

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 XXXVII.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 30, 1885.

NUMBER 1913.

The Independent.

For Table of Contents, see Page 16.

HEARING THE NEWS IN IDAHO.

BY CHARLES HENRY PHELPS.

A TRAIL, cut through the banks of snow,
Winds up and o'er the mountain chain
To where the pines of Idaho
Stand guard upon the Coeur d'Alene;
A thousand feet above the clouds,
A thousand feet below the stars,
The narrow path just rims the shrouds
That wrap the warlike form of Mars.
On Eagle and on Pritchard Creeks,
In Dream Gulch and at Murrayville,
The camp-fires play their ruddy freaks,
Redden the snow with lurid streaks,
And melt, perchance, on every hill,
The nuggets which the miner seeks.

One night in camp the game ran high;
Desperate some and reckless more;
In every cañon, revelry;
And boisterous songs went rolling by
With rugged jokes and lusty roar—
When, all at once, a sudden hush
Passed like a whisper through the pines;
The chorus ceased its noisy rush,
The gamblers broke their eager lines,
And many bared a shaggy head,
And some upon that silent air
Breathed forth a rude, unpracticed prayer:
The sick moaned on his hemlock bed;
For, down the peaks of Idaho,
Across the trail cut through the snow,
Had come this message:
"Grant is dead!"

Then men, who knew each other not,
Gathered, and talked in undertone.
And one said: "I have not forgot
How he led us at Donelson."
And one, who spoke his name to bless,
Said: "I was in the Wilderness."
And one: "I was in Mexico."
And still another, old and scarred,
And weather-bronzed and battle-marred,
Broke down with this one word: "Shiloh."

Then, by the firelight's fitful blaze,
With broken voice, beneath the trees,
One read of those last painful days,
And of his calm soul's victories,
So like his old heroic ways.
Touched to the heart, they did not seek
To hide the love of many years,
But down each rough and furrowed cheek
Crept manly, unaccustomed tears.

Ah! Never on this younger sod
Shall dew more grateful ever fall;
And never lips to Freedom's God
In prayer more fervently shall call.
And thou, calm Spirit, in what path
Thy dauntless footsteps ever tread,
No blessing kindlier meaning hath
Than brave men speak above their dead.
EAGLE CITY, IDAHO.

MOURNED BY THE NATION.

BY GEN. JOHN A. LOGAN,
UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE INDEPENDENT:

The nation mourns Ulysses S. Grant, and none more sincerely than his old associates in arms. Emerging from obscurity, he rapidly developed into one of the greatest men of the times. As a military genius and strategist, in my judgment, he has had no equal since the days of Julius Cæsar. As a patriot and lover of his country, none sur-

passed him. As a man of sound judgment in reference to matters pertaining to national affairs, he was the equal of any one. He was a most confiding man; was strictly honest and truthful, and believed implicitly in the honesty and truthfulness of every one until the contrary was made to appear. If to have such confidence be a fault, it was a grievous one in him, it being the cause of all the serious trouble I ever knew him to have. As a husband and father, he was kindness itself. Grant was a great man, and he was a good man.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

A TRIBUTE FROM THE SOUTH.

BY HON. JOSEPH E. BROWN,
UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM GEORGIA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE INDEPENDENT:

The people of Georgia unite with the people of the whole Union in deploring the death of that patriotic gentleman and magnificent soldier, U. S. Grant. The magnanimity of his character and the brilliancy of his achievements have stamped him as one of the greatest soldiers of any age. His name is a household word in every civilized nation, and his fame is the common heritage of the whole American people, North, South, East and West. Posterity will never cease to do honor to his memory, and the patriotic hearts of unborn millions will swell with pride at the mention of his great deeds.

A GREAT MAN DEAD.

BY HON. HENRY L. DAWES,
UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE INDEPENDENT:

I thought I was prepared to hear of the death of General Grant with composure; but I am mistaken. Now that it has come, I am overwhelmed with the sense of irreparable loss, and with the retrospect of twenty-five years of marvel and miracle to which I turn I first saw him, a newly-made brigadier, spending an evening, just after the battle of Belmont, with his friend, E. B. Washburne, in St. Louis. I next saw him when, covered with renown, he came to Washington, in the worn garb of a fighting soldier, to receive, from the hand of Abraham Lincoln, the commission of Lieutenant-General. I last saw him when he had already entered upon that struggle to which alone he was unequal; and, after the final issue had become too painfully evident, the conviction that, in the modest, unpretentious, and plain brigadier of few words, I had met a man of rare endowments, took fast hold of me. In the outset, how the whole outline of incomparable greatness has been filled and rounded out to completeness, need not be told, now that the great life has ended, and his work is finished. The world stands uncovered in the presence of this matchless character. Military greatness the judgment of mankind has already accorded to him; but greatness in all else that became a man was equally his due. In the Cabinet, as well as on the field, in all that is noble, as well as in all that is heroic, he was truly great. In dark days, and in prosperous, in the hour of peril, and in that of victory, he was greatest among all the men with whom he lived. In all that is truthful, in all that is gener-

ous, in all that is tender and lovable, he was equally great. A hero in all that pertains to a remarkable life, he was a greater hero when death came. Those who did not come near enough to him to know all he was, cannot mourn him as those will who did; but his countrymen and the world will reverence his memory, and pay tribute to his worth and his greatness so long as the nation he saved shall endure.

PITTSFIELD, MASS.

GENERAL GRANT.

BY THE HON. HAMILTON FISH, LL.D.,
EX-SECRETARY OF STATE.

My acquaintance with General Grant began in 1865, in Philadelphia, on his first visit to the North, after the close of the War. Thereafter I saw him frequently. His son (Col. Fred. D. Grant) was a cadet at West Point, and the General and his family often went there to see him. My country residence is on the Hudson River, immediately opposite West Point, and, on the occasion of one of his visits, I invited him to make my house his home on such occasions, and thereafter he and his family were frequently my guests. Thus acquaintance grew into intimacy, and ripened into friendship.

You ask, What were his most prominent traits of character? Well, with a man so full of strong distinctive traits, it is hard to say which may be most prominent; but I have been much impressed by his steady firmness and his generous magnanimity. His whole military career manifested his firmness both of purpose and of action. His answer to the War Department, "I will fight it out on this line if it takes all Summer," was but the spontaneous utterance of his general fixedness of purpose.

He was generous and forgiving in the extreme; not that he could not hate well when he had cause for hating, but he never did hate without having or thinking that he had sufficient cause, and was ever ready for an explanation and reconciliation. With few exceptions his dislikes were not long cherished. He was too busy and too generous to nurse them.

His unselfish generosity at the fall of Richmond and the surrender of Appomattox, stand out among the most noted instances of magnanimity on the part of a conqueror. He sought no triumphal entry into the Confederate capital, which had been the objective point of years of maneuvering and of fighting; he fed the army which he had defeated, and gave to Lee and his army terms of capitulation and surrender that commanded the admiration of the civilized world, and to this day receive the grateful acknowledgment of those who were their recipients.

After Sherman had accepted terms of surrender from Johnston, which the Government had so far disapproved as to send Grant to supersede him, instead of taking to himself the credit of Johnston's surrender, on terms satisfactory to the Government and to the people, he telegraphed, "Johnston has surrendered to Sherman," leaving the full credit to Sherman of what he himself had accomplished.

On his tour through the South after the War, to investigate, for the Government, the condition of the people, he showed a broad, generous spirit. His report was denounced by some politicians in Washing-

ton as a "whitewashing report"; but, had it been acted upon, there would have been no "solid South," and the restoration of good feeling would have taken place soon after the War had closed.

His feeling toward the South was, throughout his civil administration, in accord with that which he had exhibited in dictating the terms of surrender to Lee—full of generosity and of confidence. That confidence arose from the respect which a brave soldier has for the bravery and sincerity of those whom he has fought, and was undoubtedly increased by his visit through the South, shortly after the War had closed.

He was anxious to give appointments to Southern men; but, in several instances, gentlemen from the South, who had been engaged in the Rebellion, and to whom he was willing to offer appointments, refused to accept them.

The President, in the disposal of offices over the wide extent of the United States, must depend upon the representations of others for his information as to the character and capacity of the larger number of those who are to fill the public offices on his appointment. These representations are not always candid, and even when honestly given, are not always correct. Unfortunately—perhaps owing to the quarrel between Andrew Johnson and the Congress, or from whatever cause, and notwithstanding the very friendly and favorable report of the feeling and the behavior of the Southern people made by Grant to Congress, after his tour through their states—the Southern men of note and of prominence held themselves aloof, and not only would not volunteer advice, but often withheld information when asked.

The result was inevitable. At the close of the War, the condition of the South, now opened to a new class of labor, seemed to afford a wide field for industry and enterprise, and tempted a large class of men from the North, whose business had been broken up by the War, to seek their fortunes, and to cast their lot with the South.

The South had had little experience of an "immigrant" population. It was jealous and suspicious of the new comers; perhaps, under the circumstances, not unnaturally so, but very unfortunately so. Of those who went among them, very many were men of character, enterprise and simple purpose, migrating with none other than a sincere desire of becoming part and parcel of the community among whom they went. Others there were—adventurers of the "Dugald Dalgetty" stripe—ready to take whatever chance might throw in their way. Their "chances" were advanced by the quarrel, then at its height, between President Johnson and the Congress, and they lost no opportunity of playing upon the passions already unduly excited. The North was flooded with accounts of indignities and outrages heaped upon Northern men, and of the continued disloyalty of the South; and the South, smarting under its defeat and loss of property, isolated itself, and became united in a political combination bitter in its antagonism to the ruling power in the Nation. Such was the condition when General Grant came to the Presidency, and found nearly all of the Federal offices at the South filled by men of Northern birth. He felt the wrong of such condition, and desired to change it; but the reticence of Southern men, and their unwillingness to co-operate with him,

captured Vicksburg, with Pemberton's army of 27,000 men.

Promoted to Major-General of the regular Army, he was made commander of the military division of the Mississippi, and, proceeding to Chattanooga, he concentrated his forces, attacked Bragg, and won the famous battles of Missionary Ridge and Lookout Mountain.

Longstreet was quickly compelled to raise the siege of Knoxville, and soon afterward Congress revived the grade of lieutenant-general, to which President Lincoln at once appointed him.

General Grant issued his first general order, assuming command of the armies of the United States on March 17th, 1864.

Sending Sherman on the long campaign that included the fall of Atlanta and the great march through Georgia and the Carolinas, he came East and assumed personal command of the Army of the Potomac.

May 3d witnessed his army advancing toward Richmond. Desperate and sanguinary battles marked every step of progress, and when Grant reached the James River he had lost 54,000 men, while Lee had suffered the irreparable loss of from 35,000 to 40,000 of his veterans.

Then followed the successful siege of Petersburg, the fall of Richmond, and the surrender of Lee's army at Appomattox Court House, in April, 1865.

In every sense the hero of the War, Grant then established his headquarters in Washington. Congress created the rank of General for him, and he was commissioned July 22d, 1866.

In 1867, when President Johnson suspended Stanton, Grant was made Secretary of War *ad interim*, and held the office until January 14th, 1868.

The Republicans unanimously nominated him their candidate for President, May 21st, 1868, and he defeated Horatio Seymour, receiving 214 electoral votes to 80.

He was re-elected in 1872, defeating Horace Greeley, and receiving a popular majority of 762,991. His electoral vote was 286 to 80 for the other candidates.

In 1876 he retired from the active service of the nation, and, after a few months of private life, began his tour around the world.

Everywhere he went tributes of respect were paid him such as no other living man could have secured. The freedom of the chief cities of England was voted to him.

He was asked to settle state questions in China, and the Mikako of Japan, whose person is held sacred, shook him by the hand when they met; a thing without precedent in the history of that country.

On his return his friends made a great effort to bring about his nomination to a third term of the Presidency; but traditional opposition to a departure from the example set by Washington defeated the movement for his nomination.

Since then his only connection with public affairs was in representing the United States in the negotiation of a treaty of commerce with Mexico. Establishing his home in New York, he embarked his means in the banking business carried on by his sons and Ferdinand Ward.

The villainy of the latter wrecked the establishment, swept away his whole property, and hastened his death. On the 3d of March, 1885, he was nominated to be General on the retired list, with \$15,000 a year pay, by President Arthur, and was unanimously confirmed by the Senate.

THE PLACE OF BURIAL.

General Grant will be buried at one end of the Mall, in Central Park. It has been left to Mayor Grace to select the precise spot. Major-General W. S. Hancock has taken charge of the funeral ceremonies. The family expressed a wish that General Grant should be buried with military honors by the National Government, and the Secretary of War assigned General Hancock to the duty.

Hymn Notes.

A REMARKABLE HYMN.

BY L. FORSYTH, D.D.

Most of the hymn books in use among us contain one, or both, of the hymns, beginning, "Sovereign of worlds," and "Ye Christian heralds go, proclaim!" Who wrote them is a question which none of the compilers have thus far been able to answer.

names B. H. Draper as the author of "Ye Christian heralds," and Mrs. Voke as the authoress of "Sovereign of worlds." On the other hand, The Baptist Praise Book attributes "Sovereign of worlds," to B. H. Draper, and "Ye Christian heralds" to "Pratt's Collection."

None of these compilers seem to have known that these two apparently independent hymns are really parts of one and the same, and, therefore, must have been composed by the same person, whoever he or she may have been, whether "Anon.," "Mrs. Voke," or "B. H. Draper."

The hymn, I am quite sure, in its original text, was first published in our country, in "The General Assembly's Missionary Magazine and Evangelical Intelligencer for 1805" (p. 360), with the heading: "Hymn Sung at the Farewell of Missionaries, by a Bristol Student," and signed "B. H. D." It next appeared in a little Baptist collection of "Hymns Original and Selected, for the Use of Christians," by Elias Smith and Abner Jones, Portland, 1807, with a few changes, and the heading: "Hymn Sung at the Departure of the Missionaries, by a Bristol Student."

In this edition, the hymn begins, "Euler of worlds, display," etc., and, in the fifth verse, "Ye Christian heroes," etc. Who "the missionaries" were, at whose departure the hymn was sung, is matter of conjecture. I have no doubt that they were Drs. Marshall and Ward, who were sent out to join Dr. Carey, in 1799.

In his "Laudes Domini," Dr. Robinson gives 1803 as the date of the hymn, "Sovereign of worlds," etc. If this be the true date, then the missionaries must have been Mr. and Mrs. Chamberlain, who, in that year, went out to join the Serampore Mission.

For the benefit of all future compilers of hymn books, I append this hymn, in its original text, as given in the "General Assembly's Missionary Magazine for 1805."

NEWSBORN, N. Y.

HYMN.

BY A BRISTOL STUDENT.

- 1. Sovereign of worlds! display thy pow'r, Be this thy Zion's favor'd hour; Bid the bright morning star arise, And point the nations to the skies.

B. H. D.

Science.

THE EXTINCTION OF SPECIES.

At the last meeting of the American Association Mr. Meehan read a paper on "The Extinction of Species," in which he endeavored to point out that, under what had come to be called the law of environment alone, which had been called in to account for the rise and fall of species, things could hardly occur with the method and regularity which we saw prevailing everywhere around us; and he, for one, was disposed to look farther than had been done into Nature itself for the power which directed these operations, though at the risk, probably, of being charged with a desire to drag theology into science.

mained the same, in spite of the great advances in knowledge of the medical sciences. In like manner, in births the average proportion of the sexes continued about the same in all ages and climes. It must be evident that a mere chance condition of environment, or an undirected struggle, could not result in such systematic order. It seemed more philosophic to suspect the existence of some directing power, and, without taking the suspicion for fact, endeavor to find it.

Looking at plant life, he thought he could discern absolute provision for death; and, if so, this would involve a weakness in the prevalent idea that a mere struggle for life, or conditions of environment, were the sole factors in the origin of species. Color was an element of extinction, to a great extent. Fruit did not color till near maturity. Leaves colored when about to die. The petals of flowers were but modified leaves, and had a far less hold on life than the leaves out of which they are transformed.

While a leaf might have vital power enough to live three months, three weeks would witness the birth and death of the transformed leaves, or petals. The races of colored flowers, also, had, evidently, a shorter life than those with inconspicuous ones. Just in proportion as they are invested with bright colors, do they seem to become imbecile, and unable to take care of themselves. Many fail to produce seed, except through the friendly aid of insects; and, when they find themselves in localities where their special insects cannot attend them, they barely hold their own by offsets, or finally die away.

As, seems probable, colored flowers have been evolved from inconspicuous forms, we see that it has been with limited facilities for running alone in the world, and by so much an advance on the road to extinction.

One of the most interesting chapters in Darwin's treatise on this subject, is where he shows that, in the highly colored order of *Orchidaceae*, the amount of extinction must have been enormous; and, in comparatively recent times, dichogamy was also referred to as evidently an agent in the law of extinction. This disarrangement of simultaneous maturity in the sexual organs of flowers had been traced in a great degree to questions of temperature.

The male organs were excited to growth under a lower temperature than required by the female. In climates or seasons when the warm Spring came suddenly, the pistils would mature simultaneously, or before the stamens. In climates or seasons where milder Winters occurred before the Springtime set in for good, the males would mature before the female. In Pennsylvania the catkins of the hazel bush, or of some *Coniferae* were often thus brought to maturity long before the females appeared, and there were no seeds in such seasons.

The facts were indeed well known. The operation of such a law on the confinement of a species to a certain locality, or of total extinction, in case of a change of its own climate was apparent. It was certainly a law of extinction which no struggle for life could prevail against, whether we admit that the conditions were under intelligent guidance, or mere accident. The plants had taken on, under some evolutionary views, conditions which only insured the more speedy destruction of the species. There was no chance for any one developing some "profitable" element that would fit the race to be better adapted to the changed conditions.

Insects, or the wind alone, could aid such dichogamic changes in some few instances; but how, when the difference in time was so great that the fertilizing element was wholly lost? Mr. Darwin has frankly stated that "if we ask ourselves why this or that species is rare, we answer that something is unfavorable to its conditions of life; but what that something is we can hardly ever tell." We cannot tell if we are to look at the selfishness which is at the foundation of the origin of species by "profitable efforts," or the accidents of environment; but, when we see that color and dichogamy are directly in the line of unfavorable conditions to easy and fruitful reproductions, and that, in whatever way we look at it, death is as orderly and systematic as life itself, why should we not be permitted to look about for some influencing cause where Mr. Darwin professes to be unable to find an adequate one?

He thought an unprejudiced view of the whole question would lead to the great probability, at least, that there was some power leading all things forward into one harmonious effort, and to which the life or death of the individual was wholly subservient; and we might even go so far as to say that natural science had advanced so far as to take in, to itself many of the subjects which were supposed to be the special prerogatives of natural theology.

Prof. Lester L. Ward said that Mr. Meehan had made no new contribution to science. He was merely introducing views prevalent hundreds of years ago, which modern science had abundantly refuted, and was endeavoring to break away from. There was no advance in the promulgation of such views. They were not even novel as coming from Mr. Meehan, as the association had heard him express the same on several occasions before.

A gentleman present, whose name was not announced, asked if he understood the speaker to say that there was a power outside of the immediate environment, which directed the time and manner of death?

Mr. Meehan replied that the facts he had offered as he interpreted them did allow that death was not the result of blind chance, and that the "environment" must necessarily have some directing power behind it.

The interrogator then remarked that he could not agree with Mr. Meehan. He did not believe there was any power outside of the environment, and thought the whole address one of those attempts to reconcile science with religion which was wholly out of place in a scientific convention, because everybody knew that there was no antagonism between science and religion when properly understood, and, therefore, no necessity for any effort to reconcile them.

The presiding officer, Professor Cope, said he agreed with the last speaker. He should not have allowed Mr. Meehan to proceed with his address, only that they had reached to the end of the list of the papers to be read, and, as there was plenty of time, he allowed his sense of generosity to prevail, and allowed Mr. Meehan to proceed without interruption to the end. He would now adjourn the meeting.

Biblical Research.

THE RAYNER PAPYRUS OF THE THIRD CENTURY.

BY PROF. BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

DR. ADOLF HARNACK'S ("Theolog. Literatur," 1885, 12) review of Dr. G. Bickell's publication, "Ein Papyrusfragment eines nicht-kanonischen Evangeliums," a notice of which was given in THE INDEPENDENT of July 9th, deserves the closest attention of scholars. The fragment in question, which had been previously announced as a third century papyrus of Matthew, is a mere shred, three and one-half centimeters high, four and one-third broad, written only on one side, and containing only seven lines, mutilated at both beginning and end. Ninety-six letters are easily legible, and nine more can be more doubtfully recognized, distributed thus: 11 (16) + 16 + 17 + 19 (30) + 16 + 16 + 2(4) = 105. The original length of the line can be quite accurately determined, however, from lines 3 and 4, which contain an Old Testament quotation; and, proceeding on this hint, Bickell has restored the passage. In the following copy, the restorations of Bickell are included in square brackets. The easily legible parts of the text are given in capital letters, and the less legible portions in cursives:

- (1.) [Merà de tò] ΦΑΓΕΙΝ ΟΣ ΕΪΗΘΟΥ. ΠΑ [ντες]
- (2.) [ἐν ταύτῃ] ΤΗ ΝΥΚΤΙ ΣΚΑΝΔΑΛΙΣ [θήσεται]
- (3.) [θε κατά] ΤΟ ΓΡΑΦΕΝ· ΠΑΤΕΡ ΤΟΝ [προμύνα]
- (4.) [καὶ τὰ] ΠΡΟΒΑΤΑ ΔΙΑΣΚΟΠΗΣΘΗ [σονται.]
- (5.) [Εἰπόντος τοῦ] Ὑ ΠΙΕΤ ΚΑΙ ΕΙ ΠΑΝΤΕΣ Ο [ἐκ ἑωυ]
- (6.) [ἐση αὐτῷ] Ὁ ΑΛΕΚΤΡΥΝ ΔΙΕ ΚΟΚ [κύσει]
- (7.) [καὶ σὺ πρῶτον τρεῖς ἅ] ΗΛΩν [ἴσῃ με].

This may be fairly represented in English thus:

- (1.) [But after] EATING, WHEN THEY WENT OUT: ALL[!]
- (2.) [In this] NIGHT WILL BE OFFEND[ed,]
- (3.) [according to] WHAT IS WRITTEN: I WILL SMITE THE [Shepherd,]
- (4.) [and the] SHEEP SHALL BE SCATTER[ed.]
- (5.) [To the saying ο]F PETER: EVEN IF ALL, N[ot] I.
- (6.) [he said to him:] THE COCK TWICE SHALL CR[ow,]
- (7.) [and thou first shalt thrice] DJEN[ty ma.].

Keeping his eye on the fragment itself (the capital letters above) the student will at once observe that it is not a portion of a manuscript of either Matthew or Mark, but yet contains a text closely related to Mark, xiv, 26-30 (Mat. xxvi, 30-34). What is the relation between the two? Bickell says at once that the fragment presents an older text than either of our evangelists, and desires to find in it a fragment of one of these early evangelical writings, neither pseudographic nor heretical, but entirely well-intentioned, to which Luke alludes in the preface of his Gospel. Harnack goes further. He is inclined to see in it, not only a text undoubtedly older than Matthew and Mark, but also the first-recovered documentary trace of a primitive Gospel presenting a text out of which that of our Matthew and Mark was framed. He could wish to draw at once the conclusion that our Matthew and Mark are not original works—not even Mark. In spite of Dr. Harnack's warning, I confess myself unable to see the grounds for either conclusion. The

facts are simply these: seven short lines describing the events recorded in Mark xiv, 26-30 (Mt. xxvi, 30-34) in language closely similar but not identical, compressed into narrower space, and expressed in commoner terms. To infer that, therefore, we have here an older text, or a more original one, is to go far beyond the premises. To talk of Papias' "Logia," and a primitive text out of which Mark was made, is to take an excursion into sheer dream-land.

With Dr. Harnack I gladly agree in several of the five points which he raises in testing the value of the document. The text is not Matthew's or Mark's, but only closely related to theirs. It is plainly shorter than either. Dr. Bickell appears to have rightly determined the extent of the mutilation at the beginning and ending of the lines. And although I should not agree with his restoration in every letter, the sense of the passage is represented beyond question with sufficient accuracy by his restoration. But, on the two questions, Is the papyrus text more ancient than the text of Mark, and Is the fragment really a fragment of a Gospel? I conceive that there is much to be said, and that the trend of it will be in opposition to Professor Harnack's conclusions.

(1). The reasons that are assigned for the greater age of the text represented in the papyrus than that of Mark are as follows: Its greater brevity, the plainness of its language, and the omission of Christ's appointment to meet the disciples in Galilee. The facts here asserted are patent; the narrative that occupies 379 letters in Matthew, and about 332 in Mark, here is compressed into about 205 or less; the use of ἐγγύον (?) for ἐγγύθον, ἀλεκτρονίον for ἀλέκτωρ, κοκκίζει for φωνίσει, all mark a tendency to plain and popular, as distinguished from literary, solemn, or what Bickell calls "hieratic" speech; and the absence of the declaration that Jesus would meet his disciples in Galilee is clear, from the necessities of the space. But the conclusion is an absolute non sequitur, and depends on many assumptions, among them the prejudging of the nature of the work of which these lines are a fragment. It has no validity whatever, unless this work was a Gospel, and even in that case, would be of very doubtful validity. We must first determine the purpose of the writer in penning this fragment, before the facts that it is briefer than Mark, more popular in style, and omits certain statements, have any bearing whatever on the relative age or originality of the two. But to determine this question carries with it the determination of the broader one of the nature of the writing from which this fragment is taken.

(2). Professor Harnack frankly allows that he cannot, with absolute certainty, affirm that the lines before us are part of a Gospel narrative. "The supposition remains," he says, "that we have before us not a fragment of an evangelical writing, but a free, memoriter citation, which possibly stood in a homily." Certain analogous citations, he frankly refers to as collected in Dr. Eara Abbot's "The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel," 1890, pp. 20sq., 91sq. 98sq. Nevertheless, he believes it very improbable that such is the case here. "It is hard to believe, that through an improvised reconstruction, a passage could be accidentally restored to a form which, on many grounds, we could recognize as its oldest form." What Professor Harnack means by these "many grounds" we have already seen; so that we are again driven to the consideration of the purpose of these seven lines in order to solve their problems. And here, indeed, all investigation of them must begin. We must start with the probable intent of the passage; and only if that fails to account for its form, must we seek an account of it in other considerations.

Now, in my judgment, the passage bears on its face its purpose of a rapid and compressed review of Jesus' predictions of his desertion by his disciples, and is, therefore, not the original account from which Mark and Matthew were expanded, but, visibly, an abbreviated report of what they say, adopted to a purpose. The opening seems to hint that a saying of Jesus' before supper was ended, immediately preceded. To infer that the whole document was, therefore, a collection of sayings of Jesus, and speak mysteriously of Papias' "Logia," is to proceed per saltum with a vengeance. But, to infer from the subsequent contents of the fragment that the words of Jesus, spoken during the supper and recorded in Mark xiv, 18-21 (Mt. xxvi, 21 sq.), immediately preceded, is so natural as to be almost certain. The fragment then brings closely together the prediction during supper, of Jesus' betrayal by one of his disciples, the prediction after supper, of the desertion of all his disciples, and the prediction subsequently of the denial by Peter. Here is artificial arrangement patent; and equally patent, the intent of the arrangement. The use of the genitive absolute in line five, which seems to be certain from the legibility of the Y at its opening, so far from being, as Bickell seems to think, a proof of the antiquity of the text, is a proof of its secondariness, because an indication of its main purpose. The genitive absolute binds line five

to line six in such a way as to make the statement introduced by the finite verb, (line six) the chief matter, to which the statement introduced by the participle (line 5) is subordinate. The prediction of the denial, then, not the remark of Peter, is the point, and the construction with the genitive absolute is purposely chosen to emphasize this. It is all the more certain, therefore, that our present passage is an intentional survey of the predictions of Christ of his disciples' treatment of him. The rapidity of this survey is evident in every clause, in the beginning of the fragment no less than in the genitive absolute of line five. This rapidity is too great, and the compression too severe, to allow us to think the passage had, as its purpose, merely the record of events. It suggests a purpose beyond the record—what we may call a homiletical purpose. The plainness, or popularity, of the language used, points in the same direction. And, on the assumption of this, all the peculiarities of the passage are explained. The promise of our Lord to meet the disciples in Galilee is omitted, because not germane to the purpose in hand; the brevity is due to the speaker's haste to fix his conclusion; the popularity of the language to his practical purpose.

If, then, we start with the actual phenomena of the lines, and their most natural implication, we are led to believe them a part of a homily, or some cognate composition, which quotes our Gospels for a purpose, and deals with them so as to adapt their language to that purpose. It is only when we begin at the wrong end that we are likely to come to any other conclusion. And, if we assume that the passage is a fragment of a homily all the phenomena which Professor Harnack thinks point to greater originality, are so readily explained as to leave nothing over to throw doubt on the secondariness of the text. I do not wish to express my opinion too dogmatically, and I am certainly not led to it by any conscious *inducta ignorantia*, or tendentious zeal. But, in my judgment, these seven lines bear every trace of secondariness, and no trace of originality; every trace of being a fragment out of some homily, which used our Gospels, and no trace of presenting a primitive text, from which our Gospels sprang. I wish it were not so. It would be a great discovery to turn up a piece of one of those gospels which Luke mentions, and a discovery that the Christian world would welcome heartily, without thought of what effect it would have on modern critical theories. But we must not let the wish be father to the thought.

ALLEGHENY, PENN.

Sanitary.

REGULATION OF OUR FOOD SUPPLY.

It is now generally admitted that the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the food we eat have very much to do with the condition of public health. No longer are we in doubt as to what kind of air is needed for breathing, or as to the organic, as well as gaseous impurities, which so often contaminate it. Nature has furnished, ready to our nostrils, the great free reservoir of atmosphere; and alas that so many should live, or have to live, in houses or tenements where it is too seldom found!

As to water, it has come to be quite accurately known as to its sources of impurity, and as to its capacity for absorbing gases or conveying particles in which abide the powers of specific diseases.

But when we come to deal with foods, instead of one standard, as pure air, or another, as pure water, we have an almost innumerable variety, made more varied by the multiplied forms of preparation to which it is exposed. We are exposed to all the evils that arise from unripe, diseased, decayed, tough, and wrinkled foods, as well as to that contamination which they derive from the air. It is now so well established that good and wholesome foods may become the conveyances of specific organic particles that Pasteur and Koch, in their visits to cholera districts, would not allow themselves or their assistants to partake of food which had been cooked or had stood in cholera houses. Our first great peril from food is in that derived from the animal world. First of all, there can be no doubt that milk is much affected by the health of the animals which produce it. Fortunately, not all diseases affect the milk, and some do make it poor in quality without imparting to it any specific character. But there is too much reason to believe that tuberculous cattle may, through their milk, give miasmata and consumption to human beings feeding upon it. Ill-fed cattle, in hot stables and in feverish condition, do not produce wholesome milk, and infants and others that feed upon it are either not well or safely nourished. We recently examined a dairy furnishing milk for a dairy restaurant in New York city, in which were many cattle suffering from tuberculous disease, and yet, under forced methods of feeding giving a fair amount of milk.

Milk inspection helps to restrain this evil. But the only radical way is to have an inspection of dairies, especially of those in cities, or of those kept by persons having no pasture land. A great deal of milk comes to cities from cows that never get any grass, and that spend the most of their time haltered fast in stalls. These animals stand it for a time, but eventually suffer from tubercle, or some other form of degeneration. It is equally true that a great deal of meat finds its way to market from animals not in a fit condition for slaughter. When a herd comes to have pleuro-pneumonia, or a pen of swine shows symptoms of hog-cholera, too often there is a general slaughter. We recently knew of a herd of dairy cows on Staten Island disposed of at \$18 per head, and the sick ones soon found their way into the market. The inspection of all meat, while most important, does not detect all meat from diseased animals. Here, too, an inspection of live animals is greatly needed. Public abattoirs, under competent inspection, are greatly in the interests of a pure meat supply. But, so long as private slaughter-houses are allowed, these will receive the poorer animals, and slaughter them. The wealthier classes do not suffer much from this second-rate meat supply, since those who are dealers come to know the various grades. It is sold to the laboring or the poorer classes. Boils, skin diseases, diarrhes, and various forms of ill-health are traceable to a degraded meat supply. There is much need of a more extended system of inspection both for live and dead meat, inspectors being appointed not as favorites, but after expert examination, made by those competent of conducting it. In the keeping and cooking of meats we think it can be claimed that advances have been made in the last few years. The tendering of meat by keeping, without bringing it to a condition of incipient decomposition, is better understood. Frying in a way to harden meat and to bring it into a condition approaching that of leather is not so common as formerly. Slow frying can be so conducted as to retain the juices of the meat, and yet not harden it. Broiling is a much more common method than it once was, but cannot make up for toughness of fiber. How to roast meat so that it shall be tender and retain its juices has become both a study and an art. Those who will carefully study excellent books we now have upon the preparation of meats, and follow the practices of the best meat cooks, will not only succeed in producing palatable dishes, but find that the demands of the physiologist are met. We are able by chemistry to test the food value of these cooked foods, and so to find out how to combine the savory, the wholesome, and the nutritious. We are thus able to avail ourselves of that kind of health preservation and disease treatment which recognizes in foods and alimentation the natural method of sustaining health, and often of curing disease.

Pebbles.

...A brazen idle—The tramp.
...The Tongue River Indians are all married men.
...Clams fall early into the early closing movement.
...The weather said: "Wilt thou!" yesterday, and everything wilted.
...Speech is certainly silver at the telegraph office. Ten words for a quarter.
...The pretensions of the new English minister must be taken *cum grano Salis*-bury.
...A ship is called "she" because it always has the last word. The ship is bound to answer its helm every time.
...Col. Andrew McSwigger, a well known citizen of Western North Carolina, and at times a prominent moonshiner, was recently very much affected by a sudden and prolonged scarcity of his favorite beverage in the district in which he resides. He happened, one evening, to meet at a country store a number of gentlemen who in common with himself, were lamenting the vigilance of the United States officials. The Colonel, in the course of the evening's conversation, unseen by the rest of the company, ventured to wink at the proprietor of the store, whereupon that gentleman drew Colonel McSwigger aside, and requested the pleasure of his company in an adjoining shed. This having been reached, the proprietor extracted from a dark corner a small brown flask, and handing it to the Colonel, remarked the unusual pain it gave him to be only able to furnish so poor a substitute for the Colonel's usual drink, and explained that the flask contained alcohol. The Colonel, after lamenting his ignorance of this (to him) unknown tonic, concluded to refresh himself with at least about half a pint of it, and proceeded to pour out that quantity into a glass and drink it down. The qualities of the supposed alcohol were so superior in tone and strength to those of the elixir it was his custom to imbibe, that the Colonel quaffed the remain-

ing contents of the bottle, and went home. The proprietor of the store, who was, among other things, a skillful apothecary, afterward discovered, to his horror, that the brown flask had contained sulphuric acid, and accordingly it was his custom thereafter in his goings to and fro to be armed to the teeth, in order to accord a proper reception to such of the relatives of Colonel McSwigger as felt inclined to avenge their deceased kinsman. What was his surprise to meet the Colonel himself on the road, one morning, with no change in his former appearance beyond a preternatural bloom on his nose. "Oh-er-ah, my dear Colonel!" exclaimed the proprietor, "so glad to see you again, you know," and the worthy man's eyes brimmed with tears. "Oh-er, my dear sir, have you not been ill?" The Colonel expressed surprise. "Ill! Ah no. Brown," said he, confidentially, "that alcohol was immense. Try and get me a gallon. There was one peculiar thing about it, though," he added, after reflecting a moment. "For three days after taking that drink, whenever I blew my nose I blew a hole in my handkerchief."

Ministerial Register.

BAPTIST.

- CARMAN, A. T., accepts call to Third ch., Cincinnati, O.
- CATHER, F. J., Franklin, O., resigns.
- HODGE, J. L., First Washington Ave. and Trinity chs., Brooklyn, N. Y., resigns.
- HUNTLEY, M. L., accepts call to Mt. Tabor, Gilboa and Jackson chs.
- HURD, C. E., address 22 Thorndike St., Concord, N. H.
- LELAND, IRA, Topsham, Me., resigns.
- MACGREGOR, MALCOLM, Tarrytown, N. Y., resigns.
- MILLER, O. M., called to East Capitol Street ch., Washington, D. C.
- PUTNAM, J. W., Cortland, N. Y., accepts call to Temple ch., Philadelphia, Penn.
- ROBBINS, J. H., North Springfield, Vt., accepts call to Claremont, N. H.
- STAKELEY, C. A., called to Marcy Ave. ch., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- TAYLOR, D., New Hampshire, accepts call to East Lyme, Conn.
- THOMAS, J. C., Palmyra, accepts call to Elyria, N. Y.
- WILLARD, A. T., died recently at Providence, R. I., aged 71.

CONGREGATIONAL.

- ADAMS, CHARLES D., Drury College, ord. in Springfield, Mo., July 2d.
- ADRIAN, J. N., called to Turner, Ill.
- ANDERSON, WILLIAM, Leingsburg and Victor, Mich., resigns.
- ATKINSON, WILLIAM H., Rapid City, Dak., resigns.
- BAKER, B. F., ord. in Udall, Kan.
- BOSWORTH, WILLIAM A., accepts call to Great Bend, Kan.
- CALKINS, STORRS S., Mount Zion ch., Cleveland, resigns.
- CHANDLER, JOSEPH H., St. Cloud, Minn., resigns.
- COLE, ROWLAND H., Nickerson, Kan., resigns.
- CRAWFORD, OTIS D., Ridgway, Penn., resigns.
- DECKER, FRANK H., accepts call to Greensport and Cutchogue, N. Y.
- DEXTER, GRANVILLE M., accepts call to Soquel, Cal.
- DICKINSON, GEORGE R., Yale Seminary, called to Burlington, Kan.
- FOX, J. W., called to Buda, Ill.
- GRAVES, D. R., Elroy, Wis., resigns.
- HALLIDAY, J. C., called to Kirwin, Kan.
- HARDY, DANIEL W., Searspport, Me., accepts call to First ch., Bethel, Me., for one year.
- HARPER, JOEL, Wichita, Kan., resigns.
- HOWELLS, ANTHONY H., accepts call to Plymouth, Penn.
- HUTCHINSON, HENRY H., Auburn, called to Sumner Hill, Me.
- IVES, JOSEPH B., Douglass, Kan., resigns.
- JENKINS, OWEN, Moria, accepts call to Massena and Louisville, N. Y.
- LA BACH, JAMES M., Geneva, O., accepts call to Newton, Kan.
- MURPHY, THOMAS D., called to become permanent pastor at San Buenaventura, Cal.
- OSGOOD, GEORGE W., accepts call to Provincetown, Mass.
- PERRY, LEWIS E., ord. pastor in Pilgrim ch., Duxbury, July 15th.
- PHILLIPS, THOMAS D., Bangor, called to Madrid, N. Y.
- REYNOLDS, LAURISTON, Sixth Street ch., Auburn, called to Yarmouth, Me.
- ROBERTS, PETER, Yale Seminary, called to supply at East Pittston, Penn., for four months.
- ROOT, AUGUSTINE, accepts call to Windsor, Mass.
- SCHERMERHORN, HERMON M., called to Amesbury, Mass.
- SCOVILLE, FRANK C., Saugerties, N. Y., resigns.
- SQUIER, EDGAR A., inst. in Winooski, Vt., July 14th.
- STONE, SIDNEY, Pierce City, Mo., resigns.
- STRONG, WILLIAM E., ord. pastor in Washington Street ch., Beverly, July 15th.
- TOBEY, RUFUS B., Helena, Mont., accepts call to Carrington, Dak.
- WISE, D. W., Tonic, called to Huntley, Ill.