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, NOVEMBER 21, 1889. NUMBER 2138.

The Independent.

For Table of Contents see Page 10.

PETITS NAUFRAGES.

BY EDITH M. THOMAS.

I SAW a little shallop
That lately came to grief,
Midway a slender river,
Upon a pebble reef;
The water-weed lapped round it
With many an oozy leaf.
But what is that to thee or me?
Such little shipwrecks aye must be.

I saw two shattered pinions
With rainbow colors pied,
That once had carried Psyche
In beauty and in pride;
The summer dust befouled them,
Nor yet would kindly hide.
But what is that to you or me?
Such petty ruin aye must be.

I saw a mother wood-dove,
Her gray breast dabbled red,
And, above the evening whisper
Of old boughs overhead,
I heard the cry of nestlings
That waited to be fed.
But what is that to you or me?
Such petty sorrow aye must be.

To high estates pertaineth
The majesty of wo;
Yet see how lightsome creatures,
That Heaven hath humbled so,
The self-same way of ruin
With self-same paces go!
But what were those to you or me,
Save that a fellow-fate we see?

The keel of puny venture,
The summer's tenderling—
The butterfly, the wood-dove
With death-arrested wing—
All bid us, as they vanish,
Their Linus-song to sing.
But what were these to you or me
Save that with them we soon shall be?

NEW YORK CITY.

PIKE'S PEAK.

BY ERNEST WHITNEY.

LONE hoary monarch of the Titan peaks,
Offspring of Heaven and earth in planet jars,
Bare-bodied savage, grim with unhealed scars,
To thy wild band thy voice in thunder speaks;
Thy sword-stroke is the avalanche, that wreaks
Quick vengeance on thy kneeling victim. Wars
Come but to yield thee homage, and the stars
Visit thee nightly. Yet thy long gaze seeks,
Unsatisfied, the playmate of thy prime—
O yearning like to mine—that goddess bright,
The Ocean stream, O deep embrace that time
Forgets not, ere stern gods beyond thy sight
Her dungeons sunk! Thy memory that; thy hope,
This ocean-seeking stream that cheers thy slope.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.

OUR NATIONAL VANITIES.

BY REBECCA HARDING DAVIS.

MR. MURAT HALSTEAD, in a brilliant article in the last number of *The North American Review*, skillfully cuts away some of the little vanities in which the American delights to wrap and warm himself and to strut before the world.

I doubt, however, whether this surgical operation will do any good. The patient is good-humored to the core, and has laughed under the cuts of many a coarser scalpel than that of Mr. Halstead. Indeed, I think any rational human frog would enjoy being flayed by a touch so light and fine. The victim in this case will no doubt applaud the operation and go on his way, vain, boastful and happy as before.

He wears some coats of conceit, however, which Mr. Halstead has overlooked.

May I suggest one or two of them?

The most ludicrous perhaps is the sublime faith which the American of the present day has in the high birth of his ancestors. He usually writes a history of his family which is clear enough for three or four generations back, then comes a foggy gap, on the other side of which looms some noble earl or baron from which the stock "is said to" proceed. Quite oblivious, apparently, of the existence of any official Books of the Peerage or Gentry, he complacently seizes on the arms of this mythical progenitor and causes his wife to parade his crest on her note-paper and teacups to the fiendish joy of her enemies.

We all, too, have a conceited faith in the refinement and delicacy of the grandfathers and grandmothers whose old gowns and tables we cherish so fondly. We will not face the fact that the first colonists as a rule were respectable poor folk who came here to better their condition, or the scampish younger sons of good families who were induced to "leave their country for their country's good." Many of these Scotch-Irish, Germans and Puritans doubtless possessed stern, rugged virtues, but learning, liberality of thought and modesty of speech were not often among them. Even in the ideas of the more cultured class, there was a bigotry oddly mixed with a cheap, flimsy sentiment which would shock their descendants. If one of the Pilgrim fathers or old Virginia Cavaliers or dames of the Meschianza were to suddenly appear at the dinner-tables of their grandchildren, I fear the young people would agree with Goethe, that "our ancestors were the most admirable people on earth, but the least desirable as visiting acquaintances."

The most flagrant effort made by sectional vanity to trick out these heroic pioneers in graces which do not belong to them, is that of our New England cousins when dealing with their Puritan ancestors, and holding them up for the veneration of the country. The pretty myth that

> "They left unstained what here they found
> Freedom to worship God,"

is now, however, held at its real value by every schoolboy. They neither left religious freedom nor did they give it, to anybody but themselves, as witness the Baptists, Episcopalians and Quakers, whom they whipped at the cart's tail and the poor savages whom they shot and burned, "the smell of whose sizzling flesh," according to the godly Pilgrim father of Plymouth, "went up as a sweet savor to the nostrils of the Almighty."

Religious freedom was first planted in this country by the Swedes and afterward by Penn.

Gustavus Adolphus endeavored to "establish a colony in the wilderness in which every man should be free to earn his own living and to worship God as he saw fit."

Penn did establish it, and it was for many years the only place on God's round world in which a man was thus free.

Among all our national pet conceits and vanities the most popular is that we still offer this freedom of personal belief and action to the individual. The traveling American, however modest on every other score, boasts wherever he goes that in his country a chance to rise is offered to every man, be he Pagan or Christian, Turk or Jew. No matter how poor, no matter how vicious he is, the moment he sets foot upon the soil of America he has the chance to worship God and to earn his living in the way that he thinks fit.

And then, the happy, boastful American comes home and helps to make laws which rob certain of his fellow-citizens of their property; which deny their right to earn or hold property at all, or to appeal, like other human beings, when their houses are burned or their wives outraged, to the law for justice.

Why? Because these men are criminals, invaders or imbeciles?

Not at all. Because their skins are red.

Or, living in the free, enlightened, charitable Northern States, he sees another body of his fellow-citizens striving to quietly earn their living, and sets himself to balk them at every turn.

Because these people are more degraded than others?

On the contrary, they are, as a rule, sincere, earnest and religious. Many of them are highly educated, with better breeding and gentler manners, probably, than his own. But he takes delight in trampling them underfoot, or forcing the gentleman among them into his kitchen as a servant, or making life for the gentlewoman so bare and bitter that it is intolerable. He thrusts them out of every trade and profession. He forbids them to kneel at the Lord's Supper beside him. In a word, he refuses them, point-blank, their "chance to worship God and earn their living as they choose." Withal he is apt to boast of his cruel injustice as a proof of his own exceptional sensibility and delicacy.

Why does he do this? Has he any grudge against these people? Any wrong to avenge?

On the contrary, he has inflicted a cruel wrong on them and their forefathers for generations.

The reason is—their skins are darker than his own.

Our other American conceits are laughable, but there is something tragic in our vanity on our national freedom and justice, when we see that they now depend wholly on the color of a skin.

PHILADELPHIA, PENN.

THE TRIALS AND TRIUMPHS OF THE OFFICE-HOLDER.

BY THE HON. JOHN H. OBERLY,

EX-COMMISSIONER OF THE CIVIL SERVICE AND OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

IN these emancipated epochs of the human mind, as have been called these modern times, the old-time idea that liberty was a gift from the head office-holder, Heaven-appointed, to the masses, has been superseded in this country by what is yet to most of the world a brand-new idea—the idea that grants of legitimate political power can be made only by the people. "You must" and "You shall not," were, in ancient times, the usual forms employed by kings in addressing what they called their people; but, occasionally, incited to astonishing liberality by some noble impulse or by the promptings of fear or the suggestions of policy, they would say, "You may"; and action by the people under such gracious permission was called Liberty. But the American idea is that supreme power resides in the people and must flow from them to the Government, and not from a sovereign individual to the masses; that the head office-holder, and all officials, must act, while in the exercise of legitimate political power, under the "You must," "You shall" and "You may," of the people, and are, in fact, the servants of the people.

That this is a beneficent as well as a new idea in politics, all Americans maintain; but the most patriotic citizen must admit that the people are capricious and that they should be held responsible for most of the grievous trials that now constantly beset the President and the other appointing officers of the Civil Service of the Republic.

In an evil hour they permitted the constitutional principle upon which civil appointments had been made during nearly half a century to be superseded by the spoils principle of the patronage system—permitted the politicians to set aside the business principle that a public clerk, like a private clerk, should be employed and dismissed only upon consideration of his merits, and to set up in its stead the robber principle that what are now known as "party bosses" should be allowed to turn the public service to their private gain or to the basest of party uses.

This change of policy was the breaking away of a political dam, and the letting loose of a roaring Johnstown partisan flood that ever since has been pouring its demoralizing currents through the executive chamber, the departments, the custom-houses and the post-offices. The roar of this flood, always sounding in the ears of the President and of the heads of departments and of bureaus, is, as a committee of the Senate once expressed it, a demand that this man shall be put up and that man put down, as the system of partisan rewards and punishments shall seem to compel; that the President shall devote himself to the petty business of weighing in the balance the partisan considerations that shall determine the claim of this friend or that political supporter to the possession of some office of honor or profit under him; that he shall bear burdens degrading to all his faculties and functions, wear out his term and his life in the service of party and in the bestowal of the favors party ascendency is presumed to command, and be constantly feeding with the spoils of partisan victory a hungry, clamorous, crowding, jostling throng, ever changing but never ending. Thus Lincoln was beset, while he was President; and, it is said, felt like a prisoner behind the executive doors, and the audible and unending tramp of the applicants for office, outside, impressed him like an army of jailers. Presidents Grant, Hayes, Garfield and

and earthly existence is conditioned in physical facts. The life of man is surrounded and limited by the equilibrium of the forces of Nature, which man can never disturb, and within the bounds of which he must find his chances.

If that seems too ponderous and abstract for the reader, it may be interpreted as follows: Man must get his living out of the earth. He must, in so doing, contend with the forces which control the growth of trees, the production of animals, the cohesion of metals in ores; he must meet conditions of soil and climate; he must conform to the conditions of the social organization, which increases the power of a body of men to extort their living from the earth, but at the price of mutual concessions and inevitable subordination. Organization means more power, but it also means constraint, and, at every step of advancing civilization, we seem to get nearer to this form of liberty, but the means of emancipation proves a new bond. Such being the case, it is a plain delusion to suppose that we can ever emancipate ourselves from earth while we are upon it.

Yet men have, in all the higher forms of civilization, been determined that they would have this liberty. They have, as it were, determined that they would fly. They have made liberty a dream, a poetic illusion, by which to escape, at least for an hour, from the limitations of earth. They have put liberty at the beginning of all things, in the "state of Nature," or far on in the future, in a millenium. Within the last century, especially, they have elaborated notions of liberty as a natural endowment, belonging to everybody, a human birthright. Their experience has been that they did not get it, and, when this clashed with the smooth doctrines in which they had been educated, they have become enraged.

Now it will be most advantageous to notice that this notion of liberty has a certain historical justification, and, when historically considered, a relative truth.

The medieval social and political system consisted of a complex of customs and institutions such that, when we come to analyze them, and find out their philosophy, we find they imply all the time that men are, but for political institutions and social arrangements, under universal servitude. The point of departure of administration and legislation was that a man had no civil rights or social liberty, but what was explicitly conferred by competent authority, and that the sum of rights which any person had were not such as belonged generally to all members of the society, but such as each, by his struggles and those of his ancestors, had come to possess. The modern view gets its interpretation, and its relative justification, by reference to, and in antagonism to this. The doctrine of natural liberty as an antecedent status of general non-restraint was a revolt against the doctrine just stated. It meant to affirm that laws and State institutions ought to be built upon an assumption that men were, or would be, but for law, not all unfree, but all free, and that freedom ought to be considered, not a product of social struggle and monarchical favor or caprice, but an ideal good which States could only limit, and that they ought not to do this except for good and specific reason, duly established. The nineteenth century State is built on this construction. We are obliged all the time to assume, in all our studies, certain constructions, of which we say only that things act as if they were under such and such a formula, altho we cannot prove that that formula is true. Institutions grow under conditions into certain forms which can be explained and developed only by similar constructions.

Modern civil institutions have been developed as if man had been, anterior to the State, and but for the State, in a condition of complete non-restraint. The notion has been expanded by the most pitiless logic, and at this moment a score, or perhaps a hundred, eager "reforms" are urged upon grounds which are only new and further deductions from it. At this point, like the other great eighteenth century notions which are also true relatively, when referred back to the medieval notions which they were intended to combat, the notion of abstract liberty turns into an independent dogma claiming full philosophical truth and authority. In that sense, as we have seen, it is untrue to fact.

When we turn to test the dogma of liberty by history and experience, we find immediately that the practical reason why no man can do as he likes in a human society is that he cannot get rid of responsibility. It is responsibility which fetters an autocrat, unless he is a maniac. It is that which binds the millionaire, which limits the savage who is responsible to his tribe, which draws narrow lines about the statesman, and which will just as inevitably fetter a democratic majority, unless such a majority proposes social suicide. Responsibility rises up by the side of liberty, corelative, commensurate and inevitable. Responsibility to Nature is enforced by disease, poverty, misery and death; responsibility to society is enforced by discord, revolution, national decay, conquest and enslavement. Within the narrow limits of human institutions, liberty and responsibility are made equal and co-ordinate whenever the institutions are sound. If they are not equal and co-ordinate, then he who has liberty without responsibility obtains privilege, and some one else, on whom he can encroach without responsibility, incurs a corresponding loss of liberty, or servitude. Those men and classes who at any time have obtained a measure of abstract liberty to do as they like on earth, have got it in this way—at the expense of the servitude of somebody else. Thousands of men died that Napoleon Bonaparte might, in a measure, have his way. Great aristocracies have won wide unrestraint by displacing the lives and property of thousands of others, when the aristocracies have been built up by a remission of responsibility.

The worst modern political and social fallacies consist in holding out to the mass of mankind hopes and affirmations of right according to which they are entitled by prerogative to liberty without responsibility. The current political philosophy, having fallen under the dominion of romanticism (except as to war and diplomacy), has apparently no power to do more than to follow and furnish platitudes for the popular tendency, or to oppose all forms of liberty in the interest of socialistic equality. The prosecution of that line of criticism, however, lies aside from my present purpose.

I have now arrived at the point where the true idea of liberty, as the greatest civil good, can be brought forward. The link between liberty and responsibility can be established and upheld only by law; for this reason, civil liberty, the only real liberty which is possible or conceivable on earth, is a matter of law and institutions. It is not metaphysical at all. Civil liberty is really a great induction from all the experience of mankind in the use of civil institutions. It must be defined, not in terms drawn from metaphysics, but in terms drawn from history and law. It is not an abstract conception. It is a series of concrete facts. These facts go to constitute a status. It is the status of a freeman in a modern jural state. It is a product of institutions. It is embodied in institutions. It is guaranteed by institutions. It is not a matter of resolutions, or "declarations," as they seemed to think in the last century. It is unfriendly to dogmatism. It pertains to what a man shall do, have and be. It is unfriendly to all personal control, to officialism, to administrative philanthropy and administrative wisdom, as much as to bureaucratic despotism or monarchical absolutism. It is hostile to all absolutism, and people who are well-trained in the traditions of civil liberty are quick to detect absolutism in all its new forms. Those who have lost the traditions of civil liberty accept phrases.

The questions in regard to civil liberty are: Do we know what it is? Do we know what it has cost? Do we know what it is worth? Do we know whether it is at stake?

YALE UNIVERSITY.

THE TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, U. S. A.

BY PROF. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D.

IN a series of articles published last summer in THE INDEPENDENT I took the position that there were three remedies for the present awkward situation in the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. The first of these was the historic interpretation of the Westminster Confession. In my recent book entitled "Whither?" I have shown that the Presbyterian Church as a body, and those who are the stoutest opponents of revision in particular, have drifted from the Westminster Confession by the use of *a-priori* logical methods of interpretation to the neglect of the historic method. There are upward of eight hundred titles of books and tracts by Westminster divines, the authors of the Confession, and yet the leading dogmatic divines in the Presbyterian Church have not used a single one of them so far as one can see from the Indexes of their systems. It makes a vast difference whether one studies the Confession with the help of its authors or depends upon those who know nothing of its authors.

The second remedy that I proposed was the historic interpretation of the terms of subscription. The Presbyterian Church has been agitated from time to time by controversies as to the meaning of the terms of subscription. One is not sursprised at this, for they are capable of a great variety of interpretations. The terms of subscription have been centers of controversy from the beginning. The controversy has developed the party of strict subscription and the party of loose subscription. Few have cared to know what the terms of subscription really meant, in their historical origin and purpose.

I. The strict subscriptionists have developed into three divisions:

(*a*) The earliest of these insisted on verbal subscription; that is, subscription to the express words of the Confession. This was the view of the so called Old Side, who in 1736 carried through a minority Synod a Declaratory Act that "the Synod have adopted and still do adhere to the Westminster Confession, Catechisms and Directory without the least variation or alteration." The terms of subscription adopted in 1788 were interpreted in accordance with this theory by a considerable section of the Old School men at the time of the separation in 1838. But this theory has few advocates at the present time.

(*b*) A second section of strict subscriptionists take their stand on the formula of subscription adopted in 1788: "Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith of this Church as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures"; and interpret the "system" to which we subscribe as the Calvinistic system. This erroneous interpretation seems to have a large following in the Presbyterian Church at the present time. The fault of it is that it lays stress upon the Calvinism of the Confession and neglects other more important features. It too often interprets the Calvinism of the Confession in accordance with the peculiar views of Scholastic Calvinism as represented by Turretin and Charles Hodge.

(*c*) Charles Hodge improved the interpretation of the terms of subscription by distinguishing in the system: (1) the truth common to all Christians; (2) those common to all evangelical Protestants; (3) the special doctrines of the Reformed Churches. This interpretation brings into line the great doctrines common to Presbyterian and other Protestant and Christian Churches, but gives the emphasis to the peculiar doctrines of Presbyterianism; and these, in the school of Dr. Hodge, are not the consensus of the Reformed Churches, but the scholastic type of Calvinism that he and his pupils teach. The test of the system, as given by Dr. Hodge, is not the system itself, or anything in the system, but three classes of doctrines that are arranged outside of the system as distinguishing Christians from heathen, Protestants from Romanists, and the Reformed from the Arminian and the Lutheran.

II. On the other hand, there have ever been loose subscriptionists in our Church. There are three groups of these:

(*a*) The rallying cry of one group has been "substance of doctrine." This term of substance of doctrine would not be so bad if it were not for its indefiniteness. The question must still be asked, What substance? the substance of the Confession, the substance of Calvinism, the substance of Protestantism, or the substance of Christianity? Men have held to this phrase who could not subscribe to the Calvinism of the Confession, but only to the common evangelical doctrines contained therein. The terms of subscription were certainly never designed to have that meaning. In 1763 Mr. Harker gave this interpretation to the terms necessary and essential of the Adopting Act. "He would have them to signify what is essential to communion with Jesus Christ." The official decision of the Synod was: "But the Synod say essential in doctrine, worship and government, *i. e.*, essential to the system of doctrine contained in our Westminster Confession of Faith considered as a system."

(*b*) Another loose interpretation of the terms of subscription, common in our days, is that the system of doctrine to which we subscribe is not the system contained in the Confession, but the system contained in the Scriptures, and that we subscribe to the Confession only so far as, in our judgment, it is in accordance with the Scriptures. It ought to be plain that the Synod of 1788 had no such idea as this. This theory of interpretation virtually does away with the Confession altogether, because it claims that there is subscription only to the scriptural doctrines and not to the others, so that subscription to the Confession is nothing more than subscription to the Scriptures. From this point of view it would be useless to ask: "Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith of this Church as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?" for it would already have been answered in the question: "Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, the only infallible rules of faith and practice?"

(*c*) A third method of interpreting the terms of subscription is that we subscribe to the Confession so far as the presbytery or the General Assembly may exact it of us. This is a common interpretation, but it is entirely unhistorical and the most dangerous of all. According to this theory we subscribe not to the doctrinal system of the Confession, or of the Scriptures, but to the doctrinal system of the Presbytery and the Church. Our faith is then determined by an accidental majority vote, and its complexion will change as we pass from North to South, and from East to West. What truth-loving man would thus subject himself to the caprice of majorities and the dogmatism of ecclesiastical demagogs?

These three theories of loose subscription are as dangerous on the one hand as the three theories of strict subscription are perilous on the other. They are all alike unhistorical and unsound.

In view of these six false theories of the terms of subscription that have prevailed and are still held in the Presbyterian Church, we must take with some degree of allowance the high praise given to our terms of subscription in some quarters at the present time, and regard the general reluctance to tamper with them as unthinking prejudice. If they are really so plain and simple, how is it that these six erroneous interpretations of them have sprung up? It will be easy to show that they are not plain and simple, but clumsy and obscure terms of subscription. But before I venture upon this thankless task I shall endeavor briefly to bring out their historical meaning.

III. The Adopting Act of 1729 is the basis of the history of subscriptions in the American Presbyterian Church.

The Adopting Act declares "agreement in, and approbation of, the Confession of Faith with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, as being in all the essential and necessary articles, good forms of sound words and systems of Christian doctrine." In their decision of the Harker case, in 1763, the Synod interpreted the essential and necessary articles as those "essential to the system of doctrine contained in our Westminster Confession of Faith consid-

ered as a system." Where now the Synod in 1788, after revising the Westminster Confession, asked of the candidate, "Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith of this Church as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures," we must interpret the system in the formula of subscription in accordance with the Adopting Act of 1729, and the decision of the Synod in 1763 as meaning the system of doctrine contained in our Westminster Confession considered as a system. That this is the true interpretation is also clear from the declaration of the Synod of 1787 to the dissatisfied Presbytery of Suffolk. "We have always supposed that you as brethren with us believed in the same *general system of doctrine*, discipline, worship, and Church government, as the same is contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith, Catechisms and Directory."

The terms of subscription, therefore, in their historic sense mean that they require subscription to the system of doctrine contained in the Westminster Confession and to no other system, and a subscription not to all expression or to all articles, but to the essential and necessary articles of the Westminster system.

The advantage of this historic interpretation is very great. It stays the hands of the scholastic Calvinists who would press their hard doctrines upon us. It brings into prominence the evangelical doctrines of the Reformation that the scholastic Calvinists have neglected. It exalts the consensus of Christendom in the Confession which scholastic Calvinists have depressed.

It furthermore brings into prominence those great practical doctrines of Puritanism, that begin with the twelfth chapter and go on in sentences of power and grace through the middle section of the Confession. If the terms of subscription had been given their historical interpretation there would not have been departures from the three great principles of the Reformation among leading Presbyterian divines; they would not have been excessive in their elaboration of the first eleven chapters of the Confession; they would not have failed in the second group of eleven chapters; they would not have departed from the faith in the last group of chapters. The Confession would have been held in its own splendid proportions if the system contained in the Westminster Confession had been faithfully adhered to, and other systems of theology had not been set up in its place.

IV. The terms of subscription if interpreted in their historic sense are excellent terms. But they are not clear and definite in their grammatical and logical sense. As I interpret the formula of subscription to the Confession, it would be better expressed in the following form: "Do you sincerely receive and adopt the system of doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith of this Church as declaring in all its essential and necessary articles, doctrines taught in the Holy Scriptures?"

On the basis of this historic interpretation of the formula of subscription, I make the following criticisms:

(*a*) The system of doctrine of the formula is contained in the Confession and at the same time is taught in the Holy Scriptures. Does this mean that there is a system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures and that there is a system of doctrine contained in the Westminster Confession, and that these two systems are identical? This is the simplest grammatical interpretation of the sentence, and yet it seems to be evident that the authors of the formula could not have designed to say this. They meant to say that the system of doctrine contained in the Confession expresses the doctrines taught in Holy Scripture. But they did not say this. There can be no doubt that there is a system of doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith. There are thirty-three chapters and there is a chain of doctrine, with strong and compact links, extending through the document. But what theologian would venture to say that we have any such system in any writing of Holy Scripture or the Scriptures as a whole? The doctrines may all be in the Scriptures, but the system in which they are arranged in the Westminster Confession is evidently not in the Scriptures.

(*b*) It may be questioned, indeed, whether there is any such thing as a system of doctrine contained in the Bible. There is a system—if by system we mean an organism of inspired religion, doctrine and morals—a unity and a variety in the Bible which has been produced by the organizing mind of the Divine Spirit. But system is not used in that sense in this formula. There is no system of doctrine in the Scriptures in the sense in which the American Synod used the term system. There is no catechism, there is no confession of faith, there is no system of doctrine, no dogmatic system, anywhere in the Bible.

(*c*) The most serious criticism upon the formula of subscription, from my point of view is, that it seems to say that the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures is contained in the Confession of Faith. If I had a thought that this formula had any such meaning in the minds of those who framed it, or could possibly have such a historical interpretation, I would repudiate it with disgust and contempt. To my mind it would approximate to blasphemy to say that the Confession of Faith contains the Scriptures. I cannot get from my mind the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the temple: "But will God in very deed, dwell with men on the earth? Behold heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house which I have built"? If I know anything of the Westminster divines or the fathers of the American Presbyterian Church they would never have imagined that they could comprehend the Word of God in any confession that they could construct.

I yield to no one in my admiration for the Westminster Confession. Few have studied it with such interest and enthusiasm as I have devoted to it during the past twenty years. It is the best of creeds made by men. But the Bible is vastly greater, better and grander than any creed. There is not a doctrine that is contained in the Westminster Confession that rises to the hights or extends to the breadths of its expression in the Scriptures. There are not a few doctrines such as the love of God to mankind which find very inadequate expression in the Confession. There are other doctrines that are obscured or overlooked. There is much greater light yet to break forth from the Word of God. The Westminster Confession is but as a mote in the sunbeams of God's Word.

(*d*) The Confession contains many things that are not in God's Word. There are some things that are true enough in themselves, but they have no biblical warrant. There are also statements which are against the Scriptures. It would be an abuse of God's Word to say that the system of the Confession corresponds in all respects with the doctrines of the Bible.

I have endeavored briefly to show that our formula of subscription is not only obscure and indefinite, but it may be so interpreted as to teach dangerous error. It ought to be revised not in the direction of loose subscription or strict subscription, but in such a way as to make its historic interpretation so explicit that no one can doubt it. I have given above a specimen of such a revision by enlarging the formula so as to bring out its real historic meaning. Other improvements might be made.

The ordination vows, of which the formula of subscription is one, have already been revised more than once. The formulæ of 1788 were a condensation of the Adopting Act of 1729. The questions of 1788 were revised some years afterward when the original Question 3 of 1788, "Do you approve of the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church, as prescribed in the Form of Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church *in these United States*?" was reduced into the form, "Do you approve of the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in *these United States*?" This form remains until the present time notwithstanding there are four great Presbyterian organizations in "*these United States*"—the Cumberland Presbyterian, the United Presbyterian, the Presbyterian Church in the United States and the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Each of these four Presbyterian Churches has its own Form of Government and Book of Discipline. Which of these have our ministers been approving in their ordination vows? The Southern Presbyterian Church revised their terms of subscription so as to make them definite by giving in the formula the title of their Church: "the Presbyterian Church in the United States." But the Northern Church has allowed the old form to remain without any thought that it is mere words that history has robbed of their meaning. It should also be said that the Southern Presbyterian Church has revised the form of subscription to the Confession in recent years by inserting "and the Catechism." The Catechisms are not included in the formula, altho the General Assembly of 1848 (O. S.) ventured to interpret them into the formula. It will now be clear to all that there is some need of a revision of the terms of subscription, and that, having revised them so many times in the past, and having outgrown them and lost the sense of their historic meaning, they should be revised again so that a young minister may know what government and discipline he is approving and what system of doctrine he is adopting.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

FROM PUEBLO TO COLORADO SPRINGS.

BY JOAQUIN MILLER.

"WAL, I dunno how it is with you other fellers, but whenever I strike Colorado air I just want to git out on a big rock an' swing my ole hat an' holler!" Some of us looked up and some of us looked down as the battered old millionaire miner fired this at a quiet group that sat taking in the air and the sun and the scene; for it was as if

> "in the afternoon
> They came upon a land wherein
> 'Twas always afternoon."

But the old miner had come to Colorado when men were not nearly so plenty on the ground as now; when a man hailed his fellow-man afar off and ran to meet and welcome with shouts and shaking of hands and waving of hats. He had come here, this battered and bold and banged-up old relic, before Colorado had a history or a name or a place on the map. He had helped make its history; he had helped make it a central State in the Union; he had measured every mountain of gold or silver barefooted and with his blankets on his back before the most of us were born. And there was a spice of derision for some of us as he said to the silent group in that palace car back over his shoulder as he swung his broad hat and sauntered away:

"An' I do it, too! Oh, I just make Rome howl when I git up to my old claim. I swing my hat an' I yell till I make the wolves ashamed of themselves!"

Now all this may seem absurd, even silly; but I record it because it is an open confession by an honest and natural old man of a simple truth.

We all wanted to yell. But we were all too respectable, you see; too "respectable" to even confess the exultant shout that came teeming to the lips in every turn of the road. We were simply intoxicated. And so it is, I reckon, with every one who strikes the high, dry air on the foothills of the Rocky Mountains in the dreamful and melodious months of September, October or November.

In truth, it is a dull dog of a fellow who can only be intoxicated on champagne, or on drinks of any sort. The air of Colorado is simply a storehouse of intoxicating wines.

Denver lies to the north of Pueblo more than a hundred miles, and Colorado Springs sits on the uphill roadside to the right, about half-way between the two cities. It is not much of a place of itself, if you except the fine hotels, the banks and other buildings of the sort that attend civilization now. The town might easily have been spilled out of the bag of the Fates and so have been left lying on the hillside as it fell; a cottage here, a camp there, a tall smelter smoke-stack a mile or two down yonder in a gorge below, a group of houses about a spring of mineral waters a few miles higher up on the mountains away to the west, and so on. That is about all that man has done here, or hereabouts.

And it makes one glad to know that man may build on these foothills and burrow in these mountains for centuries to come and make but little showing, and make no disturbance at all in the sweet air or the majestic scene. There is so much room there is such stupendousness! Man is cast in too small a mold, even with all his appliances of engines and machinery, to make anything more than a molehill impression where the Rocky Mountains forever overshadow him.

Why, you might easily take the entire city of New York and drop her down in any one of these ten thousand cañons and she would be as entirely lost to sight as a bird-shot in a bucket of milk. All London could lie out yonder in any one of the ten thousand dimples below us for years, and never be discovered save by the roving cow-boy or the restless miner. So you see there is still room in the West!

. . . . . .

> "You will bury me in my Cheyenne Pass
> Where the still winds walk in the waving grass.
>
> "You will bury me in the Pass alone
> My epitaph on the unknown stone;
>
> "And that stone only where God saw fit
> To set it; and only God's hand has writ.
>
> "You will bury me in the golden grass
> Where winds with moccasined men shall pass;
>
> "Where Colorado's red stars shall keep
> Their camp-fires ever on my mountain steep:
>
> "Their ghosts are many. I shall hear them tread
> In the golden grass where I rest my head."

I have tried hard to recall the majestic lines of Louise Chandler Moulton, written to the memory of the noblest woman who ever came West to cast her fortunes with us. But as I am forever on the wing my poor head is my only library, and I know I have fallen far short of quoting the lines correctly. But I have at least the idea.

All this glorious Colorado region is continually telling over the wonderful things that "H. H.," or rather Helen Hunt Jackson said of it.

If you want to get the golden color of Colorado, the old-gold color, the new-gold color, the rest that is in the more subdued tones of it, or the blaze of battle that is in the intenser tones, turn back to Helen Hunt Jackson. She it was who first broke up the weary monotony of continuously green grasses. She it was who saw the lion's mane tossing its tawny splendors forever from the awful battlements of Colorado. The golden grass to her was the golden fleece. And she was the navigator in the seas of song who found it, loved it, named it her own, and made it her pillow when she lay down to rest.

It is hard to pass on from the grave of this woman and her great, warm memory; she was so good, so great, so soulful and so all-seeing. But as she has done her work let us go forward, forget sentiment in the hard practicalities, and, accepting her lesson and example, try to do our work.

It always seemed to me that Naples would never be quite Naples without Vesuvius. And in the same sense it always seems to me that Colorado would not quite be Colorado without Pike's Peak. It is a sort of altar to which you instinctively and all the time, when not entirely employed in something else, lift your face for strength and encouragement and rest. True, Pike's Peak adds not a whit to the fine air or the restful old-gold color of Colorado, but for all that it is a big thing.

And the fascination that there is about it! The desire, the aspiration to set foot on the eternal snows and see the world from the summit, has led to so many tragedies that all men, through the recital of them, are too sadly familiar with the glory of this mountain to make a description of it in place here. But it is much to know that whatever dust, or dearth, or dreariness, or weariness may await you below, you have only to lift up your face and be refreshed.

Immediately under this mountain, as indicated before,