

The Press.

RELIGIOUS.

THE MCGLYNN CASE.

The restoration of Rev. Dr. Edward McGlynn to priesthood in the Roman Catholic Church is regarded by both the religious and the secular press as one of the most significant evidences of the liberal tendency of present Papal policy. Suspended by the Archbishop of New York for active participation in politics and advocacy of radical social theories, and then excommunicated by the Pope for refusing



FATHER MCGLYNN.

to obey the command to present himself at Rome, Dr. McGlynn was supposed to have been deprived permanently of priestly standing. He retained the affectionate friendship of his former parishioners, and the enthusiastic support of the very large following won by his championship of advanced ideas; but there was no doubt in the public mind that his future prominence and influence would be confined to circles outside the Church. The McGlynn case seemed to be a case of insubordination or contumacy, and the generally received precedents and policy of the Church seemed to exclude the possibility of Dr. McGlynn's reacceptance. Aside from the ecclesiastical aspects of the affair, the circumstances appeared peculiarly unfavorable for the priest's restoration. People have become familiar with the view that this Church applies and enforces standards of conservatism in matters of expression, and that its priests are expected to refrain from conspicuous identification with causes and interests not specially approved by the higher authorities of the Church. The particular radical agitation with which Dr. McGlynn connected himself is one that certainly never has been favorably recognized by the Church. It is, moreover, an agitation that involves or cultivates peculiarly aggressive ideas respecting the existing "constitution of society." While no one imagines that the restoration of Dr. McGlynn implies any expression by the Church itself upon the merits of that agitation, it is regarded as an evidence of a disposition not to discountenance aggressive teachings by individual Catholic priests. Hence the importance of this decision as a decision affecting the interests of radical discussion.

HISTORY OF THE MCGLYNN CASE.

As long ago as 1882 Dr. McGlynn was denounced to Rome by Catholic Bishops for his activity in behalf of the Irish Land League. Cardinal Simeoni, in September, 1882, sent a letter to Archbishop Corrigan recommending the suspension of the priest because of "the scandal caused by his violent speeches, in which he has defended propositions utterly

contrary to the teachings of the Catholic Church." The Archbishop overlooked these offenses. But in 1886 Dr. McGlynn appeared as a vigorous advocate of Henry George's "Single Tax" theory, and of Mr. George's candidacy for Mayor of New York. He addressed many great meetings. The names of George and McGlynn were always spoken together, and the "Anti-Poverty Society" that grew out of the movement was promoted by Dr. McGlynn in the most devoted manner. Archbishop Corrigan ordered the priest to desist from his political work during the Mayoralty campaign. The order was disobeyed. Later, the Archbishop issued a pastoral letter declaring that so far as the land question was concerned, the Catholic Church held to the doctrine of private ownership. In December, 1886, Cardinal Simeoni commanded Father McGlynn to proceed to Rome in order to answer charges that had been made against him. He declined to do so, on the ground that his case would be prejudged at Rome through the influence of the Archbishop. Refusing to avail himself of other opportunities that were extended to him, he was excommunicated in April, 1887.

Since that time, Dr. McGlynn has remained active and ardent in the cause that he expounded. There has been no sign of retraction, or of a desire to get back into his priestly office by submitting to the discipline that he had resisted.

SPECIMEN MCGLYNNISMS.

Indeed, he has often spoken with extreme harshness, and much sarcasm, criticising the Church and its dignitaries in terms such as non-Catholics are wont to use. The following are specimens of Dr. McGlynn's utterances:

Some old gentleman here told an old gentleman in Rome that a priest over here was talking heresy, so the old gentleman in Rome said, "Suspend him."

It is the teaching of all religion, of natural religion, and as well of Catholicism, that a man who sins against his conscience sins against the Holy Ghost. And if even the power that sits enthroned within the Vatican commands a man to violate his conscience, to obey that command is to sin against the Holy Ghost.

Even if high Roman tribunals summon a man to answer for teaching scientific truth, and demand that a man retract it, then it is my duty, and every man's duty, to refuse to retract it.

The best way to get anything from the Roman machine is to show your teeth, rather than be too humble. Bismarck and the Czar understand this. The Pope is delighted at a little concession from them. The Pope has actually fallen in love with Bismarck, and Bismarck is flirting a little with the Pope.

So long as Catholic people give the Pope to understand that he can do what he pleases with them, and allow an Archbishop in New York to forbid an American priest to make a political speech or attend a political meeting without first obtaining the consent of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, which don't know but what Florida is a suburb of New York and Mobile a street in San Francisco—so long as Catholics let the Roman machine, of which the Pope is the mere puppet, do this, that machine will use Paddy in Ireland, and German Paddy, and American Paddy as pawns on the political chessboard, to be sold out at any time for what it can get in return.

Peter was surely a great and good a Pope as is Leo XIII., yet we seek in vain in the epistles of this first Pope for anything like the incredible assertions of the last of the Popes—I should say the latest Pope.

The Pope in politics has been the curse of every nation. Bismarck carried on a flirtation with the old lady—that is just what he looks like—and they exchanged pictures, and the old lady was highly flattered at being noticed.

Is it not time for us to protest that it is no part of our religion to engage in adulation of a poor old bag of bones, 78 years old, with one foot in the grave?

Dr. McGlynn was reinstated by the action of Monsignor Satolli, the Pope's Ablegate, who is in this country for the purpose of settling certain questions. Since he resumed his place in the Church he has continued his "anti-poverty" addresses. In a speech delivered in Cooper Union last Monday evening he maintained that his work as an agitator was in harmony with the spirit of Pope Leo's recommendations in his recent encyclicals, and he reiterated his views on the land and labor questions.

SOME STRONG CRITICISM.

The conservatives of the Catholic Church, so far as they have expressed themselves in the press, seem profoundly dissatisfied with the conclusion in the McGlynn case. The leading newspaper organs of this element, like the New York *Catholic Review*, have little to say

at present, but some very critical communications have appeared in the secular papers. Thus, the New York *Sun* (Dec. 27, Dec. 31, and Jan. 1) gives prominence to letters from dissatisfied churchmen.

"It is quite true, as has already been stated in your columns," says one of these *Sun* correspondents, "that the Archbishop of New York received no notification of McGlynn's restoration, either officially or otherwise, until it had become an accomplished fact. That this action of the Papal Ablegate was discourteous beyond all precedent, and that it was scandalous in its effect upon the large mass of the good people in the Church, is beyond question. It is also true that, though the mistake was the Ablegate's, the fault was not his, nor will his



ARCHBISHOP CORRIGAN.

be the odium. The McGlynn affair was in itself a very small one, for he has never been of sufficient importance, even when in good standing, to have had more consideration in the community than would any one of a thousand other intellectual priests who are good preachers. No, McGlynn has been simply the pawn in the game, and, though the pawn has put a Bishop in an uncomfortable position, it is nevertheless merely a pawn played by another hand. The true significance of the affair is far deeper and more important than McGlynn. . . . Whether this move for our improvement is a good one we cannot judge, because we do not know it, but of one thing there is no doubt—that the Catholics of the United States are not willing to submit their spiritual interests to the care of Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Ireland, and Bishop Keane *in caucus*, and they object and will continue to protest against the using of the Pope's Legate as a catspaw. It is an astonishing thing that Monsignor Satolli should have allowed himself to have been led into such a blunder. Does he know that it is said of him that he is kept in Washington almost under lock and key, and that it is almost impossible for anything to reach him save through those whose interest it is that nothing inimical to their side shall reach his ears? While these statements are manifestly absurd, do they not suffice to show the tension of the public mind, and will it not induce him to recognize the advisability of ceasing to remain permanently at the University, where he can only associate with those who the public believe have a personal motive in his isolation? May that astuteness for which Italians are so justly famed lead him to see the wisdom of visiting the different Bishops of the United States, as occasion may require, unaccompanied by human spectacles and ear trumpets. In this way only can he succeed in establishing confidence in his judgment, and turn his visit, which so far has been productive only of increasing discord, into one of peace."

Another writer in the *Sun* intimates that

there is no intention to accept the decision as a finality. "If Monsignor Satolli does not like to be criticised," says he, "and if he considers all protest against his action to be disrespectful, let him remember that the Ablegate is no better than the Pope, and that if Dr. McGlynn deserves no penance for his abusive language against the Holy Father, the Holy Father's representative must be content to share the fate of his master. Let him remember also that the method of discussing ecclesiastical topics in the newspapers was inaugurated by the advisers he has chosen for himself. These advisers have made public opinion the final court in all matters of dispute. The public is the Cæsar to whom they have appealed. To this Cæsar they must go."

GRATIFICATION AMONG "LIBERAL" CATHOLICS.

The so-called "liberal" Catholic organs are greatly pleased.

The *Boston Republic* says (Dec. 31):

"The final settlement of the case of Dr. Edward McGlynn, in a manner satisfactory to the Vatican, and to the excommunicated priest, brings joy to Catholic circles everywhere. The removal of the ecclesiastical censure under which Dr. McGlynn labored was a bountiful Christmas gift to the Catholic Church in America. The act not only restored a beloved priest to the fold in which he had so long labored, but it furnished additional proof of the exalted station held by Monsignor Satolli in this country and of the great extent of his delegated powers. As to the terms of reconciliation, what interest can they excite in the outside circles so anxious for information? The ecclesiastical censure imposed on Dr. McGlynn was not because of heretical utterances. It was merely disciplinary. Due reparation having been made and pledges given that no further breaches of the established rules would be made, the road to restoration was speedily cleared."

The *New York Tablet* says (Dec. 31): "The restoration of Rev. Dr. McGlynn to the functions of the priesthood has not met with approbation in certain quarters. Rome moved too secretly in the matter and actually settled the case without consulting a little coterie of 'Catholics,' who arrogate to themselves the right of pronouncing on what is or is not to the interest of the Church in the United States. These individuals are always ultra-Catholic while advocating their theories, and are ever ready to remind people who differ from them of 'authority' and 'obedience.' But they are among the loudest in their protests against, and disapproval of, Rome's instructions, when such pronouncements are counter to their wishes. Before protesting against the conditions of Dr. McGlynn's restoration, was it not reasonable to inquire or discover what these conditions are? They themselves confess that they do not know anything about it. They say that the restoration is 'apparently unconditional.' What ground have they for this surmise? None whatever, save that they were not called into consultation on the matter. They seem to be ignorant of the fact that the case was settled outside of the Archdiocese of New York altogether. It did not come before the ecclesiastical court of this archdiocese at all. It was settled by the Pope, through his accredited representative, and hence nothing remained, or now remains, but to accept the result. Monsignor Satolli has not exceeded the authority delegated to him by the Pope, and Rome has had the case long enough under investigation and deliberation to preclude the commission of a blunder or an act of injustice. If the opinion is entertained that injustice is done, the ecclesiastical authorities of the archdiocese have free access to Rome."

LABOR'S INTERPRETATION.

Naturally the Labor organs find in this event occasion for pleasant reflections.

The *Journal of the Knights of Labor* says (Dec. 29): "We cannot believe that Dr. Mc-

Glynn has recanted or professed to recant his opinions on the land question, and unless he has done so, his restoration must mean that the Roman Catholic Church sanctions those opinions, or, at any rate, concedes the right of its priests to hold and teach them. We shall be glad indeed if this should prove to be the correct view of the case. We do not believe that the fulminations of Archbishop Corrigan brought about the recantation of any considerable number of Catholics who had seen the truth upon the land question. But the utterances of the Archbishop, and the belief created by those utterances that the Church condemned the opinions which Dr. McGlynn held, did prevent many from allowing themselves to think the land question out, and for lack of thinking these failed to become land reformers. The restoration of the Doctor will relieve these timid ones of their fears and may even incline them to the study they have been looking upon as forbidden. There will be those who will think that the resumption of the priestly office will withdraw Dr. McGlynn in a great measure from activity in the reform movement. For our part we do not share this fear. He is too thoroughly in earnest to allow anything to remain undone which his hand finds to do for the betterment of the temporal condition of his fellow-men, and we believe that, without any diminution of his opportunities for good work, his influence for good will be greatly increased. We feel that we can congratulate the Doctor and felicitate the reform cause with equal heartiness. Indeed, his vindication is a very signal and important triumph for the cause."

PROTESTANT AND SECULAR COMMENT.

The leading Protestant and secular journals agree in commending the decision as a proof of progressive tendencies in the Catholic Church.

"Almost beyond credence," says the *Independent* (Dec. 29), "is the restoration of Dr. McGlynn to his priestly functions. Nothing more startling, scarcely anything more improbable could have happened. Although it has again and again been announced as possible, or even likely, the announcement was set down by all cool-headed people as one of the dreams of hot-headed partisans. This does not restore Dr. McGlynn to his parish of St. Stephen's. That is under the authority of the Archbishop. But Dr. McGlynn may be assigned to any church in the diocese, or may be received by any other Bishop. It is not unlikely that the latter will be the case. Dr. McGlynn is a man who loves the Church, and who loves the life of a priest. He has fought a good fight, always bravely, perhaps not always with discretion; but he has the good will of the people, Protestants as well as Catholics, and of those, too, who have no sympathy with his political views, but who do not believe that a priest can be required to take his politics from Rome, much less from an Archbishop."

The *Christian Register* (Unitarian) says (Dec. 29): "Dr. McGlynn appeared before the public last Sunday both as priest and reformer. Having been reinstated in his sacred office, he celebrated mass in two or more churches. In the evening, as President of the Anti-Poverty Society, he attended the meeting in Cooper Union, where he was received with deafening applause. The audience were wild in the expression of their delight. But what the restored priest said is of much more importance than this outburst of applause, because it proved that, in resuming his place at the altar, he still clings to his humanity. There is nothing in what he said, as reported, to show that he has renounced his position as a reformer. 'I was not born to be a mere agitator or professor of political economy. I was born to be a preacher of God's truth. I believed I had what is called a vocation to be a priest of Christ's Church. Such being my belief, it is needless to say that it was no small sorrow to me to be thrust from those altars so

dear to me. Since I was a child I have said, 'How beautiful are Thy tabernacles!' and those who know me best know that it was not my wish to leave those tabernacles. But, when the occasion came for me to speak from this platform as a man to men, I felt that I was doing no more than my secular duty, exercising no more than my manhood's rights, so to speak. Yes' (here the speaker paused; and, when he resumed, his voice was raised and vibrated with passion), 'yes! whether I spoke from this platform, from the tail of a cart, or the top of a barrel! I still think that the priest of the Church can find no place so holy as not to be fit to preach therein the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.' The restoration of Father McGlynn, in view of such declarations, is proof that the Roman Catholic Church means to keep in touch with the people, and to sympathize with them in their struggles and sufferings."

Boston Advertiser, Dec. 30. — The restoration of Dr. McGlynn to priestly functions, his complete exoneration from censure, without, as far as the public knows or has reason to believe, a syllable of real retraction on his part, was no doubt a bitter pill for his enemies to swallow; all the more so because they have heretofore carried so proud a stomach. Devisers of fakes should at least do their work skillfully. The apocryphal dispatch from Rome says that Monsignor Satolli will not be recalled for several months. That admission is fatal to the fairy tale. If the Pope were really dissatisfied the Legate would be recalled at once.

Chicago Evening Journal, Dec. 31. — With little or no intimation of what was to occur, the offender is restored to all the rights and privileges of the Church and the priesthood. It is natural that the act should have produced something of a sensation, and that it should be criticised as without precedent, an insult to his superiors and a letting down of the power and dignity of the Papal office. Pope Leo, however, is a shrewd man, shrewder perhaps than any of his predecessors for a century. He is a statesman in canonicals, if the reader please; he sees the drift of the thought of the times, and wisely proposes to drift with it to a certain extent, and so use it rather than vainly attempt to stem it. It is not hazardous much to predict that he will be proved to be wiser than his critics; and that his liberality will do more for the Church than if he held to the unyielding, uncompromising course of former times. The mere edict of the Church may lose something of its force, but it will gain in the power which comes from intelligent conviction, and which in the times to come will be more effective for its purposes than any which it has hitherto possessed.

Burlington Hawkeye, Jan. 1. — It appears that no conditions have been exacted from the courageous priest which as a man of self-respect he could not accept, and that, on the contrary, he has received permission to deliver lectures on social and worldly topics, besides attending to the duties of his parish. By his course in the McGlynn case Pope Leo, who is now eighty-three years of age, has given proof that he is a liberal-minded man, who comprehends the progressive spirit of the times.

THE LITTLE FAITH OF A NO-POPERY ORGAN.

The *British American Citizen*, of Boston, an ardent anti-Catholic organ, is not willing to share in the felicitations that are current. It looks for the underlying motive, and reports as follows in its issue for Dec. 31: "It may be asked now: Why does Rome, through Satolli, make it so easy for McGlynn to take up his priestly functions again?—why such apparent concessions from the Vatican? We would say the answer is just here: Rome fears the growing opposition to her arrogance in this country, and she is uniting her forces—she is calling in every possible recruit. Rome sends out a flag of truce on the public school question, and under cover of that flag of truce she strengthens

her fortifications. Her whole effort now is to throw the American people off their guard, so as to gain time to bring up her reserved forces. Her sleek and oily pretenses of good-will for America are but the slime with which the serpent coats his victim before he performs the swallowing act. The concessions are too numerous and too widely divergent from her doctrines and traditions to be genuine."

A MORAL FOR WARRING JEWS.

The *Hebrew Journal* (Dec. 30) draws from McGlynn case a moral for warring factions among the Jews. "In our fold, too," it says, "wide differences have, during the last half century, been created and maintained. Dissensions have been bred and fostered. To-day we find, instead of a united Judaism working together harmoniously and effectively for the moral elevation and spiritual development of the world, scattered fragments of parties, more interested in their partisan, sectarian objects than in the eternal mission that should absorb their communal energies. Israel of to-day ought to have brains enough and moral courage enough to effect a peaceful settlement of the differences that now split up our hosts into hostile camps. There ought to be stamina enough in the race to grapple with this problem of bringing into closer relations those who have been torn asunder by reason of matters that could be arranged for the weal of the ancestral faith, if an earnest effort were made in a fraternal, religious spirit. Judaism is worth at least that much of effort in its behalf, as is evolved in an attempt to reconcile the discordant elements in our spiritual household. It is idle to merely assert that such an attempt must necessarily be futile. The McGlynn incident is sufficient illustration of the truth that in the cause of Right nothing is impossible. It is an insult to our national intelligence, it is a stigma upon our ancestral faith, to say that it is impossible to reconcile the children of Israel beneath the banner of Judah."

RESULT OF THE BRIGGS TRIAL.

The trial of Prof. Charles A. Briggs for heresy before the Committee of the New York Presbytery came to an end on Dec. 30. The Professor was acquitted, a majority voting in his favor on all the six charges.

THE CHARGES AND THE VOTE.

The following are the charges made against Dr. Briggs, with the vote on each charge:

Charge 1.—The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., being a minister of the said Church and a member of the Presbytery of New York, with teaching that the reason is a fountain of divine authority which may and does savingly enlighten men, even such men as reject the Scriptures as the authoritative proclamation of the will of God and reject also the way of salvation through the mediation and sacrifice of the Son of God as revealed therein; which is contrary to the essential doctrine of the Holy Scripture and of the standards of the said Church, that (a) the Holy Scripture is most necessary, and (b) the rule of faith and practice.—The vote stood: (a) To sustain, 59; not to sustain, 69; "not clear," 1. (b) To sustain, 59; not to sustain, 69; "not clear," 1.

Charge 2.—The Presbyterian Church charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs with teaching that the Church is a fountain of divine authority, which, apart from the Holy Scripture, may and does savingly enlighten men; which is contrary to the essential doctrine of the Holy Scripture and of the standards of the said Church, that (a) the Holy Scripture is most necessary, and (b) the rule of faith and practice.—The vote stood: (a) To sustain, 55; not to sustain, 72; "not clear," 1. (b) To sustain, 55; not to sustain, 72; "not clear," 1.

Charge 3.—The Presbyterian Church charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs with teaching that errors may have existed in the original text of the Holy Scripture as it came from its authors, which is contrary to the essential doctrine taught in the Holy Scripture and in the standards of the said Church, that the Holy Scripture is (a) the Word of God written, (b) immediately inspired, and (c) the rule of faith and practice.—The vote stood: (a) To sustain, 61; not to sustain, 67. (b) To sustain, 61; not to sustain, 67. (c) To sustain, 59; not to sustain, 69.

Charge 4.—The Presbyterian Church charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs with teaching that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch, which is contrary to direct statements of Holy Scripture and to the essential doctrines of the standards of the said Church, that (a) the Holy Scripture evidences itself to be the Word of God by the consent of all the parts, and that (b)

the infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself.—The vote stood: (a) To sustain, 54; not to sustain, 72; "not clear," 2. (b) To sustain, 54; not to sustain, 72; "not clear," 2.

Charge 5.—The Presbyterian Church charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs with teaching that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name, which is contrary to direct statements of Holy Scripture, and to the essential doctrines of the standards of the said Church that (a) the Holy Scripture evidences itself to be the Word of God by the consent of all the parts, and that (b) the infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself.—The vote stood: (a) To sustain, 49; not to sustain, 73; "not clear," 6. (b) To sustain, 49; not to sustain, 73; "not clear," 6.

Charge 6.—The Presbyterian Church charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs with teaching that sanctification is not complete at death, which is contrary to the essential doctrine of Holy Scripture and of the stand-



PROF. CHARLES A. BRIGGS.

ards of the said Church that the souls of believers are at their death at once made perfect in holiness.—The vote stood: To sustain, 57; not to sustain, 69; "not clear," 2.

This does not end the Briggs case. It will be appealed to the Presbyterian General Assembly, which is to meet in Washington next May.

HISTORY OF THE CASE.

Dr. Briggs is a professor in the Union Theological Seminary, the well-known Presbyterian institution of New York City. His liberal teachings excited a good deal of comment before the Church itself took cognizance of them seriously. The proceedings against him for heresy resulted from the doctrines advanced in his "Inaugural Address," delivered about two years ago. The General Assembly, in consequence of that address, vetoed his appointment to the Chair of Biblical Theology in Union Seminary, disapproved the action already taken by the New York Presbytery in voting to dismiss the complaint against him, and ordered the Presbytery to place him on trial for heresy. The Directors of Union Seminary refused to respect the General Assembly's veto of Dr. Briggs's appointment, and thus the Seminary passed from the control of the Assembly and became an independent Presbyterian institution.

Throughout the prolonged discussion, Dr. Briggs, despite his teachings, has been sustained repeatedly by the Presbyterian Church as it is constituted in New York City—and this signifies a support of very great strength, intelligence, and influence. But the weight of opinion in the Church of the country at large has been decidedly against him. The recent conviction of Prof. Henry P. Smith in the Presbytery of Cincinnati, on charges almost identical with those preferred against Dr. Briggs, is an instance of the more conservative feeling prevailing at the West.

SECULAR FELICITATIONS.

From the beginning of the Briggs controversy great interest has been manifested by the public. It has been felt that the decision

would be a signal test of the present disposition of the Churches toward less rigid orthodox views. Accordingly the victory of Professor Briggs in the Presbytery receives great attention. It is hailed with satisfaction by practically all the secular organs, which welcome indications of diminishing conservatism in the religious bodies.

The *New York Times* couples this decision with Dr. McGlynn's restoration, as striking evidence of the increasing strength of the spirit of toleration. "The restoration of Dr. McGlynn to the Roman Catholic priesthood and the acquittal of Dr. Briggs from the charge of heresy," says the *Times*, "are two events that show forth with great clearness the modernization or Americanization of the Churches concerned. The offense charged was in one case an offense against discipline and in the other an offense against doctrine. It is at any rate plain from these two cases that the most inert and conservative ecclesiastical organizations must in this time, and especially in this country, lose some of their inertia, and some of their conservatism. It is scarcely imaginable that an Italian, or a French, or a German priest who had taken Dr. McGlynn's position should be reinstated without a public profession of penitence. Neither is it imaginable that a Scotch Presbyterian professor of theology should be held blameless for saying in public what an American Presbyterian professor of theology has been absolved for saying. The conclusion seems to be that the Churches are in the way to become less and less custodians of dogma, and more and more what Matthew Arnold called 'national societies for the promotion of goodness.' That is a change which everybody who is not a professional theologian must be prepared to welcome."

New York Morning Advertiser, Jan. 1. — What has been done is simply this: By majorities ranging from 12 to 24 the Presbytery has voted that Dr. Briggs was not guilty according to the charges and specifications urged by the prosecution. That is to say, he did not teach the heresies that he is said to have taught. He did not teach that "reason is a fountain of divine authority," says the Presbytery, by a small majority; he did not teach that "the Church is a fountain of divine authority"; he did not teach that "errors may have existed in the original text of the Holy Scripture, as it came from its authors"; he did not teach that "Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch"; he did not teach that "Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name"; he did not teach that "sanctification is not complete at death." So says the Presbytery, unless it admits that in so teaching he was not at variance with the fundamental dogmas of the Presbyterian Church. And, if it means that, it pronounces that what have hitherto been taught as such dogmas are no longer the foundations of Presbyterianism. Which significance are we to accept? Obviously the latter, since no contention is made that Dr. Briggs did not teach precisely what was charged against him. The New York Presbytery by a substantial majority declares that it has abandoned Presbyterianism as it is and has been generally accepted, for between the old standards of belief and doctrine and the new ones represented by Dr. Briggs there is positively no possibility of compromise. The verdict, therefore, but marks another period in the process of disruption in the Church and makes it more manifest than ever that Presbyterianism is a name that covers two modes of religious belief and thought that are as antagonistic as Calvinism and Agnosticism. The contest between these two bodies has practically resolved itself into a struggle for the possession of this parent name.

New York Sun, Jan. 3.—The acquittal of Dr. Briggs is simply another indication among many that the New York Presbytery has abandoned the old and conservative ground of Presbyterian orthodoxy, and that it will take the lead in the new and liberal school that will re-