden of church officers, fellow Christians will be encouraged, and the world will be convinced that our religion is not in vain.

Unanimity.

Much is made of unanimity in our day. Many talk about and write about it. It is thought to be a great feat to get a unanimous vote upon a proposition submitted for adoption, or to pass a measure without a dissenting voice. But unanimity is nothing in itself. Whether it counts for much depends upon how it was obtained, for what purposes, and with what results. In determining its character and worth, its moral qualities must be taken into account. United consent to that which is wrong or unworthy, or unlawful, is only an aggravation. A law may pass the legislature without a recorded nay, and be regarded as worthy of special mention and favor on this account; yet when it is submitted to a practical test, and proves injurious to morals, or to business, or to the home, or to certain classes, those who suffer from it

THE PRESBYTERIAN

PHILADELPHIA, 36 South Sixteenth St.

Published weekly by the PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING CO.

REV. ROBERT ALEXANDER, D.D. } Editors.
REV. W. W. MCKINNEY, D.D. }

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:

One copy for one year \$2.50
In clubs of five or more, each 2.00
To Clergymen 2.00
The date on the label on your paper shows the time to which your subscription is paid. If this date is not changed within two weeks after payment please notify us.
When the address of a paper is to be changed be sure to send the old as well as the new address.
No papers are stopped until orders are given to do so.

Make postal orders, checks and drafts payable to Presbyterian Publishing Co.
The Presbyterian is entered at the postoffice at Philadelphia, Pa., as second class mail matter.
Advertising rates furnished upon application.

Address THE PRESBYTERIAN, Philadelphia, Pa.
36 South Sixteenth St.

Dr. Duffield's Proposition to the Presbytery.

By Prof. Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D., LL.D.

At the summer meeting of the Presbytery of New Brunswick, Rev. Dr. John T. Duffield proposed a paper for adoption, in response to the Assembly's request that the Presbyteries report this autumn their wishes regarding the "whole matter of the restatement of the doctrines most surely believed among us." This paper has been very widely published, and it may be that it has thus become a matter of more general interest than its mere presentation to the Presbytery of New Brunswick would suggest. This may justify a few remarks upon it in The Presbyterian.

It certainly at first sight seems a somewhat odd paper for the adoption of a Presbytery in reply to a request for information as to its wishes in regard to a restatement of doctrine. It is very largely a historical recital, and the history that it recites is history of a peculiar order—what has come to be known in critical circles as "tendential" history—history written not for the history's sake, but for an extraneous purpose. It is therefore distinctly an argumentative paper—in short, a historical argument. One marvels both at the amount of history set forth in such a document, and also at the kind of history presented. Said the lady in the story, "Is it not wonderful how much taste we women have?" "Yes," was the response, "and even more wonderful how bad it all is." It does not seem likely that any Presbytery will be willing to make its own a piece of historical argument of this sort; and so we can safely pass from it to the proposal it is intended to commend.

This is nothing other than that the revision report of 1892 be resurrected and its proposed alterations of the Confession be resubmitted to the Presbyteries. It is, indeed, added, "together with such other changes as may be deemed advisable by the committee." But this seems to be adjoined almost by the way and as if a matter of course. The specific recommendation for which the whole historic argument is presented concerns rather the resubmission of the changes in the Confession proposed in 1892. It is

to give some show of reasonableness to this procedure for example, that instead of reciting frankly that those proposals, when submitted in 1892, failed dismally—the one receiving the highest number of votes falling thirty-three Presbyteries short of the requisite two-thirds, and the one receiving the lowest number of votes falling seven Presbyteries short of even one-third—the entire matter is transferred to the wholly irrelevant question of what proportion of the Presbyteries actually voting opposed the several changes, and we are told with all the emphasis of apparently significant italics, that, "a majority approximating two-thirds of those Presbyteries, and considerably more than one-third of the whole number, approved of twenty-six of the twenty-eight changes recommended by the committee." It is to add a show of justification to this procedure, again, that Chapter XXIII., Section 6, of the "Form of Government," which requires the Assembly to transmit to the Presbyteries for their judgment overtures for amendments proposed by one-third of the Presbyteries, is seriously advanced as in its "spirit" enjoining the resubmission of overtures already submitted and decidedly rejected by the Church, because forthwith one-third of the Presbyteries voted for them! On this reasoning it would need two-thirds of the Presbyteries to vote down an overture, instead of, as the Book requires, two-thirds to vote it in—which suggests that something or other here is turned on its head.

One is naturally not surprised to observe in the sequel that Dr. Duffield does not himself take this reasoning very seriously. He uses it to give an apparent sanction to the proposal to resubmit those overtures of the revision of 1892, "which were approved by a majority of the voting Presbyteries" in 1892, and which received the support of one-third of the Presbyteries. But this sanction fails with respect to the very matter on which, according to Dr. Duffield, the whole movement turns as on its hinge. "The prominent reason for desiring revision," says he, "undoubtedly was the statement in Chapter 3 of the doctrine of the Preterition of the non-elect." But the proposed reconstruction of Chapter 3, Section 7—the "statement of the doctrine of Preterition"—received the approval neither of the majority of the voting Presbyteries, nor of one-third of the whole number. This does not, however, in the least disturb Dr. Duffield. He only proposes that the Presbyteries should ask the Assembly for a more radical change at this point! The principle of procedure is then, it seems, to be this: All the changes proposed in 1892, of which approval was expressed by a majority of the voting Presbyteries (which happens also to be one-third of the whole number), are to be resubmitted in their original form; while changes for which only a minority of the voting Presbyteries (being less than one-third of the whole number), could be secured in 1892, are to be resubmitted in more radical form!

"He That Stays Does the Business."

All the world admires "staying power." On this quality success depends. The blood is the best friend the heart has. Hood's Sarsaparilla is the best friend the blood ever had; cleanses it of everything, gives perfect health and strength.

Hood's Sarsaparilla
Never Disappoints

Clearly the grounds urged to justify the action proposed are not the grounds that have determined the proposal. The reasons urged do not cover the whole proposal; they would justify the resubmission of only 26 out of the 28 original overtures; and one of the two omitted ones concerns precisely the matter which Dr. Duffield wishes changed above everything else. It must be saved at all hazards. The other may be allowed to lapse. Well, as the boys say: "We ought to be thankful for that." It is a very good overture to allow to lapse—as it proposed to engraft the anti-scriptural and anti-missionary doctrine of the "essential Christ" on the Confession, and was therefore excepted to by such members of

Mellin's Food

THE development of the infant mind is a wonderfully interesting process. Each day brings a new experience to the little one, and a new word is spoken, which indicates the progress. The brain is greatly influenced by, and is dependent on, the physical condition and general health of the body. In order to maintain the proper physical condition it is absolutely necessary to give the baby proper food. Mellin's Food and fresh milk is, physiologically, a proper infants' food; it contains the correct amount of necessary nutritive elements, and combines them in the right proportion, and does not introduce insoluble, indigestible, and non-nutritious constituents. Mellin's Food is a food that feeds.

I received the little book and sample of food which you sent and thank you most kindly. In the first six weeks of her little life my baby gained only one pound, but after using Mellin's Food she gained a pound one week, so you may know how pleased we are with it.
Mrs. PAUL BRINKSON
1812 Melrose St., Chicago, Ill.

I have had most satisfactory results from the use of your Mellin's Food. I raised my boy on it, and found no fretting; and his teething was so natural we hardly noticed them when coming. So great was the effect on the child I decided to try Mellin's Food on my little girl. She is now one year old, has all the front teeth, and is a bright, healthy baby. I cheerfully recommend Mellin's Food to all mothers.

Mrs. B. C. POOR
74 Carolina Ave., Jamaica Plain, Boston, Mass.
SEND A POSTAL FOR A FREE SAMPLE OF MELLIN'S FOOD

Mellin's Food Co., Boston, Mass.

the committee as Drs. W. H. Green, Wm. Alexander, F. L. Patton, E. Erskine, J. L. Leftwich, and Messrs. George Junkin and Morris H. Stratton. Only, why should not the other one in the same category with it—having not only equally but more emphatically failed to receive the suffrages of the "majority of the voting Presbyteries," or "of one-third of the whole number,"—be suffered to lapse, too? It, too, is a very good overture to permit to lapse. And for the matter of that why should not the whole series of overtures submitted in 1892 be allowed to lapse, too? It is a purely arbitrary distinction that is erected among them. They all failed, and failed decisively; and there exists no reason why the Church should be troubled with them again.

It has already emerged that the zeal of Dr. Duffield for revision of the Confession is primarily directed against the "statement in Chapter 3 of the doctrine of the Preterition of the non-elect." It is this point only out of all the twenty-eight adverted to in the report of 1892,—or out of all the it may be innumerable ones included in the sweeping "such other changes as may be deemed advisable by the committee"—that he thinks of sufficient importance to signalize by name, and to request the Presbytery especially to memorialize the Assembly upon. To the justification of this request, indeed, he devotes a whole paragraph. It is possibly a somewhat confused paragraph; it is certainly a very confusing one. For ourselves, we confess we find it difficult even to parse it; and when we have parsed it, we do not profess to be able to understand it. Here is its substance: "With a single exception, and that for a brief period, the statement of the doctrine of the Divine decree respecting the non-elect in the Westminster Confession, differs from the statement of the doctrine in all the other Calvinistic Confessions of the Reformation, and also in the Shorter Catechism."

So far as we can make out that asserts and asks the Presbytery to assert, that the statement of the doctrine of the Divine decree respecting the non-elect in the Westminster Confession differs in everything it says, with a single exception, from the statement of that doctrine in all the other Calvinistic Confessions of the Reformation, and also from the statement in the Shorter Catechism. One would like very much to know what the particular point is, in which alone the Confession's statement agrees with the statements of these other Confessions and the Shorter Catechism—this "pavidus nauta" of Reformed truth, so hopelessly immersed "in gurgite vasto" of Westminster error. It is further apparently asserted, and the Presbytery is asked to assert, that it has only been for a little while that even this single element of Reformed truth has found a place in the statement of the Westminster Confession; for only such a meaning can we put into the clause, "and that but for a

brief period," in connection with the present tense, "the statement of the Westminster Confession differs from the statement," etc. Apparently, therefore, this one saving exceptional element in the statement of the Westminster Confession has come into it only lately; and that implies that it has come in by some revision or other of which the public seems to know nothing. Perhaps it is his unique knowledge of this recent successful revision of the third chapter with such admirable results, that gives Dr. Duffield courage to urge still further revision on the Church. But would it be unfair for the Presbytery, before it adopts this language as its own, to ask information as to what single point it is in the Confessional statement of the doctrine of the Divine decree respecting the non-elect, which alone agrees with the statement of that doctrine "in all the other Calvinistic Confessions of the Reformation and also in the Shorter Catechism?" And might it not fairly inquire into the history of that revision movement (Dr. Duffield is great on the history of revision movements), by which this single point of truth has been so lately introduced into the Confession? Surely the Presbytery is entitled to know the details before it is asked to assert the facts!

We are not absurdly pretending not to know what Dr. Duffield means by this statement. How could we fail to know what he means by it when it is only a condensation of what he has told us more at length in an article printed in The Independent of May 16 last, and repeated with certain variations in The Presbyterian only the other day? But we are concerned to point out that in the form in which he proposes it to Presbytery to be adopted as its own, it is a blind statement and means just nothing at all. We do not intend to suggest that in its original and expanded form it means anything to the purpose. It does not. But in that form it has at least an assignable meaning, though that meaning is as nearly meaningless with reference to the present question of revision as it well could be. While in the condensed form in which the Presbytery is asked to adopt it, it has no meaning at all.

Reverting, however, to Dr. Duffield's fuller statement, we learn that what he really wishes to say is, that the statement of the doctrine of predestination in the Westminster Confession, or more specifically the statement of the Divine decree respecting the non-elect in the Westminster Confession, differs from the statement of that doctrine in all the other Calvinistic Confessions of the Reformation, "with the single exception, if it can be called an exception, of the Articles of Religion adopted by the Irish Episcopal Church in 1615, and superceded by the adoption of the Thirty-nine Articles of the English Church in 1635." Well, we may well ask, even if that be true, what of it? The establishment of difference is something very distinct from the establishment of inferiority. The Westminster statement may differ from all previous statements

only in order to improve on them all. And such is, in fact, precisely the case, in the present instance, so far as in this matter its statement differs from theirs at all.

But our attention is attracted at once by the exception which Dr. Duffield allows, and the use he makes of it. He speaks of the Irish Articles; and he adduces the briefness of their reign in the Irish Church to their disadvantage. We hardly expect that from a Calvinistic historian. The length of the reign of the Irish Articles of Religion in the Irish Church marks precisely the period of the predominance of Calvinistic influences in that Church. When they were supplanted by the English Articles, the Calvinistic influences that had hitherto governed the Irish Church gave way to the influences of Laudian Anglicanism. That is precisely the significance of the change. Is it not intolerable for Presbyterians to hear the brevity of the reign of the Irish Articles, produced by such means and in such interests, adduced to them as a reason why they should look with suspicion on the Westminster Confession's similarity with them? It is rather one of the supreme points of excellence in the Westminster statement that it is based on that of the Irish Articles, which in turn was formed by the godly hand of Ussher from the model of the Lambeth statement framed by William Whittaker. Surely misplaced inuendo could not go more amiss than in this most unfortunate allusion to the Irish Articles.

It is hard choosing, however, it must be confessed, in the matter of amissness in this remarkable arraignment of the Westminster statement of the decree, on the ground of its difference from the Reformed tradition. Everything seems so sadly awry! We pass by the curious classification of the Westminster Confession, as well as the Canons of Dort and the Irish Articles and the Formula Consensus Helvetica (if it is this Formula that is meant) among the "Confessions of the Reformation." Does a century more or less, and such a century, really make no difference? But what, we must at least ask, does the great difference that is asserted to exist between the Westminster and the other Calvinistic Confessions (except the Irish Articles), in the matter of the statement of "the doctrine of the Preterition of the non-elect" really consist in? It simply has no existence at all, is the only reply we can give. Of course, the Westminster statement of the doctrine is not a verbatim repetition of the statement of any other document, except in those clauses it has so wisely and well drawn from the Irish Articles. But in the matter of the doctrine of the decree of Preterition or Reprobation, it does not depart a hair's breadth

(Continued on Page 28.)

FIDELITY STORAGE AND WAREHOUSE CO.
1811-13-15-17-19 MARKET ST., Philadelphia
Moving with finest vans The ONLY Fire-proof Warehouse in the city
Expert packers Highest grade service
"The Finest in the World"

Dr. Duffield's Proposition to the Presbytery.

(Continued from page 21.)

from the best Reformed traditions as embodied in the leading Confessions of the Reformed Church.

Certainly, Dr. Duffield will get no support from any of the Confessions he mentions, for his proposed omission of "any doctrinal statement on Preterition." They all state it—with clearness, precision and emphasis: the Gallican, the Belgic, the Dodrechtan, the Formula Consensus Helvetica. And what they all state is the same doctrine of sovereign preterition which the Westminster Confession states. How they came to be so unanimous in stating it, his Hefpe will tell him if he will open it at page 119: "Definitions which take predestination only as election were represented by the later orthodoxy as incomplete." From Calvin's time indeed it has been a maxim in Reformed circles that "Election itself cannot stand without preterition"—a maxim the truth of which has been illustrated afresh in every anti-Calvinistic controversy.

How the matter stands with those confessions to which Dr. Duffield so mistakenly appeals, may be suggested to us by noting how the Canons of Dort, for example, introduce the doctrine of preterition (I. 15). "What peculiarly tends to illustrate and recommend to us the eternal and unmerited grace of election," runs their beautiful statement, "is the express testimony of sacred Scripture that not all, but some only, are elected, while others are passed by in the eternal decree, whom God, out of his sovereign, most just, irreprehensible and unchangeable good pleasure, hath decreed to leave in the common misery into which they have willfully plunged themselves and . . . at last, for the declaration of his justice to condemn and punish them for ever, not only on account of their unbelief, but for all their other sins." How does this statement differ from the parallel statement in the Westminster Confession which, together with all other allusions to preterition, Dr. Duffield would have omitted, as different from the statement in "the other Calvinistic Confessions of the Reformation?" Here is the Westminster statement: "The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice." If there is a difference it escapes the eye of the ordinary student; and it certainly is not to the disadvantage of the Westminster Confession.

We are not forgetful that Dr. Duffield, in his more extended statements, seeks to justify his assertion of difference by branding the Westminster doctrine of the decree as "supra-lapsarian." One scarcely knows how to take so gratuitous

a characterization. There is absolutely no basis for it in the text of the Confession; and indeed there could not, in the nature of the case, be any basis for it. For the distinction between supra and infra-lapsarianism resides wholly in the place given by each to the doctrine of predestination to life and death (which is common to both views) in relation to the decree of man's fall (which again is common to both); and there is throughout the Westminster statement—as anyone may see by simply looking at it—a studious avoidance of all allusion to the relation of these two decrees to one another. It follows, to be sure, that the Westminster Confession is as little infra-lapsarian, as it is supra-lapsarian. It states simply, with admirable clearness and force, what is common to both types of Calvinistic thought, and leaves entirely to one side what divides them. In this it does differ from some—but by no means all—of the other Reformed creeds; for some of them (but not all) are distinctively infra-lapsarian. But so far from this difference being a flaw, it is one of the chief claims of the Confession on our admiration. It makes it a generically Calvinistic document, and cleanses its skirts from all party spirit. And it at the same time renders it impossible, let us punctually remark, to attack its doctrine of the decree, except we take up a standpoint outside of the Calvinistic system altogether, and assault generic Calvinism itself.

Dr. Duffield does indeed say: "Whatever the explanation, the doctrine in question as stated in the Confession, is stated as a supra-lapsarian would state it, and its place in the Confession is where a supra-lapsarian would place it." Nothing could be truer. And it is just as true, that it is stated as an infra-lapsarian would state it, and placed where an infra-lapsarian would place it. In a word, it is stated as any Calvinist would state it, and placed where any orderly thinker would prefer to put it. As far as we can see, the assertion that "the flowers bloom in the spring" is an assertion which is stated as a supra-lapsarian would state it; and if given any sound logical connection, it would be placed where a supra-lapsarian would place it. And we do not know why an infra-lapsarian might not agree with him, both in the assertion and in the placing. The statement of predestination in the Confession is, relatively to the difference between these parties, in a word, just "like the flowers that bloom in the spring"—they have equally with them "nothing to do with the case." To label it "supra-lapsarian" is a great evil, inasmuch as by applying an epithet deemed opprobrious to common generic Calvinism, a tendency is inevitably created to desert generic Calvinism under the unjust opprobrium thus created. And when generic Calvinism is deserted, there is of course no standing ground left except outside the system.

We have permitted ourselves, however, to be led somewhat away from our text

by alluding to Dr. Duffield's explanations in his more extended articles. The Presbytery is asked to make the assertions founded on these explanations without the explanations. Perhaps, after all, it ought not to complain of that: it may be the easier task. Each explanation certainly appears to add a new difficulty. But can assertions, like these, founded on such explanations, be made by a Presbytery at all, with or without the explanations? We find it very difficult to believe that any Presbytery will be content to commit itself to a long list of, to say the least, intensely individualistic historical judgments, such as this paper sets forth—even if it should unfortunately desire to reach the same conclusion. We do not ourselves understand how a soundly Calvinistic Presbytery could reach the conclusion that it were well to eliminate the statement of the doctrine of Preterition from the Confession; or, how a Presbytery, zealous for the peace and purity of the Church, could wish to resurrect and press anew on the attention of the Church, the discredited, and justly discredited, revision overtures of 1892. But, in any case, it is certainly to be hoped that if a Presbytery should be so misled as to wish these things, it will ask for them with straightforward and plain directness, and not through the medium of a column or so of "tendential history."

The will of Samuel W. Brown, of Philadelphia, contains bequests to charities amounting to \$43,000. The income of \$5,000 is left to his sister, Elizabeth W. Brown, for life, with reversion of the principal to the Presbyterian Home for Widowed and Single Women at Fifty-eighth street and Darby Road. To each of the following institutions is left \$5,000: American Tract Society of New York, American Bible Society of New York; American Sunday School Union, Philadelphia, and Home for Aged Couples of the Presbyterian Church. To the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church of New York is left \$10,000 absolutely. Legacies of \$2,000 are left to each of the following institutions: Northern Home for Friendless Children, Southern Home for Destitute Children, Home Missionary Society, Old Men's Home, Society to Protect Children from Cruelty, and Children's Aid Society. The residuary estate is left to the Presbyterian Home for Widows and Single Women absolutely and without any restrictions as to the application of the legacy.

The Presbyterian hereby acknowledges the receipt of \$2 for the India Famine Fund, from Miss Lillie J. McDowell, of Uniontown, Pa., and \$2 from L. S. of Muncy, Pa.

PISO'S CURE FOR
CURES WHERE ALL ELSE FAILS.
Best Cough Syrup. Tastes Good. Use
in time. Sold by druggists.
CONSUMPTION