
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE IX.

NOTES AND CRITICISMS.

I.

MINISTERS AND MOBS.

THE recent outbreaks of lawlessness and disorder at Homestead and among the striking switchmen at Buffalo have not been without cause. But the cause is not to be sought alone in the oppression of the capitalists, but in great degree in the wickedness and ignorance of the working-men. For this the clergy must assume a large share of responsibility. Without adequate knowledge of the laws of business, or of the exigencies of modern industrial enterprises, they have united to a lamentable extent in blind denunciation of corporations and capitalists, and have been among the most active in disseminating erroneous views as to the rights of labor, while they have not had the courage to preach with proper emphasis to laboring-men upon their duties and responsibilities. To a great extent preachers have neglected to remind their hearers of the repeated and explicit injunction of the Mosaic law that the judge is "not to favor a poor man in his cause" (Ex. xxiii. 3). While constantly emphasizing the admonition of Moses to the judges, "not to honor the person of the mighty," they have too habitually passed over the equally solemn admonition "not to respect the person of the poor," but in all cases to judge in righteousness (Lev. xix. 15); so that it has almost come to be a question in the public mind whether capital has any rights which laboring-men are bound to respect. In this growing sentiment lies a most threatening evil.

The attention of all who discuss the industrial situation is most earnestly commended to the significant facts brought out so clearly by Dr. Gladden in the last number of the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA (pp. 385–411), namely, that the production of the necessaries of existence even in this the richest country in the world, is so small that there is no large margin of annual surplus for luxuries. There is a significance which few realize in the fact there mentioned, that, were the total production of all the industries of the United States equally divided among the people, it would give to each person less than fifty cents a day for his recurring wants. Any unmarried man who gets more than fifty cents a day, and any man with a family of four or less who receives a larger share than two dollars a day, is getting more than he would receive on an equal division of the country's productions. Nature is not prodigal of her bounties. As our Saviour said, the poor we shall always

have with us. The cares and responsibilities and rewards of riches can belong only to a few. There is not store enough ahead in the world at any time to tide the world over a single season in which productive labor should generally cease. A life of labor is the normal condition of the human race. To pray for a daily supply of bread must always be the precious privilege and the bounden duty of mankind.

The so-called labor troubles of the present time are not in any great degree strifes between the rich and the abject poor, but rather between two contending classes of capitalists. The laboring-men of Homestead with skill enough to earn from three to ten dollars a day are not poor men. Their skill is capital, and brings to them an exceptionally high rate of profit. This is as it should be if only they can maintain their position of superiority in an open market. But an organization which tyrannizes over other laborers, and will not allow non-union men to learn a trade, has in it all the evils of a monopoly of capitalists, with the added evil of inordinate temptations to violent lawlessness, arising from the general ignorance of the class endeavoring to maintain the monopoly. Switchmen getting sixty dollars a month are not a class to be commiserated, but to be envied; and they are envied by hosts of workmen whose lot is doomed to be much poorer than theirs.

One of the most serious errors of all, and one very frequently made, is that of assuming that capitalists do not labor. Whereas, the truth is that no class labors harder, that none is more harassed with care, and none more likely to fail, in the end, of getting returns for its labor. Of those who venture to invest their means in business, only a small portion make it permanently profitable. As a rule, those who do succeed in managing great industrial enterprises so as to make them profitable, are the ones who ought to remain in charge of the business; for they not only are profitable laborers themselves, but conduce to the prosperity both of their employees and of the general public. The great burden of the industrial world is the many unprofitable investments which are constantly made by visionary or incompetent men who become managers of capital. It is the easiest thing in the world to mismanage a great enterprise, so that its capital shall be frittered away in unprofitable lines of labor; while it is the hardest thing in the world to secure long-continued success in those great manufacturing and commercial enterprises upon which so much of the world's prosperity now depends.

Clergymen are in danger of betraying their narrowness of view in the extreme emphasis they place on the wisdom and virtue of the eleemosynary gifts of the rich; for, in fact, these are usually the smallest parts of the benefits bestowed by a conscientious business man upon the world. The accumulation of capital is itself a great public benefit. Even though it be under the management of a few, capital inures as much to the good of the general public as to the benefit of the capitalists themselves. For, concentration of capital is essential to cheapness of production and to steadiness of business; and, as already said, if capital has accumulated in the hands of a particular person, it is *prima facie* evidence of the existence in him of that instinct of personal

economy, and that sagacity of investment which will secure its preservation. Were the accumulation divided among the many, it would be impossible to get, in the average, either the same economy in expenditure, or equal skill in management. Capital, like an army, is managed best under unity of leadership. It is thus that we can best justify the ways of Providence in the actual construction and development of human society.

As an illustration, we have in mind a business requiring large capital and hundreds of co-operating workmen, close calculation of distant results, and careful adaptation of means to ends, which has been maintained in a New England town for more than half a century. Yearly the ships have come from Archangel, Russia, laden with the raw fibre that was to bring returns only after many transformations and much waiting and numerous risks. The bills of the Russian flax grower have had to be met in advance, months or years before the manufactured article could reach the consumer. In machinery, and in processes of manufacture, the firm has had to keep pace with all improvements. Fluctuation in the markets, financial convulsions, and risks from fire and flood must be guarded against; while, to secure the highest success, there must be a generous expenditure for the promotion of the national welfare, and liberal investments in furtherance of other branches of business in the immediate locality. Mines must be developed, railroads built, business blocks and other factories erected, experiments of more or less hazard in various directions of enterprise must be encouraged, general education and morality and good feeling must be promoted, and honor must be maintained. Thus it will be found that the investments of a large-minded capitalist are interwoven with almost every interest of society. There is no ability which is of more economical value, than that which enables its possessor to make safe investments in industrial enterprises. The failure or suspension of such a business firm as that referred to would have been at any time a widespread and far-reaching disaster. Scores of families would have had their means of sustenance cut off, and hundreds more would have been indirectly affected.

It cannot be denied that the devotion of a capitalist to his business and the wise liberality with which he adjusts his personal expenses, may be actuated by selfishness more or less refined; and God often makes use of the low motives of our nature to accomplish his beneficent designs, suffering the business man himself to be little more than a galley slave. But all this *may* equally be the result of a broad view of the general welfare and an accurate knowledge of what will secure it. Whether it arises from one or the other of these motives must be determined by a great variety of observations of a personal character, and can be fully known only to the agent himself and to God who seeth all.

Nor are we at liberty to disregard the part which Providence has in giving to certain persons special responsibilities and opportunities in the management of the world's capital. Speaking roughly, business success is the product of two factors—what is within a man and what is without him—

his ability and his opportunity. The one is always useless without the other. It is no uncommon experience of the world to see abundant opportunities wasted for lack of some one to improve them. The lamentation is always more or less in place, that the harvest is plenteous, but the laborers are few. And, on the other hand, in an administration of nature in which general laws prevail, it is unavoidable that much natural ability should seem to be wasted on account of the difficulty which each person has of getting into his appropriate sphere of labor. It is not unfrequently the case that an opening for business, like the troubled waters of the pool of Siloam, is watched by a crowd of anxious persons, while only the first one who steps into it can obtain the desired advantage. There is always an imperative call to adore the Providence which brings the man and his opportunity together.

This leads to the remark that the world cannot get along without paying proper respect to "the powers that be;" for in an important sense they are ordained of God. The officials of a railroad hold their position, for the present at least, by God's appointment. Whoever rides upon a railroad train commits his life to the efficiency with which the rules of the road are obeyed by the employees. A mob cannot be trusted to run a railroad train. By all just rights the employees of a railroad assume some of the moral responsibilities of a common carrier. The idea that, in violation of contract, railroad men have a right to strike for the redress of their individual grievances is monstrous. Railroad employees who can conspire with others to disarrange the whole business of the country, and in violation of their own contract, in an effort to keep non-union men from filling their places, are public enemies, and clergymen ought to have courage enough to tell them so. The contract of an employee ought to be as sacred as that of the employer. The misguided sentimentalism and culpable cowardice of the ministry are largely responsible for the mental and moral perversions which have produced the lamentable outbreaks of the past few months. To the clergy we naturally look for the enforcement of the almost axiomatic principle, that, in general, true progress can come only through an enlightened public sentiment, and an orderly and wise readjustment of the complicated systems of laws required to meet the new emergencies of changing conditions. Revolution is not the ordinary road to reform.

As an instance of the ease with which revolutionary and destructive ideas can be smuggled into current thought by deceptive phraseology, the widespread advocacy of "compulsory arbitration" of labor troubles is a notable illustration. What "compulsory arbitration" more than now exists can we have without destroying the whole idea of property rights underlying the command "Thou shalt not steal"? All parties may *now* be compelled to arbitrate before the courts their violations of existing contracts. But, in seeking redress before the courts in civil cases, the laboring-men have now, in most respects, a great advantage over the capitalist. The laboring-man can levy on the property of the capitalist for injury done, whereas the capitalist may suffer untold direct injury from laborers who strike in open viola-

tion of contract, and there is usually no redress, for he cannot levy upon the homestead or other exempted property of the employee, and imprisonment for debt is not allowed.

If the phrase "compulsory arbitration" means anything when analyzed, it signifies the total surrender of property rights and of personal liberty in future contract. If, for example, when an employer and an employee differ as to the continuance of future employment and wages uncontracted for, they are to be compelled to accept the decision of an arbitration board, that board practically takes possession both of the employer's capital and of the personal liberty of the employed. If an arbitration board is to say to A, that he *must* employ B at definite wages for a definite period in the future, it may say to B, You must agree to serve A at definite wages for a definite period in the future.

The point is of so much importance that we may be more specific. The phrase "compulsory arbitration," as used against employers, cannot refer to the carrying out of past contracts. Capitalists are now obliged to do that, or pay the damages, and compulsory arbitration could do no more. Strikes relate to contracts for the future, unless made in violation (as sometimes happens) of contracts already made. Compulsory arbitration means that to a compulsory board shall be submitted the question of the employment, for the future, of definite men, at a definite rate of wages, for a definite time; for, unless each of these is definite, the compulsory arbitration may be defeated. The board of compulsory arbitration would, in fact, be a species of court, and compulsory submission to it would mean submitting to a tribunal (in effect a court) the making, against the will of the employer (and of the employee as well in justice), of an unwilling contract for the future.

The principle may well, and if it be a good thing should, extend to every contract of employment, and of purchase as well, and when analyzed and defined will be seen to extend to the depriving of all individual liberty of contract and even of the control of the use—as to by whom—at what rate—and for what time—of what we have heretofore called one's own property. It needs but a moment's consideration to see that this wholesale destruction of the freedom of contract is subversive of all the principles upon which our civilization and our common code of Christian morals are based.

In the improvement of public sentiment the ministry, it is clear, can be successful only as they have some real light to shed. The greatest danger is that, on sociological questions, they will become sciolists and charlatans, accepting crude theories of social reform, as the great *desideratum*, without due comprehension of the complicated nature of the questions involved. We may well look with apprehension upon the efforts to make political economists and social reformers out of theological students. A little knowledge on these, as on all other subjects, is a dangerous thing, unless the possessor of it knows how little it is. In general, we may say that lawyers and judges and business men and statesmen of large calibre are the ones to whom must be entrusted the main burden and responsibility of this delicate task of read-

justment. For the most part, the clergy will have enough to do in building up the true moral fibre of their young men and women, in rousing their dormant spiritual energies, and in bringing them true comfort and guidance under the inevitable sorrows and disappointments which are the common lot of humanity in the world.

G. F. WRIGHT.

II.

NEW BOOKS ON THE SUNDAY QUESTION.

THE extent to which men of all creeds and parties are now thinking about the Sunday question finds one indication in the unusual number of new books on that and related topics. Several of these are before us. They treat the question from a variety of standpoints, and illustrate a great diversity of opinion. In the following notes, which are necessarily brief, we wish, so far as the main question is concerned, simply to indicate the character of the several books, without offering criticism except on minor points.

Mr. Warren's book[1] is a fresh, thoughtful study of the entire subject from the layman's standpoint. He finds our authority for the keeping of the Sabbath, in natural religion, in the Fourth Commandment, in the New Testament, and the commands of the Church. The third he regards as our especial authority, but emphasizes the authority of the early church in the words of Baxter, that the change from the seventh to the first day "had the very same author as the Holy Scriptures (the Holy Ghost in the apostles), so that fact hath the same kind of proof that we have of the canon" (p. 136).

Dr. Crafts' book[2] is well and favorably known in its earlier editions, and stands among the very best of books in favor of a better observance of Sunday; but he has kept the best wine till the last. The most valuable portion of the book, to those who wish to study the subject systematically, is the appendix, with its nine hundred and ninety references and notes.

Mr. Foster[3] discusses the Sunday question, and other related questions,

[1] The Sunday Question: or The Lord's Day; Its Sacredness, Permanence, and Value as Shown by its Origin, History, and Use. By S. Edward Warren, C. E. Boston: Jas. H. Earle. 1890. (Pp. 290. 3¼x5½.) $1.50.

[2] The Sabbath for Man. A Study of the Origin, Obligation, History, Advantages, and Present State of Sabbath Observance, with Special Reference to the Rights of Workingmen. By Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts. Sixth Edition, Revised and Enlarged. New York: The Baker and Taylor Co. 1892. (Pp. 672. 3½x6.) $2.00.

[3] Reformation Principles Stated and Applied. By Rev. J. M. Foster, District Secretary to the National Reform Association, Cincinnati, O. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell. (Pp. 448. 3½x5¾.)

from the standpoint of one who would have the name of God in the Constitution, and considers its omission equivalent to saying, "O King of kings, we propose to run this nation independent of you, in the name of 'we the people'" (p. 237). His style is an unusual, and generally happy, combination of the popular orator and the newspaper correspondent. It is thus picturesque and vivid, and never lags. The author has, however, an infirmity for quotations, and often puts into the mouth of others thoughts which are equally his own, and might be stated as well and more directly in his own words. His fondness for illustrations leads him sometimes to turn aside after them: we have counted thirteen quotations and illustrations on a single page selected at random. While this often adorns, it sometimes impedes the thought, which meanders slowly through a tropical growth of attractive illustrations. Sometimes, too, his figures become his logic, as in his attempt to prove the nation a conscious, moral organism, and a responsible person. The work is a very fair and able presentation of the principles of the National Reform Association.

Mr. Harris designs his "Sunday Laws"[1] as a law-book, pure and simple, but it has a theological value, also. To the lawyer it must meet a real and important need, but to the intelligent pastor who wishes to make a careful study of the Sunday question, the legal aspect of the day needs to be considered together with the moral and the religious. The book is more interesting than we should have thought a law-book on the subject could be, and we know of no more valuable book treating a single phase of the subject. Besides the results of legislation on the subject, are given accounts of hundreds of cases before the courts, with a brief epitome of each and the decisions of the courts. These relate to Sunday labor, transportation, contracts; sales of liquor, cigars, drugs, confectionery, and ice-cream; and the answering of such questions as, What constitutes Sunday travel? What is legally a work of necessity or mercy? Are church subscriptions made on Sunday valid? and scores of others equally interesting. These are matters about which ministers ought to be informed.

Equally interesting, and almost as important, is the volume of "American State Papers Bearing on Sunday Legislation."[2] The author, Mr. Blakeley, like Mr. Harris, is a lawyer, but, unlike him, is opposed to all Sunday legislation. The notes with which the pages abound, enrich the volume, while they display the trend of the author's own opinion on every important point. The papers relate to Sunday mails, the relation of the State to religion, the Bible in the public schools, and many like questions. An appendix contains extracts from the Constitutions of the several States respecting religion, and

[1] A Treatise on Sunday Laws, Civil and Criminal. By George E. Harris, of the Washington, D. C., Bar. Rochester, N. Y.: The Lawyers' Co-Operative Publishing Co. 1892. (Pp. 338. 3¼x6¼.) $3.50.

[2] American State Papers Bearing on Sunday Legislation. Compiled and Annotated by William Addison Blakeley, Counsellor at Law. New York and Washington: National Religious Liberty Association. (Pp. 368. 3½x6½.)

also a report of the King case, in which a Seventh-Day Adventist of that name was unjustly fined and imprisoned in Tennessee, for working in his field on Sunday.

Dr. Lewis is one of the ablest scholars among the Seventh-Day Baptists, and is the author of several works on the Sunday question. His most recent volume [1] treats of the Sunday question, *inter alia*, as a survival of paganism in Christianity, tracing it to Baal- or sun-worship, and contending that Sunday was never observed by the Church till the middle of the second century. He has brought to his task no little erudition, and has expended upon it much patient research. In like manner, he finds that pagan water-worship is responsible for whatever of baptismal regeneration is believed in by Christians; that the allegorical method of interpreting the Scriptures is a survival of heathen typology; and that the idea of a state church, and the cognate idea of legislation on religious questions, are essentially heathen.

Without entering upon a discussion of these conclusions as affecting the Sunday question, we venture to suggest that the fault of the book is its failure to consider the power of Christianity, as an external organization, to assimilate foreign elements. Not every heathen custom is a bacillus, with power to inoculate with its virus the whole Christian system; and not every rite and custom has been rigidly prescribed, so that the adoption of new methods—some of which possibly might be found in other religions—is forever excluded. Lent and Easter and Christmas may all have come to us from pagans without of necessity bringing with them all their accompaniment of superstition and vice. That Christians commemorate with Christian devotion events in the life of Christ on days that correspond with obsolete heathen festivals, no more proves that Christianity is corrupted thereby, than that Confucius' alleged use of the substance of the Golden Rule before Christ, corrupts the entire Sermon on the Mount. The cross may have been a pagan symbol, but its origin no more defiles it for Christian use than the origin of Paul's text at Athens unfitted it for his use in a sermon, or for admission to the Word of God; and to bring up to the modern Christian any associations connected with its Phallic origin were as cruel and revolting as it must be destitute of good results. But, apart from any opinion which the reader may have of Dr. Lewis' deductions, there can be little doubt in general about the value of his researches. His book is a real contribution to our knowledge of the church in the early centuries of her history.

And now, lest the reader may not yet find among these works the theory that suits his bent, we refer again to the little volume by Dr. M. C. Briggs,[2] which we have mentioned once before. He affirms, and endeavors to prove, that Sunday was the original Sabbath; that the observance of this day by

[1] Paganism Surviving in Christianity. By Abram Herbert Lewis, D. D. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1892. (Pp. 309. 3½x5¾.) $1.75.

[2] The Sabbath. What—Why—How? Day—Reasons—Mode. By M. C. Briggs, D. D. New York: Phillips and Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston and Stowe. (Pp. 188. 3x4¾.) 60 cents.

the entire world except the Hebrews is strong proof of it; that the Hebrews at the time of the Exodus were worshippers of the Egyptian sun-god, Osiris, symbolized by Apis, the golden bull; that the week was changed at the time of the Exodus to prevent a relapse into the customs of the surrounding nations, and is proved by the establishment of a new calendar (Ex. xii. 21); and "that the day of the Hebrews' toilsome march from Rameses to Succoth was made the initial of an exceptional weekly Sabbath, set back one day from the perverted primeval Sabbath, and belonging to this peculiar people alone, and during their preparatory history;" so that the change after the resurrection of Christ was not only authoritative, but was a change back to the original day, whose observance had been suspended temporarily in a single nation and for a specific purpose; so that all are now bound by the Fourth Commandment to keep Sunday as the original seventh day.

With such a variety of books on this subject, and each book good of its kind, the book-buyer has the convenient privilege of paying his money and taking his choice.

III.

CHURCH UNION IN JAPAN.

WITHOUT wishing to make a detailed criticism of the articles on the attempted church union in Japan which appeared in the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA for July and October, 1891, and without making any pretence of writing a rival history of the movement, I should like to add a few words on two points.

1. The statement that "this *ultimatum* revealed to them that the Itchi churches wanted union on essentially Presbyterian principles or none," seems to me to be altogether erroneous, and one which justice to the Presbyterian brethren with whom I had the pleasure of conferring at that time requires me to contradict somewhat emphatically. As is stated in those articles, the Kumiai churches at their meeting in November, 1888, appointed a committee to revise the proposed basis of union. It may therefore be fairly presumed that this committee was a representative one, in which the churches had confidence. That committee met in the following March (in the room where I am now writing), and spent a solid three days in their work. No Presbyterians were near to intimidate them, and, though three of us missionaries were present, I can testify that we did almost absolutely nothing but sit at one side and listen. If the result of this committee's work did not express a Kumiai view of a fair basis of union, it is hard to see how the churches would go to work to get one. Now how was this committee's work treated by the Presbyterians? Every one of the very numerous changes was adopted except one. And what was the one point where strict Presbyterianism asserted itself? It was that bukwai should "consist of the pastor and repre-

sentative of each church" This is what the Presbyterians insisted on, and it must be confessed that some of us still fail to see anything "essentially Presbyterian" in it, unless all councils in which churches are invited to be represented by pastors and delegates are Presbyterian.

Yet this was one of the two principal obstacles to union, for the Kumiai churches had formed a habit of being represented in councils by pastors and delegates, or by delegates only, just as they pleased, and it seemed to some of them that it was aristocratic to make the pastors *ex-officio* members of bukwai At a recent installation in Kōbe the bukwai (for the Kumiai churches have adopted both the word "bukwai" and the practice of committing ordinations and the like to the district bukwai, rather than of calling special councils) was composed entirely of lay delegates: not one church had sent its pastor.

The other obstacle to union was in the matter of discipline. Here the Presbyterians accepted what was proposed by the committee of revision, namely, that a church-member who believed himself to have been unjustly excommunicated might ask for a review of his case by the bukwai, and that the bukwai, if it found the fact to be so, might either instruct the church to take him back, or might give him a letter of commendation to some other church. This seemed to us to be by no means an essentially Presbyterian arrangement, and the fact that it was proposed by the Kumiai committee would seem to show that it was at least a fair compromise. But some of the Kumiai brethren were strongly opposed to having any mention whatever made of discipline. They wished it all to be left to Christian love, and were unwilling to consider the possibility of a church-member's being unjustly excommunicated, and left with no means of redress. They also objected to the suggested rules for procedure in cases of church discipline which were presented in the Appendix. Whether or not such suggestions (which were nothing more than suggestions) were needed or advantageous, or not, since they had no connection with form of government, and were only intended to secure a fair trial to church-members accused of sin, it certainly cannot be said that those who thought them desirable were insisting on essentially Presbyterian principles. In fact, it seems to most of us that the Presbyterians showed a most admirable spirit of concession and a most genuine desire to do everything possible to accomplish a true and equitable union, and that the party in the Kumiai churches who opposed union were extremely ultra-Congregational and unwilling to yield anything whatever.

2. Another question is whether the failure of the attempt at union was due entirely to the difficulty of organic union, or was largely occasioned by adventitious causes, so that this particular failure does not necessarily show that organic union is impracticable. In support of the latter view of the matter I present the following considerations:—

(1) As the writer of the articles well remarks, the friends of union among the Japanese did almost absolutely nothing (I think I might safely have omitted the "almost") to enlighten the churches as to the advantages of

union, and as to the meaning and expected working of the proposed constitution. The opponents of union had the field to themselves until the meeting of the general conference was held. Why this was so I cannot certainly explain, having never taken the trouble to inquire; but I conjecture that it may have been, in the first place, because the need of such a campaign was not appreciated, and, afterwards, because the opponents of union attacked the proposed constitution largely as giving undue power to the ministers, and thus it seemed a little indelicate for ministers to come forward prominently as its defenders. However that may be, no one who was here then can doubt that the opponents of union gained a great advantage in having the field so much to themselves, and that the proposed basis of union was at a great disadvantage through not having been expounded and defended among the churches at an early date.

(2) The opponents of union had a powerful ally in Mr. Neesima. No one who knew him, and no one who may now read his biography, can wonder that his influence among these churches was unparalleled; and if good men were infallible in matters of policy, his opposition would be decisive against the proposal, for no better man ever lived. But even the best men are liable to form mistaken judgments, and Mr. Neesima—as I personally know—was prejudiced against the Presbyterians from the very beginning of the talk of union, for reasons which it is unnecessary to give here. That he was somewhat lacking in sound judgment in the matter may perhaps be inferred from his remark, that, if the union were accomplished, he might go off to the Hokkaido to work; for the union would in no way have interfered with the school which was the great work of his life. It is evident, however, that, even though he did not directly and publicly oppose union, his well-known dislike of the plan must have had a powerful influence among those churches which so well knew his unselfishness and nobility of character. I have myself very little doubt, that, if he had heartily favored union, the thing would have been accomplished, and I still think he was greatly mistaken in his opposition.

(3) The matter came up for final decision in an unfortunate manner. Instead of meeting the question whether the union, as proposed and modified, should be adopted or not, the general conference took up the proposed constitution, and proceeded to discuss it and amend it, article by article, just as if it were a draft which had arisen within itself for itself only, and as if it were free to modify it as much as it pleased before adopting it. Thus the direct question of union or no union was not raised. There was no opportunity to raise enthusiasm for union. Hours were spent and strength was wasted on the discussion of details, and while the small knot of extreme opponents could not carry things their own way, the majority made concessions for the sake of harmony. The result was that the constitution was adopted, but in so modified a form that it is not strange that the Presbyterians could not accept it. It is surely unfair to reproach them with not accepting a constitution which is, in some respects, more extremely democratic than that of any Congregational body in the United States. Then, as the writer well

shows, the matter of reporting the result to the Presbyterians was so bungled as to seem like wanton discourtesy, and to lead at once to a stop to all negotiations.

(4) It is a striking fact, which I can testify to from personal observation, that no difficulty was found in coming to harmonious agreement in the meetings of the joint committees, either the one which framed the constitution in the first place, or the one which revised it. Nothing could have been more harmonious, or have given a better illustration of Christian brotherliness, than those meetings. Not that there was no difference of opinion, but all was discussed in the best temper, and every decision reached was heartily acquiesced in by all. This was true not only of the first committee appointed before the attacks on union began, but of the second, or revising, committee, appointed in the midst of the conflict. It was only when the general conference met, apart from the Presbyterians, that difficulties arose. This fact gave some of us great hopes that if the union were once perfected, and the two parties brought together, they would live together in peace and love.

It may be added, though not bearing on the historical question, that the Presbyterian Church in Japan adopted last year a new confession of faith, which omits all peculiarly Calvinistic features and all references to former Calvinistic creeds. Thus these two bodies now stand upon purely evangelical confessions, and there would not be the slightest difficulty in coming together doctrinally. Although the doctrinal question was not the chief difficulty in the way of union, yet the fact that in the proposed union the Kumiai churches were asked to take their hats off—as it were—and pay their respects to certain ancient creeds which they, for the most part, knew nothing about, was certainly one stumbling-block. It is, perhaps, a fair question, whether it is wise and reasonable to hold that two companies of churches which agree so completely in doctrine and worship, should for all generations hold apart from each other, because of such differences as that, in one, pastors are members of bukwai by virtue of their office as pastors, and, in the other, only when they are especially chosen delegates by their churches. For the bukwai in the two bodies are coming to do very much the same work. The constitution of the Kumiai bukwai of the district, for example, says that its duties shall be ordination, installation of pastors, organization of new churches, etc.

D. W. LEARNED.

Kyoto, Japan.

THE foregoing communication and the articles to which it refers, give such divergent explanations of the failure of the Congregational and the Presbyterian churches in Japan to form an organic union under the proposed constitution prepared and revised by their committees, that some further comment is called for. It would seem that three causes combined to assure failure:—

1. The parties to the proposed union were not equally prepared to ne-

gotiate it. In consequence of the "very little care or interest for anything like church polity" on the part of the American Board, it is declared that the Kumiai churches were, at the outset, "ignorant of the fundamental principles involved, and of their essential difference from those of the Presbyterians with whom they were treating." But in consequence of the wisdom of the Presbyterian Board, the Itchi Church, being instructed, on the contrary, "moved with the precision of an army well drilled and well generalled. It knew its mind." Hence, in arranging the basis of union, it was ignorance against intelligence, a pupil against a master, the neglected against the instructed. No wonder, as light dawned upon the Kumiai churches, they increased conditions, until some discovered that the proposed constitution was essentially Presbyterian.

2. The revised, like the original, constitution proposed for the union is essentially Presbyterian. This has been denied "somewhat emphatically;" but the denial is supported by no proof, except that the Kumiai committee assented to the constitution, and that the changes the said committee suggested were accepted by the Itchi committee, save one of no distinctive ecclesiastical import. How competent this evidence is, appears from the preceding head. That the revised constitution (1889) was essentially Presbyterian is made clear:—

(1) The constitutive principle of Congregationalism is the complete independence under Christ of each local church, though in reciprocal fellowship, competent to organize itself, to ordain, install, dismiss, and discipline its pastor, and complete every church act. The constitutive principle of Presbyterianism puts the organization of churches, churches themselves, ordination, installation, discipline, and dismission of ministers under the authority of judicatories, whose approval completes church acts. It is government by sessions, presbyteries, synods, and assembly, on the principle that the greater shall rule the less, in enlarging judicatories.

(2) There is found nowhere in the constitution either the assertion of the right of a church to control its own affairs, except its "internal organization," which does not touch polity or external authority, or the denial of authority over churches.

(3) On the contrary, it is expressly asserted of the united body "that its government be by churches, bukwai, and a sōkwai" (chap. v.); and then the constitution declares that "the churches delegate certain specified powers to bukwai and the sōkwai," "in the following chapters;" but, "a church shall however send representatives and an annual report to the bukwai" (chap. vi.). These delegated powers are: (*a*) "Bukwai license probationers; ordain, retire, and discipline ministers; install and release pastors at the request of churches; organize or aid in the organization of churches; . . . appoint representatives to the sōkwai; and decide cases of discipline referred to them" (chap. vii.). (*b*) "The sōkwai . . . organizes bukwai and determines their bounds: and decides cases of discipline referred to it from them. . . . It may establish, or form connection with, theological schools" (chap.

viii.). (*c*) "Ministers, whether members of churches or not, are subject to the discipline of the bukwai to which they belong" (chap. ix.). (*d*) "A minister shall be restored only by the bukwai by which he was disciplined" (chap. ix.). (*e*) "A member of a church deeming himself unjustly disciplined by his church may ask for a review of the case by the bukwai: a minister deeming himself unjustly disciplined by his bukwai may ask for a review of the case by the sōkwai. No other references are allowable" (chap. x.) (*f*) "A bukwai may confirm, reverse, modify, or suspend a sentence brought before it in this way," or, at its discretion, adopt one of two other courses (chap. x.). (*g*) The sōkwai has the same power in cases brought before it by the bukwai (chap. x.).

(4) This is, in essence, identical with the Presbyterian Form of Government.

3. Had union been effected on the proposed basis, certain results would have followed: (1) The sōkwai, being empowered to "establish, or form connection with, theological schools" (chap. viii.), would have come in due time into connection with all the theological schools of the Kumiai churches. (2) The Kumiai churches would have taken all their church property with them into the united body, according to the legal principles which control Congregational churches in such cases. (3) The union, born in ignorance of the principles involved, would not have satisfied the Kumiai churches, whose love of liberty is intense. As all similar unions in America have failed with evil results, this union would also have failed in due time. (4) But had the union been effected and had it proved unsatisfactory, the Kumiai churches could not have withdrawn from it without the loss of all their church and school property in connection with bukwai and the sōkwai. This is a startling result brought to the attention of the Kumiai churches just before their final action. A seceding party can take nothing with it. The united body would have been one church, with its bukwai and its sōkwai. These bodies on the terms of the union could have claimed jurisdiction, and "a spiritual court is the exclusive judge of its own jurisdiction; its decision of that question is binding on the secular courts."[1] Even when a Presbytery drops a church from its roll, "only the ecclesiastical relation is terminated; 'the question of property must be determined by the courts of the State.'"[2] "A church may not withdraw without consent of Presbytery."[3] Even when Presbyteries in Ohio had been formed, under the Plan of Union, of Congregational churches, no church could withdraw, unless by unanimous vote, and take its property. Such is, we believe, the law and practice in America; and since principles of polity and justice are the same everywhere, we can affirm the same to be true in Japan.

Surely we have no cause for "special pride" in leaving our churches in

[1] U. S. Supreme Court, 13 Wallace, 679.

[2] Hodge's What is Presbyterian Law? p. 221.

[3] Presbyterian Digest, p. 172.

foreign fields in such ignorance and peril. Nor have we cause for surprise that the Kumiai churches, studying the New Testament and books on polity, as the negotiations progressed, and becoming aware in part of the nature of the union proposed and of their property peril therein, should have abruptly shrunk back. These three considerations explain in part at least the failure of the proposed organic church union in Japan.

A. HASTINGS ROSS.

Port Huron, Mich.