




LIBRARY OF
WELLESLEY COLLEGE



PURCHASED FROM
LIBRARY FUNDS



Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue, Architect.

REREDOS · ST. THOMAS'S CHURCH
NEW YORK CITY

Art & Religion

By Von Ogden Vogt



New Haven: Yale University Press

London: Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press

225664

Copyright 1921 by Yale University Press

Printed in United States of America

First published, December, 1921

Second printing, February, 1929

121
129
130
132

TO THE MEMORY OF MY FATHER
WHOSE MENTAL INTEREST KINDLED MINE
AND TO MY MOTHER
WHO IS A MYSTIC

Preface

ONE puts forth any venture of constructive suggestion for these confused times only with the greatest diffidence, knowing far better than any critic can know the weaknesses and ignorances revealed.

Yet there need be no diffidence about any fresh testimony that beauty is desirable and good: nor about the consequent contention that the religion of Protestantism stands profoundly in need of realizing it. This, together with some practical explications, is all I want to say to churchmen.

To artists and lovers of the beautiful, I want to speak my definite expectation of a time soon to come again when patrons of the arts will see in the religious institution an incomparable opportunity for the most pervasive influence of beauty upon the people. Every church building in village or city should itself be a noble work of art. And the arts have each a proper place in the fostering of the supreme experience of worship.

I am led to say these things by the very oppressive burden of disunity in the spiritual life of the community and the time. There cannot be an age of great artistic brilliance until we reach a more nearly harmonious faith. I am happy in the simple daily work of a parish minister. But I am unhappy and deeply disquieted amidst the discord in the religious world. I wish I could have mental fellowship with the Catholics: I wish I could have it with more of my Protestant brethren: not merely for the easement of my own aesthetic discomfort, but for the sake of countless others. There can be no cure for many souls until we are together.

Inasmuch as many readers wish to know who it is who speaks of any matter, it is proper to state that I am the regularly installed pastor of a Congregational Church. Much of my feeling in things ecclesiastical is doubtless derived, however, from the Reformed Church in which I was bap-

Preface

tized and to which several American grandfathers belonged, as their fathers before them in the Swiss Church.

The illustrations presented are taken mostly from the free churches. One expects an Episcopal Church to be beautiful and one looks for an altar in it. The noteworthy thing is the number of free churches which have revived the ancient setting for the communion table at the head of an apse or chancel.

I wish gratefully to acknowledge much practical help from Miss Grace E. Babcock. For the loan or gift of photographs, I am very pleasantly indebted to Messrs. Charles Collens, Ralph Adams Cram, Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue, the Society of Arts and Crafts, Detroit, and the Society of Arts and Crafts, Boston.

VON OGDEN VOGT.

Wellington Avenue Church Study,
February 25, 1921.

Preface to Second Printing

IF I were writing these chapters today, eight years after their first publication, there would of course be some changes. For the most part, however, these would only develop the free principles already suggested. Among the most rigorous present day experiments in worship are those of theological radicals. I still hope that they will not entirely lose touch with the great body of American religion. We should be greatly advanced on all sides if we could more clearly conceive of religion as the comprehending category, no matter what at any time, or for any party, its intellectual or moral content might be.

In these few years, both the architectural and liturgical movements here described have become widespread. The progress in liturgics is slow, but there is an increasing desire for nobler forms of public expression in religion. In architecture there is still little indication of new forms suitable for religious buildings. Work in the Gothic mode has be-

Preface

come predominant. It has two important justifications. As a people, we are aware of our inheritance from the Greco-Roman world through the classical character of the most of our civic buildings. But we have not yet so appropriated our proper share in the thousand years of western culture from the fall of Rome to the Italian Renaissance. Gothic buildings enable us to incorporate this also. The other reason is that a Gothic structure emphasizes primarily religion itself rather than ideas about it or ethics that flow from it. There is ample evidence in the most recent developments of the pictorial and plastic arts in churches, that they may intimate new theologies and new ethics caught up into and enlivened by the abiding psychological forms of the religious experience realized in a great building of the Gothic lineage. What architectural style may be hereafter waits upon a more matured religion.

VON OGDEN VOGT.

January 3, 1929.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	1
Truth, goodness, and beauty. The new age. The close of the Reformation age. Protestant negation of the arts. Catholic acceptance of modernism. The art of worship the all-comprehending art. Proposals for examining the connections of art and religion, historical, psychological, and practical. Proposals of liturgical principles and materials. Proposals for architectural style, tone, significance, and tendencies. Current writings about the new age.	
II. An Age Described by Its Art	9
No satisfactory art in a nondescript age. The arts born of the national and time spirit. The relations of art to unified life. The youth, size, and complexity of American life. The coming description.	
III. The Unity of Religion and Art	18
Religion the source of primitive arts. Religion the principal subject matter of historic art. The inner identity of the mystic and aesthetic experience. The demand for unity in composition and in reality. The feeling of satisfaction derived from beauty and from being. The creativity of art and of religion.	
IV. The Cleft between Art and Religion	34
1. The cleft between religion and science.	
2. The cleft between religion and morals.	
3. The cleft between religion and art.	
The Roman Mass. Catholic architecture. The Anglican Prayer Book. Protestant forms. American church architecture.	

Table of Contents

V. The Mutual Need	48
The world of the arts the source of spiritual life for many. The world of religion. Art needs religion—to universalize its concepts, to supply moral content. Religion needs the arts—to be impressive, to get a hearing, to be enjoyable, to assist reverence, to symbolize old truths, to heighten the imagination, to fire resolves.	
VI. Corporeality in Religion	56
1. The corporeality of objects and acts. 2. The corporeality of creeds. 3. The corporeality of crude excitement.	
VII. The Sensational Character of Art	63
The sensational preacher. Modern view of human nature. Sensational conduct of ancient religious teachers. The sense appeal of the Japanese temple and of the English cathedral.	
VIII. A Brief for the Cultus	67
Religious culture primary in religion. Its historical recognition. Its apparatus or ritual. The necessity of religious acts. The source of perpetuity. The sermon an insufficient basis for religious culture. The background of change. Modern possibilities.	
IX. Prophet and Priest	82
The conflict between reforming prophets and conserving priests. The prophet as instrument of change. The priest as Teacher, Spiritual Adviser, Pastor, and Artist.	
X. The Artist as Prophet	90
Traditionalism preserved by the arts. The aloofness and lawlessness of artists. The historic divergence of artistic forms from their content, Egyptian, Greek, Italian. New ideas through the arts. The permanence of beauty.	

Table of Contents

XI. Symbols and Sacraments	97
Classic and Romantic methods. Universality and power of symbols. Danger of symbols. Idolatry. The meaning of a sacrament. The spiritual presence. The material elements. Baptism and the Eucharist. Objective value and validity. Transubstantiation of persons.	
XII. Religious Education	107
Observing beauty. Modern religion weakly impressive. The power of ritual. Worship in the church school. Children in the church service. Adult education in religion. Theological schools deficient in religious culture. The state university and the Christian college.	
XIII. Church Unity	116
Difficulties of unity in thought and action. The unifying effects of feeling. The desire for more inclusive religious experience. The incompleteness of separate types. The service of art in promoting unity. The revival of mediaevalism, liturgically and architecturally. The community church. The flank attack in debate. Universal similarity of mystic experiences.	
XIV. Technique and Freedom	133
The positive character of freedom. Futility of complete independency. The incoherence of liberalism. The necessity for critically improved technique in worship. A new service book. Scholarship in liturgics. Ceremonial. Freedom not the gift of formlessness but the mastery of form.	
XV. The Mysticism of Isaiah	145
The identity of the experience of worship and that of beauty. The elements of the experience: vision, humility, exaltation, illumination, dedication. Isaiah's great record.	
XVI. The Order of the Liturgy	152
Outer expression in the order of worship parallel to the elements of the inner experience of worship. The principal	

Table of Contents

liturgical parts. Dramatic unity. Miss Underhill's analysis of the Mass. The need for experiment.

XVII. Introit and Antiphons 166

The revival of the Introit. Materials for it. Process of ideas in it. Copies of antiphonals used at the Wellington Avenue Church.

XVIII. Music 174

Music the highest art. The unity of the service. Faults of anthems. The matrix of the service. Members of the choir as ministers in the sanctuary. Antiphonals. Especially composed services.

XIX. Architectural Style 180

Sketch of Greek, Roman, Romanesque, Byzantine, Gothic, and Renaissance building, together with meanings intimated by these historic styles. Current style revivals in Gothic and Classic strains. The question of style revival or translation. The new architecture.

XX. Structural Tone 203

Tonal effects of interiors. The faults of neutrality, comfortableness, coldness, agitation. The virtues of repose, austerity, warmth, and brilliance. The effects of proportion, scale, and materials.

XXI. The Chancel 214

The historic Christian Church chancel. Its revival amongst non-liturgical churches. The artistic high light, the differentiation of liturgical parts, practical convenience. Recent opinions. The use of altar and candle light. Ineffective compromises. Adaptability of the chancel.

XXII. Practicable Matters 229

Educational and social facilities of the church building. Placement of the structure. Problems of the smaller church.

Table of Contents

Partial construction. The aesthetic character of practicality.

XXIII. Religious Ideas for the Architect 236

A House of God. A House of Man. A House of Salvation. The intimations of modern free thinking, brotherhood, and art.

XXIV. The Future Church 243

The delimitation of church functions. Integrations of the new age. The mergence of historic faith and natural religion, in the Apostolic age, in the coming age. A time of formation. Truth, Goodness, Beauty. The primary category. Survey of the character of the coming cultus. Christian content in ancient categories.

Appendix 252

Orders of service in the Wellington Avenue Church, Chicago.

Index 257

List of Illustrations

Reredos, St. Thomas's Church, New York	<i>frontispiece</i>
	PAGE
Pulpit, First Baptist Church, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	21
First Church in Cheshire, Connecticut	43
Carved Oak Triptych	79
Silver Crozier; Christmas in Heaven; St. Peter	95
Skinner Memorial Chapel, Holyoke, Massachusetts	123
Silver Alms Basin; Altar Cross in Silver, Ivory, and Enamel; Carved and Gilded Candlestick	141
First Baptist Church, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Second Church in Boston, Massachusetts	193
House of Hope, St. Paul, Minnesota, Presbyterian	209
South Church, New York City, Reformed	219
Second Church in Newton, Massachusetts, Congregational	225
St. Anne's Chapel, Arlington Heights, Massachusetts	231
First Congregational Church, Montclair, New Jersey	237
Second Church in Boston, Massachusetts, Unitarian	247

Art & Religion

Chapter I: Introduction

IT would seem that humanity permanently values truth, goodness, and beauty. These values are essential to religion. But there is a cleft between the popular religion of our day and all these three. There are many persons engaged in healing the breach between religion and science; equally many concerned with a new ethical seriousness in religion; few seem to be aware of the cleft between religion and art.

A new age is coming. It will be upon us swiftly and we must bestir our imaginations to prepare for it. We are like the dwellers in the war-swept areas of the old world whose homes were wrecked by shell fire. Our intellectual houses are falling about our ears. We do not yet know whether we must rebuild them or desert them. We are hurriedly wondering what to save from the wreckage. We are half unconsciously taking stock of our valuables; making new appraisals of what is most precious. It is a time of reëxamination of all things, a time of changes, profound and universal. The disorganization of normal life by the great war has compelled a new openness of mind and roused new demands for better life.

Yet it is not the war experience that is causing the new age. It hastens it; it more rapidly closes the old age; it will perhaps in history mark the end of a period about ready to be ended anyway. The breakdown of many old sanctions and standards was already taking place. The crisis of war if not the agent was the powerful reagent, precipitating that which the old formulas could no longer hold in solution.

These values that we are reappraising, these formulas that are breaking down, what are they? In the main they are the work of the Reformation age. We have been living religiously and morally and politically by the premises and forms of thought established by the Reformation. This does

Art & Religion

not mean that these principles have been accepted by all or that they are now to be entirely displaced. It does mean that Reformation assumptions have quite generally wrought themselves into all departments of human life, that their logic is fairly complete, and that it is now time to estimate their success and failure.

The new premises, sanctions, and standards, whence are they? They are largely the effects of nineteenth century science and mechanics, both negative and positive. We do not know exactly what they are, nor shall we until they are half consciously established in practice. They relate to changed conceptions of individualism and freedom, authority, property, education, human nature, liberty, art. These and other interests are to be differently conceived than in the period under Reformation dominance. Science is not alone the sufficient cause of these transformations. It is rather the efficient cause, the force that will break much remaining mediaevalism, confirm the central Reformation Protest and then displace both Protestant and Catholic sanctions, preparing the way for the positive work of new forces in philosophy, popular morality, art, and religion.

The Reformation age is being effectively closed by the work of nineteenth century science, its close marked by the upheaval of war. But the new age will not be predominantly scientific. Science has displayed, negatively, what it cannot do for human life as well as what it can do. Approved scientific method will go forward to be one of the major instrumentalities of the new good. But art will be another major instrumentality. Both will be agents in forming the new age after the desires of life itself, that human experience of universal life which we call religion and which alone is the sufficient cause of human good.

A new age is never an entire break with the past. It carries forward from the immediate past much that does not logically belong with the new forms. It carries forward from the more remote past much that is still more out of harmony with the new forms. And it restores some things from the distant past more useful and valued in the new age than they were in the immediately previous one. Feelings and

Introduction

forces are swept out of notice, even for long periods, which later come back freshly to benefit and balance human life. One of these feelings is the feeling for beauty, one of these forces is the force of artistry.

The Reformation age has not been favorable to the arts. Protestantism has been chary of the arts and suspicious of the artist. Ancient and mediaeval feeling for beauty has been all but extinguished throughout large bodies of Christians. It is coming back, irresistibly and swiftly. I am all too unhappily aware that mediaeval ecclesiastics will say: I told you so: you should never have left us: give the Protestants time and they will all return to the fold. Nothing could be more greatly in error than so to estimate our new interest in beauty. Mediaeval ecclesiasticism, incompatible alike with the noble morality and the progressively democratic politics of the Reformation age, will be utterly alien to the new age. It is an all but unbelievable tragedy that the old churches still refuse to hear the great Protest, the very while that children of the Reformers are beginning to see the good things their fathers swept away together with the bad.

There would be no question about the coming of a new and glorious age if the older churches might honestly try to understand the claims of the free churches, and if the reformed churches might with equal candor survey their faults and weaknesses. We cannot enter upon a great constructive time without bold, disinterested, and imaginative effort on the part of religious leaders to these ends. We cannot enter the new age until the old churches give up their concepts of an authoritative faith "once delivered to the saints" and freely accept the spirit of modernism: nor until the rank and file of the free churches do the same thing, as their leaders have already done.

And this effort must begin at home. It is time for every churchman to realize that his particular sect is insufficient for the brilliant life of the new age. Others have examined it and found it wanting. It will do little good for Protestants to lay all the blame upon the Catholics or upon each other. There is needed a rigorous attempt amongst all Protestant

Art & Religion

faiths to reestimate the essentials of religious life, and to acknowledge how many of these are found in the old church, and how many are lacking in the common American denominational parish.

In a general way, the great lack of Protestantism is not intellectual nor moral but artistic, not ethical but cultural. In the pioneer and commercial stages of American life this lack has not been so noticeable or unfortunate. For the most part those who have recognized the severance of art from religion are chiefly persons who have felt the ungodliness of art rather than the ugliness of religious forms. With the growth of cities and city planning, the rapid improvement in the popular arts, including architecture, and the advancing brilliance of civilized life the church must keep pace.

Beauty is one of the essential necessities of human existence. It is a strange fact that so few of those who are critical of the church from without or anxious within have taken notice of this lack. For several years now, both the religious and secular press have been exercised over the church. Many have attacked the theology or the ethics of the church, few have openly criticised its meager worship. Many experiments have been proposed and many tried, few have touched upon the untold assets of the world of the arts for the cultivation of that spiritual life which is the prime function of the church.

The art of worship is the all-comprehending art. No other art can satisfy the demand of human nature for an all-inclusive experience. Nor can the conditions favorable to that experience be ever freshly reproduced without the aid of all the arts.

The suggestions which are hereinafter set forth might possibly have better been arranged for three books, except that at this time it is desirable to feel the close relationships involved. If architects are to build successful church buildings, they must know more about the requirements of the worship to be conducted in those buildings. If the artist in worship is to be successful, he must know how to set forth his message architecturally as well as liturgically. If worship is to be considered as a great art, there needs to be in the

Introduction

mind of Protestantism in general a new point of view respecting both the history and the possibilities of religious culture. The material to follow, therefore, covers these three things: first, historical, psychological, or polemical matters; second, liturgics; third, architecture.

The first group of chapters attempts to make some contribution to the polemics of the day respecting the church in the new age. The attempt is born of a deep sense of need for a new popular psychology about the essential religious values. We need to reexamine the practical categories of organized religion. We need to enquire whether the ecclesiastical institution should not function primarily, not for the sake of theology, nor merely as a moral program, but to foster the religious experience.

This group opens with a discussion of the connection of art with the time spirit or national spirit of any people. Next, the historical and psychological connections and disconnections of religion and art, and their mutual need are set forth. This is followed by chapters indicating the normal connection of art with the priestly and cultural side of religion rather than its prophetic and moral side. The close of the division shows the connection of art with current church movements.

The necessity for technique in worship opens the brief liturgical discussion. In this area of liturgics there are only two important suggestions to be presented. After an examination of the nature of the inner experience of worship in the chapter "Isaiah's Mysticism," the findings are in the next chapter applied to the problems of the order of worship. There is stated definitely what I believe to be the only sound principle of liturgical construction. The other suggestion in this department is a detailed proposal for improving the opening part of the ordinary church service by the revived usage of the Introit.

These brief chapters constitute, of course, a very incomplete discussion of the subject. Other books are needed, which will present more comprehensive reports and proposals concerning modern liturgics. These will be forthcoming as improved experimentation proceeds. The definite sugges-

Art & Religion

tions of these chapters, however, are sufficient to specify something of the nature of the task involved in the better development of the religious cultus.

Respecting architecture, it has seemed advisable to begin with an extremely short survey of the historic styles, familiar as the history of architecture may be to many persons. Only so, however, is it possible clearly to present even a brief analysis of the meaning of style and of the special intimations of particular historic modes. There is just now a great deal of unintelligent style revival, and also much groping after new stylistic invention. The chapter discusses this situation. Other chapters relate to practical phases of church building; the modern religious ideas which need to be symbolized in the modern church; and the handling of physical materials to the end of producing the desired atmosphere or structural tone in the building. The facts presented in the chapter on the chancel, together with their illustration, are largely unknown either to the church world or to the architectural world.

These suggestions are written for the attention of architects as well as for church building committees and for people who wish to enrich their powers of appreciation. If I did not know the facts to the contrary, I should be inclined to credit the architectural profession with competency in these matters. There are brilliant leaders who have thought deeply upon the intellectual issues involved in church building, and whose canons of art are of the highest order. This exceptional ability, however, has not yet succeeded in forestalling the construction of many hopelessly ugly churches. It is hoped, also, that the chapters may be of practical assistance to the competent architect in his efforts to persuade building committees to the acceptance of more excellent forms.

The book is not a defence of beauty or of art; they will take care of themselves. It is not so certain that the art of worship will take care of itself. The art of worship is the combination of all the arts; the experience of worship is the consummation of all experience, whether of beauty or of goodness or of truth. The book is an effort to assist the reli-

Introduction

gious world to a recognition of the category of beauty as a primary and necessary element in the religious reconstruction of the new age.

I am well aware that it is talking high talk to use the term "new age," and that the term is being used by many, indefinitely and loosely. But in the thought of many other students of history, the issues of the day in all departments of life are of such a character as to warrant the use of the words, with a definite meaning. Although I do not agree with the historical interpretations or the philosophic assumptions of Mr. Ralph Adams Cram, his insistence at this point is illuminating. "History is a series of resurrections, for the rhythm of change is invariable. Each epoch of five hundred years follows the same monotonous course, though made distinctive by new variations. . . . We are today in the midst of just such a grinding collapse as that which overtook Rome and the empire of Charlemagne and the Christian Commonwealths of the Middle Ages. . . . Before the year 2000, now but two generations away, modern civilization will have passed and a new era have taken its place."*

Before the war, the late Professor Charles R. Henderson wrote: "We are now in the midst of a transformation more significant than the downfall of the Roman Empire, the rise of modern nationalities, or the Reformation." In a lecture on architecture, Mr. Claude Bragdon used this phrase: "During the post-Renaissance or the Scientific period, of which the war probably marks the close."† Mr. Alfred H. Lloyd in his paragraphs on "The Glory of Democracy" expresses the same view. "A time of epochal transition! Truly we are nearing something new in life. A time of creative living must be at hand."

The most recent definition of the nature of present-day change, in the light of the historic sweep of human feelings, is that of Professor Albert Parker Fitch. "We are witnessing in fact the final emancipation, or if you please, defection, of society from the enchantment of the Middle Ages. . . . If the political, ethical, economic and aesthetic interests of man

* Cram, "Gold, Frankincense and Myrrh," pp. 2 and 3.

† *Architectural Record*, September, 1918.

Art & Religion

are changing, it is safe to assume that his religious world is being transformed too.”*

These and other writers have each a somewhat differing interpretation of the meaning of the times. They all agree in expressing the long historic power of the Reformation forces, the unsatisfactory character of their practical outcome, and the necessity for new integrations of life so far-reaching in character as to constitute a similarly forceful historic movement.

I am not presuming to estimate all the factors material to the new construction of life, but only one of them. In the new age, religion will have new things to say and a new burden of utterance seeking to say them. It will be keyed to the discovery of new forms for telling its word to people. If it does not, it will not reach people. In the world of the arts it will find the means for its new creative and re-creative life. In the experience of worship it will center the joys of its new faiths in human nature and its new hopes of divine life. In the better development of the art of worship it will fulfil its function of lifting life out of its ugly materialism onward and upward toward the truth and the goodness and the beauty that is to be.

* Fitch, "Can the Church Survive in the Changing Order?" pp. 26 and 43.

Chapter II: An Age Described by Its Art

WE are just now so accustomed to looking at everything from the point of view of peoples, tribes, and nations that it is natural to begin our notice of the arts from the same point of view. Peoples are known by their art, the English by Shakespeare and the Prayer Book, the Greeks by the Parthenon, the American Negro by his folk melodies. So also we know an age by its art, the mediaeval time by the great Gothic buildings, the artificialities of early eighteenth century life by English poems and French palaces, the Classic revival by the Renaissance buildings of Italy and all Europe; and all the greater and lesser movements of human feeling by their records in stone or letters or music.

The arts constitute the description of the world as an age or a people apprehends it. The spiritual life of a time is depicted with unescapable exactness in its artistry. A spiritual movement that does not find expression in the arts cannot attain self-consciousness or dominance or survival. An age or a people that does not reach any self-realization or any unity of thought or feeling that breaks forth into artistic expression is nondescript.

Three little objects in my study signify what I mean. One is a katchina of the Hopi Indians of Arizona, a small grass mat with the woven figure of an air spirit arrayed in head-dress and apron. One is a little brass tray with the beautiful geometric pattern of stars in parallel lines so typical of Saracenic art. The third is a little Catholic image of Santa Barbara from Brittany. You could take up one of these little objects and describe almost offhand the main characteristics of the life from which it came, as a scientist reconstructs some old dinosaur from one of the fossil bones. You could conjure, for instance, the whole structure of fatalism in philosophy, despotism in government, the abstract decora-

Art & Religion

tion, the polygamy, and everything else from beggar to caliph that belonged in the same world with the little piece of brass: and also the faiths, feelings, institutions, and customs that belong with the descriptions of the universe of which the others are symbols. Trifling as the little objects are, no such thing is ever produced in any nondescript commonwealth. Each has been cast up from a sea of human life, wide and deep, of which it is, so to speak, only a fleck of foam left to remind us of the tossing waters of many souls. Sorry indeed is that citizenship and weak of mind the generation which cannot leave behind even so slight a mark or sign to testify its struggle for faith or describe its hope.

Or we may come at the idea by another more familiar route. One of the most early and simple of the promptings which lead people to travel to foreign parts is an interest in the picturesque. Partly childish, the interest is also profound. It is the pleasure of discovering communities that are descript rather than nondescript—Oberammergau, Bangkok, Oxford, Kioto, or any other place where there has been some sustained attempt to describe all things and set forth the common view in laws, customs, and all the arts of life from house building to worship. One does not like to see among the maidens at a well in the old land of Ephraim that some carry water in the tall earthen jars of ancient mould and some in the huge tins of an American oil company. It spoils the picture. The charm, the unity, the satisfaction are gone. One does not wish to go abroad unless he may return and say: This is the way the Romans do; thus and so it is among the Fijis. And some people when they find such a place of unity and charm do not come again home to their own nondescript life and town.

Art is not something detached from life: it makes life and is made by it. It appears in every age and represents to us the life of which it is a part. "The artist or the philosopher who maintains that art is purely a temperamental expression unrelated to the solid facts of life, . . . is cherishing a fatal illusion."* If that life is disjointed, the arts will be sporadic and weak. If there be no real structure of ideas and

* Pond, "The Meaning of Architecture," p. 105.

An Age Described by Its Art

customs, no faiths that dominate and unify, no society that is describable, how shall it be described to its own or any other mind? If the life of a people or a time does not present any strong lines or clear characteristics, how shall it be represented? In fitful fragments surely.

I do not mean to say that any society has ever become so unified that its leading feelings have dominated all. Rebels, prophets, protestants, are in every time and place, but if they are in the majority, the community is nondescript and the voices of the arts are mute, for they have no great thing to say.

A seeming contrary opinion has been expressed. "Art must be democratic and win its own clientele of free admirers; it must never again be a mere outgrowth of an authoritatively united community spirit. It must serve as one of the main paths to the future and the unborn."* The word "authoritatively" is unfortunate. Modern men do not desire an art that is the outgrowth of any formal mandate; but they do desire the kind of united community spirit which both produces great art and is produced by it. "All great periods of art have been but the expression of their time. Art has come after the event, not its avatar, but its fulfiller, not its prophet, but its message."†

We shall wish later to notice the value of the artist as prophet of change, with a free and individual word; but also his word is born of the spirit of his people and time. There is a timeless and universal appeal in the greatest arts, yet Dante was a Florentine, and the destroyed sculptured figures of Rheims could not have been carved in the age of Pericles. So also do the little arts follow the time or society spirit. The dainty chairs of the salons of Versailles were not fashioned in Salem, Massachusetts.

The noblest art does not expend itself in trifles; it attempts to speak something concerning all things, to utter some intimation of the total human faith about God and man as it is most lately and highly conceived. The most significant and wonderful of such intimations have come,

* Hocking, "Human Nature and Its Remaking," note, p. 318.

† Herbert Adams, "Address before American Academy of Design."

Art & Religion

not as lone, exceptional voices, but rather as a sweeping wave of human feeling rising to a crest and breaking forth into manifold and beautiful expression. This social character of the arts is testified both by critics and by the facts. "The expression of an ideal is possible because and when and only when, that ideal dominates the race."* Not personal dreams but the hopes of a nation breathe through the Psalms: the genius that dotted the isles of Greece with majestic temples was a racial intelligence: not few but many builders, driven by the fusing fires of a powerful time spirit, hurried up the walls of the great thirteenth century churches in France and Flanders. Even respecting the works of Michel Angelo, certainly as much a lone and individual artist as ever lived, it is said that "We do not think of these great creations as works of individual genius only, but as nourished and inspired by tides of contemporary thought and emotion. Their agitation is the agitation of a century."† It is suggested of another great Italian artist, Virgil, not that he spoke his own word only, but that he was the "Latin that should voice the saddened grandeur of the Pagan heart."‡ In certain times and places, human life has been possible of description. Some conjunction of racial temperament, stage of reflective thought, economic stability, and what not other less discoverable factors, has produced a unity of life. The artists of the age have described the essence of that life.

No age is, of course, wholly under the sway of its dominant notes. Usually something less than its best is in the ascendant: often rival faiths contend for the mastery of a race: or a strong minority long sustains its illogical footing: or the time is wholly discordant and nondescript. Our American world would appear to be not much better off than this latter case. We are very far from such unity of mind and manners as prevailed in the Florence of Lorenzo, the England of Elizabeth, or in Moorish Spain. We are too large, too new, and too composite in race and religion to have reached a describable unity in life.

* Pond, "The Meaning of Architecture," p. 39.

† Phillipps, "Art and Environment," p. 264.

‡ Taylor, "The Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages."

An Age Described by Its Art

Most of the great historic commonwealths, where life has become refined, customs prevalent, and loyalty so long centered as at last to be celebrated in song and ritual or symbolized in the other arts, were small states—Judea, Athens, Byzantium, Ile de France, Nippon. In these little groups of human beings, their solution of the great mysteries became so ordered and so intense as at last to form itself into the imperishable crystalline deposit of their arts, and thereby we know them and revere them. Our country is so large as to postpone whatever unity is desirable. In the North and South, in mountain land and plain land, the flavor of personality and temperament varies with the flavor of the speech of the people. The ease of communication and movement helps us to overcome this natural difficulty—but much more help shall we have as we learn to utilize every artistic symbol of our common life, for the arts which unity produces turn about to produce more unity.

And we are too young to be formed to a common mould. Young communities have no time for good form. Good form is taken on gradually, always the mark of an older and more settled life. But it is a great blunder to underestimate its power or disbelieve in the certainty of its appearance. The usages of polite as contrasted with frontier society are much the same the world over. Pioneers have always scoffed at forms and their grandchildren have rushed upon them with avidity; perhaps the earlier generation mistaking crudity for sincerity, the younger equally mistaking manners for culture. Later generations learn the economy of energy realized in relegating to forms many things that do not need constantly to be freshly decided, and the easement of life's harshness and jar by the dependable respect that resides in good form. There is no older society that does not value good form and the church world is no exception to the rule.

Racial recollection is long, racial aversions and sympathies are often intense. "Because of a diversity of our origins and ideals a unification of our society must be a long time—perhaps centuries—in coming."* Although there are common grounds of expectation and purpose on which most

* Pond, "The Meaning of Architecture," p. 225.

Art & Religion

of the races mingling here stand together,—and this is our hope,—there are also inherited differences in the sense of values. If the Scotchman admits that he is bluff but honest, perhaps a Latin will make reply that he does not care for honesty so much as he cares for suavity. This is a sheer difference in the estimate of human goods; and with a thousand others must be reconciled in some larger unity of common idealism. We have valued the moral integrity and industrial energy of the northern races as the foundation of our commonwealth. Surely there are also some virtues and values in the imaginative gifts of the southern peoples and in their deliberate preference for some other enjoyments than those of commercial victory. Some of the forces necessary to the interracial development lie in the realm of the arts we are discussing.

The religious disunity of America is notorious. It is intolerable as a permanent condition. No useful good is longer served by it. It has ceased to function as a guarantee of liberty. The deepest cleft is between those faiths which are authoritative and autocratic and those which are measurably compatible with democratic institutions. A “divine right” kind of church calls for a “divine right” state. Aristocratic religion cannot permanently live in the same world with democratic government. One must at last give way to the dominating unity of the other.

Less dramatic, but probably, therefore, the more difficult is the Protestant diversity. Most of the differences have been intellectual, credal. On the upper levels, these are now all cut across by the unity of modern thought. The theological lectures at Union in New York, at Congregational Yale, at Episcopal Cambridge, at Methodist Garrett and at Baptist Chicago are all in the same intellectual world. On the lower levels, the old separations still persist. Some leaders look for progress toward unity by ignoring intellectual differences and seeking the fellowship of common moral effort. This is indeed worth while and partly possible. But only partly, for some of the credal differences involve such opposite moral ideals as entirely to block practical unity until the intellectual breach is at least narrowed.

An Age Described by Its Art

Meanwhile there remain deep diversities of temperament, varieties of religious experience in the realm of feeling. It has often been said that men differ widely in this region, that some require the appeal of form and ritual, some desire a minimum of feeling and a maximum of thinking in their religion, as others enjoy the warmer exercises of a more primitive emotionalism. I believe that such a view is a false estimate of human nature and suggested largely as a piece of special pleading for the separate maintenance of these types of religious expression.

The truer fact is that we have all of us something of all these needs. Most people prefer what they have been accustomed to in these things and could likely have been bred to enjoy far other usages than they do. The differences of breeding, training, or circumstance account for varied preferences in artistry much more commonly than do differences in original temperament. Simple persons of little education are not effectively moved by appeal that is largely intellectual. They require the stronger feeling values of direct emotionalism or of ritual. More education draws away from strong emotion of any sort and demands satisfactions of the mind chiefly. Yet more culture begins to revalue lost feeling and to seek it in the world of the arts.

Whoever desires to foster religious unity must take large account of the essential unity of human nature in its demand for feeling. It is possible that a study of the artistry of religion, a study of the pleasures and the driving power of the emotive faculties, an analysis of the kinds of formal technique that create emotion, will be quite as valuable for the cause of religious unity as the attempt to get together theologically or morally.

When our nation is older, and when our differences of race and religion are less numerous and less sharp, the arts will expand to the proportionate place they must always occupy in the spiritual life of any great race or any descript people. We shall be no longer nondescript, but everywhere there will be evidence of the ideals which dominate our common life. Already American unity has been remarkably strengthened by the common action necessitated in the war.

Art & Religion

But the unifying equivalent of war is not easy to find in time of peace.

And the unifying effect of isolation will never again prevail in human life. Swiftly all the old descript commonwealths are breaking down before the all-inclusive world economy in which we are beginning to live. No race can again form so separate a culture and artistry as that of Siam or Japan. The world is one as never before. And it is nondescript as never before. Common knowledge everywhere modifies peculiarities and diminishes differences in race, religion, and politics. This is partly the cause of the bewilderment among artists. They do not know what to say or how to say it any more than do theologians or senators. They do not live, any more than the rest of us, surrounded by definite and definable customs. We are all more or less cosmopolitans and come dangerously near not "belonging" anywhere. We are rovers and strangers, scarcely having a true spiritual homeland.

All these things are admitted and they constitute new and difficult conditions for civilized life. Yet to recognize them is partly to master them. The human race is not yet ready to merge into one vast, vague composite. Nor are states and nations about to disappear in some universal hegemony.

Americans believe that there is a future life and greatness for their commonwealth. We are engaged in the gigantic process of self-consciousness. A rich and noble content is already suggested by the term Americanism. That content will be enlarged and specified rapidly or slowly according as we foster our own best ethics and according as we seek spiritual greatness to match our material success. No mere conquests of the foreign markets for steel will make us a descript people. But every victory over prejudice and ignorance, every success in our labors for economic justice, every newer and later solution of vexed problems in brotherhood, every restraint and lift in the scale of pleasure will weave itself into the pictured scroll which to ourselves and to all men describes what we think and feel and purpose about life. With the gathering unity in ethics will come increased clarity and brilliance in the arts. And the richer expression

An Age Described by Its Art

of the arts will in turn promote and establish the common will until America in the new age may become a civilization describable and described as never a life was described before.

Chapter III: The Unity of Religion and Art

ART and religion belong together by identities of Origin, Subject Matter, and Inner Experience. Religion and art were one and the same thing before either of them became consciously regarded as a distinct human interest. The principal subject matter of the world's artistic treasures is religious. The experience of faith and the experience of beauty are in some measure identical. In these three ways there is displayed the unity of religion and art. I am not here interested to elaborate them, but the numbers of religious leaders who have no interest in the arts, and the numbers of artists who have no participation in the life of definite religion need all to be made aware of these facts.

The beginnings of religion and of art alike lie far back and hidden in the immemorial life of primitive man. In the earliest historic times they were interwoven and no one can say which was first, for they were not two, but one. The painted stick or bunch of feathers which as a fetish was utilized for its magical powers was also in some sense a work of art. The dances and pantomimes of early tribal life were attempts at the magical control of nature or nature divinities. Exercises in frenzy were both religious and artistic, primitive forms of ritual, primitive forms of drama. "This common emotional factor it is that makes art and ritual in their beginnings well-nigh indistinguishable."*

Religion has been historically the great fountain source of art, and the art of worship the mother of all arts. "Ritual and art have, in emotion towards life, a common root, and primitive art develops emotionally, at least in the case of drama, straight out of ritual."†

It is sufficient for our purpose to accept the judgment of anthropologists that in one way or another most of the

* Jane Harrison, "Art and Ritual," p. 41.

† *Ibid.*

The Unity of Religion and Art

arts—music, dancing, sculpture, poetry, drama, architecture—were developed out of exercises and objects originally devised for the magical control of divinities, the celebration of seasonal feasts or the production of ecstasy for its own sake or for power in war—all exercises of primitive religion.

“Art will then never arise and develop among men unless it has a foundation in religion. Art absolutely profane in origin, art born to satisfy the aesthetic taste of the spectator, art which seeks for expressiveness rather than for the material utility of its products, even if this be a spiritual utility, is inconceivable in human history and has absolutely never existed.”*

This is perhaps a too sweeping claim, but something very like it is true. An adequate discussion of it would involve a long study not enough pertinent to our present work to make. It is difficult for us with our reflective and analytical habits of mind to throw back our imaginations into the early time when life was just life, single and undivided, without religion or art or any other category as such. It is not impossible that such a unity of experience is a goal ahead of us as well as a forgotten history behind us.

The second consideration in noting the unity of religion and art is the fact that in all human history the principal subject matter of the arts has been religious. “All the art of the human race is essentially religious art; from the Chaldean to the Egyptian, from the Mycenaean to the Greek, from the Assyrian to the pre-Buddhistic Chinese, from the Mexican to the Peruvian, there is no exception.”†

The three things which most attract Americans to cross the sea in search of the riches of the old world are the Greek temples and statues, Italian paintings, and Gothic architecture. With a very few exceptions all of these incomparable treasures were created by religion. The histories of the older oriental empires and of Egypt display the same facts. Literary art also, considering the Greek dramas, Dante, and Milton, at its high points if not at its lower, has been chiefly religious.

* Alessandro Della Seta, “Religion and Art,” p. 35.

† *Ibid.*, p. 34.

Art & Religion

Even the secular spirit ushered in by the Renaissance did not take away the dominating religious content of the brilliant works of that movement. The revival of pagan themes and the erection of exquisite and luxurious palaces in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries did not rival the continued religious character of the painting, sculpture, and church building of the age.

The effects of the movement, however, soon became characteristic, and modern art, since the seventeenth century painters, especially Flemish and Spanish, and since Shakespeare, has not centered its attention chiefly upon religious subjects. Whether this has anything to do with the slighter and less impressive character of modern art everyone may decide for himself. There does not seem to have appeared in these modern times any movement of life so self-conscious and masterful as to attain brilliant and consistent expression by a great artistic movement comparable with earlier creations.

I am not saying that modern art is irreligious, or that any art must be religious in subject matter to be religious in spirit. I am not saying that this modern age has been less worthy than previous centuries which were more unified. We are attempting something wider and harder. But before this time, the principal artistic creations of the world were closely connected with religion.

Even now the perennial artistic creativity of religion is again beginning to burst into manifold expression. The best directly church art of the nineteenth century was in the medium of stained glass. The free churches, for the most part prejudiced against the use of pictures on canvas or on the walls, were quite willing to enjoy pictures in glass. Amongst the old churches, with a few signal exceptions, both decorative works on a large scale and handicrafts in small scale were generally either crude, bizarre, thin, or merely rich.

But the twentieth century has already developed many notable works born of the revived passion for beauty in the church. Such achievements as the murals in the apse of St. Agnes' Church, Cleveland, the lofty reredos in St.

The Unity of Religion and Art

Thomas's Church, New York, and the new pulpit of the First Baptist Church, Pittsburgh, are evidence that religion cannot long be hindered from its natural flowering in the arts.

In another chapter I hope we may see that the artists of the race long ago began to say in form and color things which did not agree with the subject matter they were setting forth. Here we note simply the main fact, that historically the principal themes of the arts have been religious. The arts have grown out of religion or have been produced for the service of religion.

The unity of religion and art is more profoundly discovered in our own consciousness. It is the unity of experience itself. Religion is more than art and may seem to get on entirely without it, yet religionists are always saying some of the same things that artists say and artists are always testifying some of the same feelings as are religious devotees. To perceive beauty is to be moved by something of the same emotional course as attends on the perception of Divinity. And to create beauty is in some sense to participate in the character of Divinity.

Beauty is one of the three supreme categories of value. It follows that religion is directly concerned with beauty, for religion is the experience of the highest value. The three values are constantly interwoven in human experience. The true and the good are beautiful. The beautiful, most highly speaking, is both true and good. That which is false is not beautiful; it is an ugly lie! That which is bad is not beautiful; it comes of an ugly temper. Whether you are aware of it or not, there is a pleasure in the truth and a satisfaction in the contemplation of the good which are in some measure aesthetic feelings.

Without presuming to set forth a theory of aesthetics, I want here simply to suggest that the experience of beauty or the formation of beauty into the world of the arts is like the experience of religion in its essential assumptions or demands in the realms of thinking, feeling, and willing.

Religion is more than thought, and its experience is larger than merely logical judgments concerning the truth.

Art & Religion

Yet it is based upon a definite intellectual faith in the oneness of reality. A pluralistic universe is no very satisfactory object of religious faith. There are no longer any vital polytheistic religions. The object of religious faith is always the one true God, in whose ultimate being all the discords are harmonized.

Precisely so, no particular object is beautiful that is not a unity. Definitely discordant lines or sounds or shapes or colors mar the harmony of any composition and so injure its beauty, whether the object be a poem, a building, a simple melody of song, a landscape painting, or the landscape itself. It needs no laboring of the point to suggest that the first demand of the lover of beauty is the demand for unity or harmony. If there be discordant elements, as for instance, in a musical work, or in a landscape, there is nevertheless that demand that these be harmonized by some more inclusive range of unity.

There is no logical limit to this demand short of the universe itself. I am not saying that all artists or devotees of the arts are aware of this. I am saying that logically the aesthete is united with the religionist in his search for an ultimately harmonized world. My four-year-old son can fashion accurately with colored blocks a simple composition copied from a design. He understands perfectly when a single piece is out of place with reference to the unity of pattern lines and colors previously selected. A higher unity is represented in a Turner landscape. The Overture to Tannhäuser and the story of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde depict a theme of universal range, the war of good and evil. Behind the baffling questions of life for mortals and gods in the Greek tragedies, back of all the themes, looms the finality of Fate:

“That which needs must be,
Holdeth the high gods
As it holdeth thee.”

The history of all the arts will abundantly testify this outreach toward the ultimate. The greatest works of art are those which have attempted to speak concerning the

The Unity of Religion and Art

nature of all things, those which have intimated higher and higher ranges of unity. And in a sense all genuine art depicts the nature of any particular thing in such a way as to imply its unity with all things: "Art on its side, tacitly protests against metaphysical dualism. It does so because, being the most immediate form of knowledge, it is in contact with activity, not with passivity; with interiority, not exteriority; with spirit, not with matter, and never with a double order of reality."*

One of the things which religion adds to thought is feeling. Religion is always more than definitions of the mind; it is an attitude or disposition of the heart; it is an immediate experience of reality, a contemplation of the Divine, a communion. It is a feeling of dependence, a feeling of peace and of trust. Religion is joy and exuberant abundance of life. It is that experience beyond thinking and doing which engages all the faculties in the highest spiritual adventure.

The experience of beauty includes all these things, at least in kind. It is a feeling of repose and quietness. It is a feeling of satisfaction, an experience which it is not desired to change, being good in itself. The artist is not satisfied with secondhand descriptions of reality set forth by scientist and philosopher; he would have immediate experience of the truth. He does not present his view of life in propositions or in theoretic form, but rather seeks to express the *feel of reality*, the *taste of existence*, the *texture of the world*. This is the reason why many great works of art intimate more by their form or manner of treatment than by the subject matter, and why many supreme artistic creations have a vaguely definable content of ideas, as for instance, Shelley's "Cloud" and Michel Angelo's figures in the Sacristy of San Lorenzo.

Nor is the artist satisfied with the struggle for material goods in the practical world. Although he deals with materials, his luxury is a higher one than that of elaborate drawing rooms, motor cars, or the conquest of trade. The good he seeks is a more nearly spiritual good, an experience of

* Benedetto Croce, "Aesthetic," p. 398.

Art & Religion

contemplation as an end in itself for which the labor of the practical world is only a means.

Now these are precisely the points of view which the teacher of religion also is constantly seeking to induce. He too calls people from their pursuits and practical ambitions to enjoy the communions of the spirit. He also summons men to leave off for a moment their doing that they may devote themselves to seeing. He also is persuaded of the inadequacy of mere thinking, claiming the possibility of a more nearly immediate experience of reality.

If this is anything like the truth, it is a strange thing that the professional schools for priests and prophets abundantly supply instruction that is intellectual and moral while very meagerly offering any tutelage of the imagination or any instruction in the discipline and development of the emotional career or in the technique whereby the minister of religion may become a proficient master in these areas. This will one day be changed so that every trained leader of religion will be more aware of the universal hunger for beauty and more capable of utilizing this almost unlimited asset for the religious ends of his task.

We are accustomed to thinking that the world of religion is willing to recognize this kinship with the world of the arts more readily than is the critic of the arts. The contrary is true. One is more likely to find the language of religion in the writings of the art world than to discover an equal intelligence amongst religious writers concerning the critique of the arts. When Bernard Bosanquet says that "the mind of man has its own necessity, which weaves its great patterns on the face of the whole world. And in these patterns—the pattern of life itself—the fullest feeling finds embodiment,"* he is discussing the impulse and the necessity of the artist toward the same experience as the mystic.

William Temple in discussing some of the noblest works of art, writes: "In the presence of such transcendent Beauty, we realize the hope of mysticism. In a single impression we receive what absolutely satisfies us, and in that perfect satisfaction we ourselves are lost. Duration vanishes; the

* Bosanquet, "Three Lectures on Aesthetic," p. 58.

The Unity of Religion and Art

'moment eternal' is come. The great drama proceeds; the music surges through us; we are not conscious of our own existence. We hear and see; and when all is done, we consider and bow the head."* He is writing as an art critic but in the language of religion. Again in discussing one of the lectures of Mr. Arthur Balfour, he writes: "The past and the future vanish; space itself is forgotten: whether or not mysticism is, as Mr. Balfour fears, the only possible philosophy of art, it is beyond question that the aesthetic experience is a purely mystical experience; that is to say, it is the direct and immediate apprehension of an absolutely satisfying object."†

I have somewhere read in a writing of Archdeacon Freemantle, the following: "Art becomes a binding link between men and draws them together toward God. It forms a society which must properly be called a Church. Its yearning toward the ideal is worship, a prayer. The sharing in artistic impressions is a genuine form of worship. It is destined to occupy no mean place in the full redemption of human life."

The religious feelings relate to life as a whole. They are the response of man to the presently realized existence of divinity. They reach out to grasp the Universal and the Absolute. The feeling for beauty is usually not universal. But it is a feeling for being, for that which has existence. Every work of art says, Notice this fact, this bit of life: be a lover of life as you see it here. Religion says, Be a lover of Life as a Whole, God's Life, love God. There is a profound identity of attitude between these two.

Religion is not merely thinking and feeling, it is also right doing. The moral issues of religion are ever the concern of healthy human life. We will have nothing to do with a religion which is ineffective in the practical world or weak in its increasing enthusiasm for a thoroughgoing application of its ideals to every phase of life, industrial and political as well as personal. These are the vast problems of the hour. We shall have no future religion at all if they are not manfully and courageously handled.

* Temple, "Mens Creatrix," p. 125.

† *Ibid.*, p. 128.

Art & Religion

It is too commonly assumed that at this point the arts must part company with religion. Many have felt that to be interested in Beauty while the world is suffering from inhumanity is an ignoble thing. Unfortunately, both the conduct of artists in general and many critics of the arts have tended to foster such a view. Mr. Merton Stark Yewdale sets forth a correct note on the expressive desire of the aesthetic experience and then completely spoils the picture by separating that experience from practical life. "We have a sensation of an enhanced power, a compelling desire to rid ourselves of a certain state of tension, . . . eagerness to reciprocate the force which the artist exerts toward us."* So far so good. Then something extremely bad: "As our faculties are again assembled we see once more that life is the great delusion and Art the supreme counter-agent to existence."†

How could anyone write that who had ever read Emerson's "Compensation"? There are in fact no real barriers between the world of Art Life and the world of Common Life. The artist marks off a bit of the world and harmonizes it and sees that it is good or beautiful. Religion rises to see that all creation is good. It will admit no barriers. It would glorify all life.

The very nature of artistry is activity. Works of art are described as creations. Whatever may be said about the appreciation of Beauty, art is the production of Beauty. Artistry is expression, release, liberation, outgoing effort, authorship, origination. Its results are not called thoughts of art or feelings of art but works of art.

And the artist not only creates new forms of material beauty but also new persons. The very essence of the thing that happens to people when they are impressed by beauty, either of nature or of art, is increased vitality. They are literally remade, increased in strength of body and strength of mind.

Still a third practical effect of the artist's work is the result in the world of the enhanced power developed in the

*The Aesthetic World," *International Studio*, November, 1918.

† *Ibid.*

The Unity of Religion and Art

aesthetic experience. This is the point least clearly intimated by writers on the subject, and denied by many. It is the point of disagreement with Mr. Yewdale. Even Professor Hocking in his profound discussion of art and religion in the volume, "Human Nature and Its Remaking," does not sufficiently get away from his suggestion that the world of art is an arena in which man may make his conquests more easily than in the world of fact. "Art is the region which man has created for himself, wherein he can find scope for unexpressed powers, and yet win an absolute success, in testimony of his own reality. . . . It has but feeble contact with the more pressing problems of the 'common man.' It fits no one for dealing with the as yet unharmonized aspects of experience. Its tendency would be to seclude itself, build for itself high garden walls, and in the midst of a world small enough to be perfectly controlled, forget the ugly, the squalid, the disordered, the just causes for warfare and rebellion."*

There are undoubtedly many facts which bear out this view. And with the facts coincides the oft-repeated description of the experience of beauty as being a feeling of power coupled with the paradoxical feeling of repose, a sense of great energy but of no demand to exercise it. The aesthetic moment is by everyone described as the moment of perfect satisfaction.

But I believe it to be only a moment. Something else follows and that very quickly. We are not long enthralled by the satisfaction of any work of art; soon we recall life as we know it, all of it, and the recollection breaks the spell and demands a new satisfaction of the imagination. I have nowhere seen a better description or explanation of this paradox of repose and passion than that of Croce: "The sensibility or passion relates to the rich material which the artist absorbs into his psychic organization; the insensibility or serenity to the form which he subjugates and dominates the tumult of the feelings and of the passions."† But the moment of serenity and repose is followed by fresh disturb-

* W. E. Hocking, "Human Nature and Its Remaking," pp. 291 and 326.

† Benedetto Croce, "Aesthetic," p. 35.

Art & Religion

ance at the remembrance of the practical world. There is no logical limit to the natural desire of the artist to subjugate many elements into a comprising harmony. And whoever perceives and enjoys that harmony, strictly speaking, must at last step outside of its frame and seek a composition that will harmonize all things. This is religion.

A definite suggestion of this logic occurs in Mr. Hocking's chapters: "But interest in beauty reaches the central current of the will, and when this interest is awakened all transference of skill and discipline becomes natural. It is the nature of beauty to overflow departments and to make the man of one piece. . . . The real artist knows that to yield to the aristocratic impulse in the aesthetic consciousness is to cut off the sources of his own art. For beauty, let me repeat, is reality offering a glimpse of the solution of its own problems of evil."* And Miss Harrison says that: "Art is of real value to life in a perfectly biological sense; it invigorates, enhances, promotes actual spiritual, and through it, physical life." Mr. Pond's definition of art turns upon this point precisely: "The regulation of thought and act with the idea of making—not getting—making the most of life is called art."†

Another suggestion of this all-including expressive logic of art comes from C. A. Bennett, although at first seeming to disagree. He says that "This is one of the great contributions of art to life: it offers a rest cure to the weary moralist." And this by offering a refuge from the real world of real moral struggle—"If morality offers us only a vision of a world perpetually in the making, art presents to us a picture of a world in some sense finished and complete. It transforms us from participators in the struggle into spectators of a drama. We need not decide: we appreciate. The power and beauty of the whole composition give a consciousness of unity which is able to contain the moral distractions. The moral nerve is not stirred to life, we do not feel 'that something must be done about it.' "‡

* Hocking, "Human Nature and Its Remaking," pp. 324 and 327.

† Pond, "The Meaning of Architecture," p. 224.

‡ *International Journal of Ethics*, January, 1920.

The Unity of Religion and Art

Notice, however, that Mr. Bennett does not confuse the "spectator" attitude to the work of art with the same disposition toward life. As just suggested above, it is my view that this withdrawn and restful experience of looking upon beauty does not last long before the recollection of life tries to get inside the picture. To be sure there is nothing demanding to be done by what is inside the artist's depiction, that momentary world being complete and perfect. But so soon as the rest of the world by recollection, begins to obtrude itself, then immediately there is everything to be done about it. And as the result of the rest, of the refreshment, and literal recreation of the experience, there are new powers ready for the task.

And this pressure of the world as a whole to come within the frame, Mr. Bennett intimates: "Art, we say, in effect, if not in intention, redeems the world from ugliness. The goal of artistic endeavor would be attained when it had been shown that nothing was outcast from the world of beauty, when a rendering of life had been given in which ugliness was included and transformed."

I do not claim that this natural tendency to translate the energy of the artistic experience into definite moral effects in the practical world is the usual issue in the life of the average man. Ordinarily, it fails unless the man has in other connections already been touched by a religious motive, and instructed in the moral life. This purposive moment is the point where, as it were, Art leaves off and Religion begins. I do believe, none the less, that this expressive tendency is the logic of the experience of beauty even by itself. The average man, moved by the power of beauty in nature or art possesses no artistic technique, no particular skill in poetry, painting, or architecture. His clay is the plastic stuff of his own character and his materials the fluctuating affairs of the workaday world. Probably thousands of men have not only been moved by impressions of beauty henceforth to express themselves more richly in common life but have had definite success in carrying out the impulse.

Is there any very great difference between the expressive

Art & Religion

logic of the Arts and the expressive demand of Religion? Religion itself does not always succeed in getting its vitality coupled up with the moral life. Religion and art are alike in the impulse to recreate the world after the heart's desire.

If all these things are anything like true, why have we been so slow in recognizing it? Why even have so many thought of the arts as subversive of religion? If Religion and Art are so much kin in their common Assumption of Unity in the Universe, in their Experience of Contemplation, and in their Mandate to Expression, why have we so frequently thought of artists as irreligious? The answer is that we have thought wrong.

Modern art is individualistic, very little devoted to setting forth a definitely religious content. But this is the nature of the age and not the fault of the artists. This is the artist's empirical approach to reality no less than the scientist's.

Artists have been habitually antinomian, lawless. So have prophets, breaking down old moralities that newer and better might be formed. Not many devotees of art seem to apprehend the full course of their own typical career. This is partly due to much bad art. Not all art is good any more than average popular religion is the best religion. The better the art, the more likely it is to result in a completed course of experience.

Artists and critics of art often stand outside the definite institutions of religion. But it would astonish the ignorant church worker to be made aware of the range and passion of the search for reality and of right attitudes toward it which is revealed in the total world of music, letters, painting, building, and all the other forms through which the artists of the world are attempting to set forth "their scheme of the weal and the woe."

I am not sufficiently a philosopher to launch a discussion of the nature of the limitations of art as compared with religion. The transcendence of religion is viewed to be such, not in one direction merely, but in several, especially in relation to the three aspects of experience so briefly presented

The Unity of Religion and Art

in this chapter. I can suggest only a hint of such a discussion by another sentence or two from Croce, "Art is the root of all our theoretic life. To be the root, not the flower or fruit, is the function of art. And without a root, there can be no flower and no fruit."* Or again, to much the same intent: "If art, then, be the first and most ingenuous form of knowledge, it cannot give complete satisfaction to man's need to know, and therefore cannot be the ultimate end of the theoretic spirit."

Nevertheless, Art and Religion belong together by certain profound identities of Origin, Subject Matter, and Inner Experience.

* Benedetto Croce, "Aesthetic," p. 386.

Chapter IV: The Cleft between Art and Religion

WE cannot live without truth, goodness, and beauty. Not everyone cares for these, but they are the supreme human values. Religion cannot live without them. Yet there is a world of Thought outside the world of religion which repudiates much of what organized religion claims to be the truth. There is a world of Moral Aspiration outside the religious world which is impatient of the lagging step of organized religious faith toward better conceptions of justice and brotherhood. So also there is a world of Art dis severed from the institutions of religion, its spiritual hunger unsatisfied by the ugliness of present-day religious forms. Religion cannot complete her reformation until she has squared her experience not only with Scientist and Moralist but also with the Artist.

Since the mid-nineteenth century there have appeared innumerable books concerned with healing the breach between religion and science. The opening of the twentieth century saw the setting of a full tide of interest in making earnest with the newer moral implications of religion. The coming generation will insist upon its birthright to beauty.

The cleft between science and religion is an old story. I recall hearing Governor Baldwin of Connecticut say some years ago something about the happy completion of the task of transition from the old theology to the new. It was true for the noble old parish of which he was a member. It is not true of the larger part of the Christian world. The "modernist" movement in the Roman Catholic Church has been stamped out ruthlessly. There would appear to be glimmers of light here and there in the Greek Church. The Anglican communion still maintains rigidly a view of the sacraments and of ordination which is a sheer logical impossibility to the accepted scientific assumptions of modern life. In the great city where I live most of the Protestant preaching still

The Cleft between Art and Religion

holds to an essentially traditional view of the scriptures and does not accept the canons of historical learning. There is indeed a deep cleft between religion and thought.

No one claims that science is always right. It is itself humble and teachable. In these virtues it is often more religious than religion. But it does claim to be one of the avenues toward the truth. It has achieved conceptions of the material universe and certain methods of work accepted by so large a part of the world of thought that religion can do nothing else than examine them fearlessly and try them bravely.

Many are no longer interested especially in this controversy. The flank of the battle against tradition has been turned by religion itself, in the charge that the traditional views of church and scriptures are not only unscientific but irreligious. Modern religion believes in the prophet, and in the continued revelation of truth as ever of old. The traditional experience is not sufficiently religious for the modern man.

The cleft between morals and religion is the issue of the hour. Many times have I listened to the claim on the part of some social worker that there was more of the Kingdom of God outside the church than in it. Many times has it been charged that the church was interested in charity but not in justice. The older aristocratic churches do not in the nature of the case sympathize with the growingly democratic character of modern morals. Of late, there has been large attention on the part of denominational leaders and newspapers to the industrial and civic questions of the day. But even so, the leadership in social criticism and in constructive social suggestion has been outside the church rather than in it. The fault does not lie with Christianity as such. The implications of that are wide and deep, and would involve profound alterations in many institutional structures if logically and thoroughly applied. It is a misfortune not merely for religion but for the world of social and moral leadership that they are so dissevered.

More and more people are becoming interested in this subject. It is the overwhelming question of the day. It is

Art & Religion

infinitely more important for the moment, and possibly always will be, than the subject of this book. And yet, from another point of view it is part of the same subject. For it is after all the struggle of human life to have a larger share in the beauty of life.

The cleft between art and religion is a less familiar subject. The lines of cleavage between religion and art run differently. If the old hierarchic churches seem to us of the Protestant world still to be interested in the maintenance of outworn truth and in the practice of an outworn goodness, they may easily accuse us of not being interested in beauty at all. As there is a world of Science outside the church satisfied with the love of truth and a world of Morality outside the church seeking its own way of goodness, so there is a world of Art outside the church enjoying its life of beauty; and it is a very large world.

There is something about life more significant than thinking or than doing, life itself which finds its expression and its joy in the beauty of nature and of art and the intimations and communion which these assist. It is a fatal mistake for religion not to realize the vast numbers of people who find their spiritual satisfactions as devotees of the arts.

Humanity permanently craves beauty. The generation will soon be here which will refuse to worship in ugly buildings, or attend an ill-constructed service with fitful and spasmodic music. There are more people of the present generation who have withdrawn from devotion to the church for its failure in beauty than we imagine. Worship is a fine art, the finest and highest of all the arts, but there has been little improvement in it since the Reformation.

This accusation holds against the older churches as well as against the free churches. We may rightly lay to the influence of the Reformation the negation of the arts which on the whole has characterized Protestantism. There is no logical reason why Protestantism should be suspicious of the fine arts, but the historic results have been as unfortunate as if there were. Not all the poor artistry, however, in the Christian churches is the fault of the free churches. It is possibly no more blameworthy to be contented with

The Cleft between Art and Religion

meager and uninteresting forms than to maintain outworn and stereotyped forms, however successful they may once have been.

The canon of the Roman Catholic Mass has been fixed for so long that no improvement in the art of worship can be credited to the Roman Church for many generations. The service is still in Latin. Those who are instructed in its meaning step by step can understand it, but not anyone else. Symbolic art was devised for the purpose of communication. A stranger to the Christian faith would be very slightly enlightened by the symbols which the Romanists use to convey the gospel message.

The Roman Church makes great claim of being the vehicle for the continued revelations of the Divine Word. But nothing has been vouchsafed to it for hundreds of years sufficiently fresh and enlivening to find incorporation in the regular mode of teaching the people. There seem to have been no improvements even in the matter of telling the old truths. A liturgy which is truly vital must certainly from time to time be purged of the elements for which there no longer appear assignable reasons. The principal variable parts of the missal were themselves selected more or less arbitrarily. Mr. Adrian Fortesque,* in his study of liturgical sources, cannot discover any reasons for the assignment of the schedule of Introits as they now stand. All these things are sufficiently faulty apart from the chief criticism of all, that the religion taught in the Roman service is not the modern man's religion.

These things were not always true of the great liturgy of the church. Far back, in the days of the Fathers, there were varied and variable usages both east and west. In the later crystallizations of form throughout different nations there were developed different orders of worship, Syrian, Coptic, Leonine, Gallican, Gelasian, Gregorian, Gothic, Jacobite, Mozarabic, Sarum, St. James, St. Mark, and other sacramentaries. Some of these are still maintained. But many of them were long since merged and lost in the

* Adrian Fortesque, "The Mass."

Art & Religion

authoritative order of Rome, and the vital growth of freedom stopped.

Architecturally the Roman Catholic Church in America is just now making very great improvements. Much of its recent work is of great artistic merit. But it is passing strange that for the most part during American history there should have come to this new nation no artistic intelligence and culture through the channels of the old ecclesiastical organization. No Protestant Church in America has built any more ugly buildings than the Roman Catholic Church.

By all the probabilities in the case we should look for a far higher record in the Anglican Church and its American associate the Protestant Episcopal Church. And so indeed we find at many points. The architectural history of the Episcopal Church in the United States from its beginnings to the present is almost unexceptionally excellent. No other body comes anywhere near approaching it. Since the Colonial days, when it followed the prevailing Classic mode, it has consistently utilized its proper English Gothic inspiration. I have never seen a distinctly bad Episcopal Church, and there are many buildings of great beauty.

The state of the case for the liturgy is not so good. The English Book of Common Prayer is, of course, one of the great artistic masterpieces of the world. Its rhythmic and noble style of speech, rich vocabulary, and compact, lucid structure are of the highest order of art. Its range of ideas and depths of feeling betoken a religious experience genuine, profound, and sympathetic. But the experience so beautifully set forth is not at many points our experience. No very important change has been incorporated since the restoration of the second prayer book of Edward VI by Queen Elizabeth. However admirable the age of the great Elizabethans, its emotions and ideals will not completely serve for us.

New collects are, of course, used in this country and in England, but the principal offices remain unchanged. There are so many intimations of a royal and aristocratic régime that as it stands it cannot serve to express our present faith

The Cleft between Art and Religion

or aspiration. Its morality is different from our morality. The theology back of it is not our theology. Its content of ideas is not satisfactory. And its form, although gracious and powerful, is, nevertheless, more and more remote from the forms of average speech, especially in America.

It is not necessary to go to outsiders for criticisms of the Episcopal liturgy. "The prayer book as it stands is a volume that serves only those who are highly instructed in the faith."* This is the same fault that attaches to the Latin Mass, and almost as grave. This remoteness from the common medium speech was more than ever discovered in the pressure of army camp conditions. "How we have blushed for the incomprehensibility even of the collects," writes Chaplain Milner-White. "We never guessed of old how removed it was from common wants: nor how unintelligible are its prayers and forms of devotion. Its climate to the simple ardent Christian is often ice."

Respecting inadequacy of the order to express modern moral conditions is this: "The prayer book in a peculiar way reflects the mind of the church to the nation. It is the public programme of British institutional Christianity; an official demonstration of the interests and passions that we bring to the throne of God. Men mark that these interests are curiously remote from those of an eager and well-meaning world, from its life, society, and work. For example, the problems of labor press upon us, and vast Christian issues hang upon them, but the Prayer Book cares, on the face of it, for none of these things; and the Church therefore stands condemned by the millions. If only a litany of labor lay within its covers, what a reproach would be done away with. And more—it would preach Christian social obligations as a thousand sermons could not; the mere fact of being in a prayer book would make it, so to speak, a general routine order; the conscience of church people would be insensibly and surely taught and moved."

Another writer, the Rev. C. Salisbury Woodward, M.C., M.A., Canon of Southwark Cathedral, says that "The

* The Rev. E. Milner-White, D.S.O., M.A., "The Church in the Furnace."

Art & Religion

language of many of the prayers is out of date and therefore unintelligible if not actually misleading to the majority," and that "The subject matter of the prayers is unsatisfactory; it is too general and abstract for common use." He also believes that the psalms and lessons are indiscriminate and not well selected for modern faith or devotion. He proposes changes in these and in the form of language: "If John Smith and Thomas Jones are to learn to pray with reality they must be allowed to ask for the things they really need and to ask for them in the language of their own day, not in that of the Elizabethans, however perfect the latter might have been."*

Some of these criticisms are the same as originally made by the first Puritans. It is surely not to be expected that the average American can be spiritually satisfied by these forms so long ago unsatisfactory to many, lately in the critical experience of the war freshly seen to be inadequate to set forth modern faith and hope. This is not to refuse, however, to make use of many of the best prayers in the book. Some of these prayers are published in the ordinary hymnals of free churches and often used. Yet undoubtedly one of the reasons which keeps the free churches from a larger resort to this great treasury of devotion is the seeming inability of those who use it and publish it to maintain it as a fresh and growing instrument of grace.

The cleft between the rest of Protestantism and the world of the arts would be patent to all if we had eyes to see it. Not all of Protestantism is derived from the Puritans. The Lutheran bodies were little touched with Puritan feeling. Their forms early became stereotyped and have ever since been characterized by a certain dryness. Yet even so, some of their usages are far superior to those of many of the free churches.

The Wesleyan bodies, having once left behind the mother church, early developed exercises of vivid color and warmth, appealing to the sensibilities in a more primitive and more powerful way than the finer arts are capable of. Fiery speech

* The Rev. C. Salisbury Woodward, M.C., M.A., "The Church in the Furnace."

The Cleft between Art and Religion

and highly colored rhetoric were proved to be more effective in pioneer conditions than lighted altars or vested choirs. It remains to be seen whether the usage of these emotional factors can continue to be inspiring as the community becomes older and more cultivated.

The Puritans themselves objected to the material elements in the sacraments. They abolished not only holy water and ashes but also pictures and statues, not only shrines of the saints but organs and instruments of music and even the use of the ring in the marriage service. Presbyterian, Reformed, Baptist, and Congregational bodies were largely touched at the very beginning with the Puritan spirit. Yet the usages in all of these groups are today very different from the original practices and they are as formal and stereotyped in their own way as the canon of the Mass itself. The boasted freedom and spontaneity of the free church worship has shaken itself down to a common level of custom, and not a very high one at that. One might easily discover on examining the order of service in a thousand churches of these denominations that the variations would be so slight as to be negligible.

There is a kind of average order of service used all over the United States in the majority of Protestant churches which is pretty much the same thing. It has been developed naïvely and has some excellent traits. And if it is proposed to change it, someone is sure to cry, "No, no, this is not Congregational," or whatever other church proposes the experiment. Yet the fact is, that this average order is of comparatively recent date and only remotely resembles the exercises of public worship used in the earlier days of all these bodies. The order has the merit of natural development, but with equal naturalness it needs more development, and it also needs something else, as do all the old liturgies.

We live in an analytical and psychological age, and are no longer able to enjoy a wholly naïve experience. In a day when all the other arts are analyzed and criticised in detail, it is impossible to expect that an uncriticised art of worship can be effective. We have come to the point where we must reëxamine the whole subject. This average order that is so prevalent among us is unpsychological, tiresome, stereo-

Art & Religion

typed, ill constructed, neither interesting nor impressive nor beautiful. It contains far less spontaneous and original material than is claimed for it. Even in the prayers, the only opportunity for fresh content, probably the average minister covers the same thoughts in the same style much more frequently than does the Prayer Book and does not do it nearly so well. There is more repetition of phrases and of ideas than in the written liturgy. Notable exceptions on the part of gifted ministers do not alter this unfortunate general situation.

We have a liturgy but it is a poor one. We use artistry but not good artistry. The current usages in forms of worship are not at all those which originally characterized the religious movement of the Protestant world. They are the forms developed in the latter half of the nineteenth century, a time, more than any other in all history, of artistic confusion and prevalent ugliness.

Recently there have been many attempts at improvement, some of them significant and successful. For the most part, however, they are spoken of as "enrichment of the service," "the use of forms," "an elaborate order of worship." None of these phrases explains much, or indicates any genuinely artistic achievement. They do evidence a dissatisfaction with something sadly in need of improvement. But the need is not more formalism nor enrichment nor elaboration. The need is for unity, simplicity, and beauty. There are many "enriched" services composed simply of the typical, ugly, average American order with additions of musical numbers, choir responses, vestments, or read prayers, a kind of glorified city edition of the common town order. All these things jumbled together, however elaborate, or however beautiful in detail, do not make a noble liturgy. Nothing is beautiful that does not have unity, harmony, wholeness.

There will continue to be a cleft between religion and art until the service of worship in the average Christian church is organized on precisely the same principles as those by which any artist, working in any medium, organizes the material under his hand into a beautiful work.

Equally severed from the high possibilities that are open



Hall & Winton, Builders, 1826.

FIRST CHURCH IN CHESHIRE • CONNECTICUT

A "Colonial" church greatly superior to any of the nondescript buildings common in America until the recent style revivals.

The Cleft between Art and Religion

to us is the most of American church architecture. Here also all is confusion in the Protestant world. Those ecclesiastical bodies of a homogeneous tradition and race have done much better than the others. The Lutheran and Reformed groups are of this character, and their buildings, if not always beautiful, are always symbolic of their use and dignified. Previous to 1830, an excellent American style prevailed, and there yet remain, throughout the commonwealths of the early colonies both north and south, numbers of very beautiful Colonial churches.

Everyone familiar with American domestic and public architecture since that time knows the sad story of wretched and ugly work in various forms. Two or three strong notes in building gained considerable currency one after another throughout the country, such as a slender kind of wooden Gothic, the walnut-and-marble-fireplace period, the Mansart-roof decade. Then came the most shocking of all the types, the attempted reproductions which followed the work of a great architect, Richardson. Not only West, but in the East, there are innumerable church buildings which must be laid to his door. His own work was magnificent, especially in Trinity Church, Boston; but all over the country there are little churches which resemble, however faintly, the few successful buildings that were made in this adapted Romanesque style.

By some terrible invasion of a desire for a practical building, a combination building, there appeared in this style the device of a square church, having the pulpit in one corner so that the opening of great folding doors could combine a Sunday school hall with the church auditorium. No invention was ever more frightful. No artist would dream of focusing attention to the corner of a square room. Sitting askew of the cardinal points puts a slant into your very morals. And the circular pews make one feel as though he were in a clinical laboratory. The prominence of organ pipes on one side and the dreary, barren waste of folding doors on the other constitute a composition in disharmony and impropriety almost positively demoralizing. The buildings of this style stand on one side of a deep and wide gulf from

Art & Religion

anything that could remotely be connected with the world of the fine arts.

It seems utterly unbelievable, but within a year or two there has actually been published a book promoted by the Missionary Education Movement, recommending for country churches precisely this most ugly conceivable structure, the square church with corner pulpit. That such ignorance and bad taste should be found among church leaders of the time is ample evidence of the sorry state of religious art. Why should these leaders be unaware of the excellent work being done in many quarters?

We are rapidly approaching a time of far greater interest and demand for successful artistry than ever before in American life. Domestic and public architecture is improving by leaps and bounds. Better taste is being developed throughout the whole community. Larger and larger numbers of people are becoming familiar with the best products of the world of the arts. Meanwhile very few religious leaders are at all conscious of the connection between the art of worship and art in general, and there are still being built incredibly disagreeable church buildings. Religion may fairly be charged with being far removed both architecturally and liturgically from the canons of taste and of beauty which are rapidly being applied in all other departments of life.

The charge should be extended to include blame not only for bad artistry, but for failure to make larger and better use of the positive goods to be derived from all the arts, glass work, painting, sculpture, decoration, dramatic action, music, literature, and architecture.

The fault is not wholly the fault of the church, but also of artists. Very few artists know enough about religion or the church to represent it in saying what needs to be said artistically. Few architects understand the message of modern religion. Few composers have sought to produce work which could be woven into a unified liturgical composition. Few patrons of the arts have realized the incomparable opportunity for public refinement and elevation offered by the churches.

The Cleft between Art and Religion

Religion is more than beauty, and worship is more than art. If the artist is captivated by the life of beauty, the religionist is able to see the beauty of life. It is precisely because the artist is himself so good a seer, and because his work helps people to see some part of reality, that religion needs to work with him that people may be led to a more moving vision of the Whole.

Chapter V: The Mutual Need

WE need first to speak of mutual recognition. The churchman has not yet noted the magnitude of the world of the arts. He has moved in the area of his own spiritual experience and his own modes of worship. He has related that experience with the problems of thought, or at least he thinks he has. He has related that experience with the problems of conduct, the morals of private life, and now more and more the morals of industrial life. He has noticed the world of science and the world of civics; he is only slightly aware of the world of art.

The artist is vaguely aware of the pervasive fact of religion, but is in the main ignorant of the directions of religious progress. His religious interest tends to be archaeological. He enjoys the survey of the picturesque remnants and survivals of once vital and noble rituals; he has little interest in the spiritual growths which have not yet found expression in his own mode. If art is to have a vital connection with religion, it must face forward instead of backward, it must begin to anticipate the future movements of the spirit rather than to occupy itself with wistful regrets for disappearing religious cultures.

Every civilized community is now vitally interested in the arts. In any great modern city the numbers of persons and the numbers of hours devoted to some form of artistic production are very far in excess of the numbers of persons or hours consciously devoted to religion. Night after night, theaters are filled with thousands of people. Day after day, the moving picture houses are thronged. Week after week, the printing presses are turning out unnumbered copies of novels. Month after month, the popular magazines publish millions of pages of short stories. Much of this output may not be sufficiently good to be acknowledged as art, but it

The Mutual Need

pretends to be, and the success of its appeal lies in the category of the arts. So much will be readily recognized.

It is not so easy to be aware of the scope of the higher works of art and of artistic criticism. A very large number of American cities foster the production of music on a high plane. The most of these also possess a more or less creditable collection of works of plastic or pictorial art, together with the possessions of private collectors. Large portions of the journalistic press of all nations are devoted to the criticism of the fine arts. The comparatively small space in the popular journals devoted to religion is in some measure an index of the comparative popular interest. There are not many journals devoted wholly to the arts, but they are for the most part of a high order of excellence. Not only questions of technique and composition, but questions of spiritual interpretation crowd the paragraphs of the art critics of the world.

The first thing to say, then, is an admonition to the churchmen simply to notice these facts, the incalculable sum total of human interest devoted in one way or another to the production or appreciation of poetic, dramatic, and other literature, to music, painting, sculpture, architecture, and the decorative arts.

The second thing to say, is an admonition to the artist to open his eyes to the perennial and pervasive human interest in religion. There is no community without it in some form or other. It is a world far more subtle, powerful, and extensive than his world. Those who consciously devote themselves to it far outnumber those who have anything like a critical attitude toward the arts. Its feeling reaches almost every human life at its beginning and end. Its enterprises engage the services of far more professional workers, together with far more volunteer workers, than any other human interest. It is a vast, complicated world, which cannot possibly be ignored by anyone who attempts to see life and see it whole.

In the light of these facts, I am setting down two or three ways in which art needs religion and religion needs the arts.

I am not unmindful of the danger to the artist and his

Art & Religion

work if he sees and speaks from the point of view of any specific religion. If his spirit and outlook are limited to the range of experience derived from any particular religious sect, he is by that very fact hindered from the fresh and untrammelled insight expected of him. He cannot be a successful seer if he sees nothing more than he has been taught to see. But the true artist is not very liable to this danger. He possesses an independence of his own. His danger is, rather, a too great separation from normal feelings. The average artist is a separatistic person. He may belong to a group or guild of fellow craftsmen. He is at least subconsciously aware of the great dominant spirit of his time and nation: but he is almost necessarily a more aloof and independent worker than the scientist or the moralist or the religionist.

The superiority of religion is this, that it has been built up in the community. It relates itself to all interests and all experiences, past, present, and future. It comprises the pursuit of truth and goodness as well as of beauty. It draws upon efforts of the mind and of the will as well as of the emotions. It has its theology as well as its ritual. It is at work as well as at worship. It has an evangel to proclaim, a mission to perform, a perpetual moral program to carry through, a perpetual ministry to exercise. When it betakes itself to contemplation, it is already equipped with the best thinking of the day and the best ethics of the day. Its total attitude to the world is not derived from the imagination only, but from rigid processes of historic thought and from persistent efforts in the practical world. These mental and moral factors have entered into its make-up profoundly.

The artist, without religion, usually approaches his world very largely uninfluenced by the values derived from science and philosophy, or the virtues engendered in the moral efforts of mankind. It is impossible for the religious mystic to approach his world without being profoundly affected, even though subconsciously, by the long inclusion of the values of thinker and doer in the life of the religious community to which he belongs. The fine arts of the world would be infinitely richer if produced by men whose attitudes toward life came forward out of the more inclusive back-

The Mutual Need

ground which it is the constant effort of religion to maintain in the human consciousness.

Art needs religion, therefore, to universalize its background of concepts, both mentally and morally. Some art critics, such as Benedetto Croce, repudiate the art that begins conceptually. They do not regard anything as strictly in the world of aesthetics except an immediate intuition of particular reality. I do not know what they would make of "Macbeth" or Rodin's "Hand of God." Certainly these works seem to have been conceived rather than perceived. And in any case, the artist's perception of particulars is powerfully affected by his conceptions of all things. The only area in which conceptions of all things are formed by the historic and communal exercise of all the human faculties and endeavors is the area of religion.

Art needs religion to correct its moral content. I do not wish artists to be pointing morals. But they are constantly affecting popular morals whether they intend to or not. I am willing to admit that this is none of their concern, but it is the concern of the rest of us. And it is their concern to produce works of artistic excellence, which is impossible if these works are not true reports of life as it is. Religion presumes to make a true report of life as it is. It assumes to describe spiritual laws as these are discovered to be true and universal. It assumes to construct a definite moral content in the light of these laws. If the artist could bring to his observation of life and his artistic depiction the moral equipment of religion, he would be a better artist. I am not asking that he be a moralist except in so far as it affects his art.

Religion needs art to be impressive, to get a hearing. This is one of the chief problems of the church. How shall it arrest attention? How shall it make itself more noticeable in the community? How shall it set forth its first appeal so that he who runs may read? Most people are in a hurry these days, involved in many affairs. Weak voices and unimpressive proposals do not reach them. Religion cannot affect the average man unless it first gets his attention. The problem of advertising religion is far deeper than a matter of newspaper notices. At this point the fine art of building is the chief

Art & Religion

dependence and religion cannot dispense with it. This is especially true in the larger communities. In the life of the older America, most people of the community understood a great deal about the intellectual and spiritual differences through which the differing sects came into being. This is not true today. The masses of our church people no longer understand these things or care about them. The masses of aliens know nothing about them. The majority simply read from superficials. The obscure and unimpressive church buildings, however high or distinguished may be the life which they house, tell nothing to the average outsider. The religion that survives in the new age will be impressively set forth at the very start by the outward appearance and interesting character of its structure. Moreover, first impressions on the inside are vital. The church can utilize the work of the artist architect, decorator, musician, and liturgist to the ends of an immediately impressive appeal to anyone who comes within.

It is the artistic side of religion which is the chief source of the enjoyment of it. The deeper joys of religion are, to be sure, its spiritual joys, trust, and peace, and hope, forgiveness and worthy labor. But the everyday human satisfactions, and sometimes the stimulus for the higher spiritual joys, are derived from successful artistry in public worship. Religion would not long attract people in an advancing civilization if it should cut away the rhythmic forms of hymns and songs, the artistic excellence of diction and rhetoric, and the stately dignity of noble buildings. Many people turn to art instead of to religion for rest and refuge, for recreation after the moral struggle of practical life. A work of noble art is in itself, by its composure and perfection, a peace giver, a restorative, a sanctuary for the moment inviolable. How much more would men turn to religion if the great composing faiths could be set forth so triumphantly in noble and sensible forms as to restore the joy of salvation.

Reverence and humility are assisted by the arts. Ugly buildings together with careless and slipshod orders of service certainly do not assist reverence nor tend to make anybody humble. The most of people despise poor workman-

The Mutual Need

ship. They are not readily led to revere the works of God by bungling and imperfect works of man. Perfection they respect; carefulness and finish they admire. It is the attempt of every work of art to approach perfection in its own medium. Its effect is to shame carelessness and imperfection. The assistance of various arts can be brought to bear upon the worshiper in church in such a way as to help him to be reverent and to display to him the larger cause of religion over against which his own life may be seen to be unsatisfactory.

To conserve and freshen old truths is a constant task in religion. All communication is more or less symbolic. Symbols addressed to the eye and to the ear add weight to those which merely address the mind. Art is representative, that is, it presents again and again understood but unrealized truths. It refreshes the experience of valuable but neglected standards. It revives fundamental but oft-forgotten ideals. It succeeds in reaching the inner man. It is penetrative, it drives deeper than prose or logic. When we wish to realize afresh for our comfort the providing care of God, we do not simply state a proposition about it; we read, "The Lord is my shepherd." But this is art. The Twenty-third Psalm carries farther and means more because it has rhythm and imagery as well as beautiful thought. So also, in many directions, works of plastic or pictorial art, music, song, succeed in communicating the faith where bare prose and cold reason are ineffective.

To seek new light and new truth is an equally constant effort of religion. Some form of artistry is always valuable as a preparation for new insight. The direct physical effect of beauty is to kindle the senses and to increase the imagination. This tends to open-mindedness. This lifts people above the region of prejudice into a freer air and a more comprehensive outlook. Something of this sort is necessary before the word of new truth can secure a hospitable reception. The editor of the *Outlook* has recently said: "There is nothing today so essential to the world as its art. Even the prophet and teacher of religion cannot avail unless he either has in

Art & Religion

him the creative power of the artist or can enlist that creative power in the service of the ideas he promulgates.”*

Religion needs the arts to quicken resolves. Resolution is getting courage up to “the sticking point.” Great purposes may be formed in the cold and the dark. Not often, however, unless that cold and dark be exceptional and critical. They are more commonly formed in times of illumination and power. The many lesser resolves necessary to keep good works and good lives going are assisted by recurrent emotional experiences. If the emotional life of people is largely stimulated outside of religion, it is less liable to be directed into worthy or intelligent resolution and practical issue. If religious life is unstirred by emotion, it is little likely to develop the zeal necessary to overcome the world.

Religion and art, therefore, need each other. Art without religion fails of the highest significance. Religion without art is dumb.

It is unfortunate for the world that the imaginative power engendered amongst the devotees of the arts is not more directly harnessed to the moral efforts of the times. It is unfortunate for art as art not to be stirred by the great concerns of progressive religion. Writes Mr. Lisle March Phillipps: “It is the peculiarity of modern art that to an entire doubt as to its own aims and principles it unites an extraordinarily highly developed gift of manual dexterity and great technical knowledge. It can paint or carve anything it likes exactly in the manner it likes; at the same time it does not know in the least what to paint or carve, or with what purpose to paint or carve it.”† Religion could tell it.

Religion, on the other hand, is in these days often crude and uncultivated in its forms of expression. It is often meager in thought and limited in imagination. It does not give people entrance to that abundant life that thrills and throbs in the aspirations of humanity as a whole. It is often less passionate and less daring in its search for reality than art. Stanton Coit has pointed out this dearth of religion without the aid of art: “Protestantism in purifying its inner

* *The Outlook*, December 17, 1919.

† Phillipps, “Art and Environment,” p. 266.

The Mutual Need

life has gone far toward destroying its outward form. . . . But without expression, and expression in choice and deliberate form, religion, like the feelings, tends to become stagnant, sour and corrupt.”* The religion of the new age will sympathize with every circle of spiritual aspirants, and call to its service the gifted workers in every field of human progress, the artistic no less than the scientific and philanthropic.

* Stanton Coit, “Social Worship.”

Chapter VI: Corporeality in Religion

THE word spiritual is one of the most misused terms in the religious dictionary. It is commonly used as applied to some experience that is largely physical. Paul had a difficult time persuading the Corinthians that the excitement of speaking with tongues was of a lower spirituality than the more temperate gifts. There would appear to be something properly called spiritual about those unimpassioned virtues, patience, perseverance, meekness, and the like, displayed in the cold and the dark, in temptation and loneliness, that is far removed from the emotional glow so often called spiritual. These are the highest fruits of the spirit.

But the spiritual life as a whole rises from the physical life. If it rises at last purely and freely, it none the less rises from the swathing fires of sensibility. And the kindling of the sense usually requires something tangible, touchable, visible. Spirituality is the great and desirable end; corporeality is the necessary means. Truth must be embodied to be realized; it must be incorporated to be understood. No religious movement has ever been forceful or popular without a rich corporeality. An image, a rite, a creed, a feeling, a feast, a vision, or a sacrament has always been used to embody its truth.

Religion has ever struggled to reach a true balance of body and spirit. Prophets, in the name of the spirit, have over and again led the revolt against idolatry. But the people have not been able to reach their heights, they have neither understood nor remembered the high word of the prophet until a priest has brought it close by a symbol or a sacrament. Then, alas, the people have loved the symbols and the sacraments for their own sakes, until the day of another prophetic revolt of the spirit. My sympathies in this entirely human story are not only with the prophets, but with priests

Corporeality in Religion

and people as well. Religion will always require fresh incorporation as well as recurrent reformation.

Historically, there have been three principal types of appeal to the senses—the incorporation of truth by Physical Symbols or Acts; its embodiment in Creeds; its arousal to Crude Excitement.

The symbols, rites, and sacraments most commonly familiar are those of the Hebrew and Catholic worship. Our modern interest in the Old Testament is so largely centered in the prophetic books yet so valuable to us, that we fail to appreciate the prominence of the cultus or ritual practice in early Jewish religion. Beginning with no other object of veneration than the Ark of the Covenant, the Jehovah faith rapidly adopted Canaanitish shrines, high places, and sacrificial practices. The three agricultural feasts, later increased to seven, Solomon's Temple, the calves of Jeroboam the son of Nebat at Dan and Bethel, the morning and evening sacrifices on the open altar in Jerusalem, the great Day of Atonement, the processions and psalm liturgies, with other objects and exercises, constituted a rich and impressive corporeality in religion without which it could not have maintained its life.

So also the mediaeval Christian church made elaborate use of symbols and rites to represent its truths and make them impressive. Mediaeval corporeality centered in the seven sacraments, around each of which was developed a more or less extensive usage of forms, acts, and objects. Baptism brought the child into membership with the church. Confirmation signalized reception into full communion and imparted grace from God. By the Eucharist the spiritual nature was nourished to eternal life. In Penance, sins since Baptism were healed. Ordination invested the new priest with power for the eucharistic miracle. Marriage expressed the sanction of the church over the fundamental acts of life. Extreme Unction fitted the believer for entrance into Heaven. Besides these, many other religious ideas and experiences were tangibly symbolized or stimulated—penitence by the confessional; the forgiveness of sins by priestly absolution; the life of personal prayer by the rosary, household

Art & Religion

images, candles, and incense; the sacrificing spirit of secular and religious priests by humble garb and ascetic life; the sacrifices of the people by special and seasonal self-denials; the dignity and power of the church by the pomp of the hierocracy; public worship by magnificent and beautiful churches, shrines, statues, paintings, and music; the unity of the church by prayers for the dead and offerings to the saints.

Many other lesser usages and forms were utilized, varieties of vestments, festivals, processions, crucifixes and banners, chants and offices, prayer books and gestures, stations and pilgrimages; all of these being forms of incorporating some experience or faith. Outtopping all, brilliant, penetrating, and awful, the celebration of the Mass constituted perhaps the most impressive religious act ever devised.

Against these great Hebrew and Catholic systems of cultus, the prophets revolted; Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah in the eighth century B. C.; Luther and Zwingli and others in the sixteenth century A. D. But in each case the prophets had scarcely done speaking when their spiritual word was in turn embodied in a new form of incorporation on a distinctly lower plane, but by a process absolutely necessary to its perpetuation. We thus come to the second type of corporeality in religion, that of creeds and codes.

The ancient prophets looked on the rites and sacrifices of their day, and they sternly said: No, this is not religion, this is not what Jehovah requires. We are not saved by feast and assembly; we are saved by righteousness. "I desire mercy and not sacrifice." They thoroughly moralized religion. Then the legalists stepped in and began to define and specify the righteousness. They framed the code of Deuteronomy to embody, to incorporate, the moral religion of the great prophets. Speedily the "Law" became the same kind of object of veneration and formality as the golden calves. They worshiped the "Law" like an idol. Psalm 119 is a song of praise to the "Law."

So, also, is the story of the Christian reformers. Luther thought on the sacraments of the mediaeval church and all the gross formalism that had gathered round their adminis-

Corporeality in Religion

tration. And he said: No, this is not religion. We are not saved by these sacramental rites, we are saved by faith. He, too, freshly moralized and spiritualized religion. But he was no sooner gone than once again the same old story repeated itself. His followers and successors began to make lists of the faiths by which we are saved. And these were written down in the Augsburg Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Westminster Confession of Faith. In these formularies there was embodied and incorporated the new spiritual and moralized religion of the Reformers.

But these became the same kind of objects of veneration as the images they dispossessed. Probably no statue of the Virgin was ever more thoroughly idolized than the Westminster Confession of Faith. The attitude toward it is no more commendable on the one hand and no more reprehensible on the other than the attitude of the devotees of the Mass. It is quite precisely the same, no better, no worse.

Psychologically, this credal form of corporeality in religion has answered the same purpose as the ritual form. Just as the mediaeval priest held up his crucifix, or elevated the Host, just so the Calvinist preacher held up his creed; and for the same purpose, to bring near that which is far, to communicate the unspeakable, to tell the unutterable, to make tangible the faith in the unseen. These Reformation statements of faith are so complete, so exact, so finished, clear-cut, and closed as to partake of the nature of an object. They are no less objective than a Catholic image; but not so flexible, for you may get anything you put there out of an image but not from a creed. They are no less formal than a Catholic ceremony, for salvation by faith has often become salvation by credence, a thoroughly unspiritual proposal.

Against these systems of legalism and credalism, the prophets again revolted. The reformation of Jesus was set over against the formalism of Pharisaic devotion to the "Law," that there might be born a religion more purely of the Spirit spiritual. The movement of John Wesley was in part a reaction from the hardness and dryness of credal formalism that there might prevail a more inward expe-

Art & Religion

rience of the Spirit. But here again, as ever before, the high prophetic and spiritual word was lowered in the process of popularity. The issue displays the third type of corporeality in religion, that of crude excitement.

An account of Jesus' break with the legal religion of his day is a long story by itself. Although he spoke of fulfilling the "Law," he distinguished between greater and lesser commands of the "Law" and did not himself hesitate to break lesser laws at the inner dictation of a higher law of the Spirit. The outcome of his relation to the "Law" was the liberation of the early Christian community from the Mosaic codes and the freedom of new life and power by the Spirit.

But the more violent and bodily manifestations of the Spirit soon became the more popular. People began to enjoy spiritual possession. They began to seek it, not for self-mastery and all the graces of goodness, but for power over others and for physical thrills in themselves. They sought excitements and ecstasy for their own sakes until they appeared to be mad or drunken, uttering incoherent cries and speaking with "tongues."

So, also, John Wesley was disturbed by the formalisms of his later day, the creedal religion so like the legal religion of Pharisaism. No, he said, we are not saved by these beliefs, these agreements to the creeds and confessions. Religion is a matter of the heart, a right attitude of spirit, an inward knowledge of God and His saving grace, not a thing of the mind and its definitions. We must have a new heart and know and feel ourselves saved. This was the high word of a prophet, protesting against the formalisms of creedal religion in the name of the Spirit.

But it was scarcely said than it, too, like its prototypes, descended in order to be understood, to be popular and effective. You must feel your religion inwardly. Very well, then, go to an old-fashioned camp meeting and you may see people feel it. They come home reporting a wonderful spiritual time, when what they have had was a wonderful physical time. I am not criticising just here, but only describing. The popular camp meeting preacher has never been the quiet teacher of spiritual and moral religion, but the brilliant

Corporeality in Religion

orator, who, by vivid imagery, personal magnetism, and a kind of physical *tour de force* could rouse the emotions until laughter, tears, and creeping flesh, and half-hysterical speaking with tongues signalized that ecstatic enjoyment for which the people had come and marked another memorable "experience" of religion.

This type of religious corporeality, no less than the ritual and creedal types, thus came to be enjoyable and sought for its own sake; that is, it was idolized, made an end in itself. Its thrilling and emotional character brought together throngs of people attracted over and again by its fleshly pleasure. This is the factor chiefly responsible for the power and rapid spread of this type of religious experience in America. The religious bodies which have fostered it and utilized it have become the largest churches in the country.

Besides these three types of physical appeal in religion, there are, of course, others, such as Christian Science and Apocalypse. The incorporation of religious faith in a creed has often been paralleled by the symbolism of a vivid Hope. The history of this kind of formalism in religion is long and interesting, just now renewed in popular attention to Pre-millennial or Second Coming dreams. Its widespread recrudescence at this moment is simply another instance of the immemorial tendency of human nature to slip from under the hard demands of spiritual and moral religion in order to enjoy the speculative, the vividly imaginative, and the self-approval of passionate attachment to a definitely objective religious figure. Followers of this Adventism, instead of worshiping God and seeking to display the Spirit of Christ in common life, have fashioned the physical figure of a vision descending from the clouds, and devote themselves to the adoration of this image and to calling upon other men to share with them this useless cult.

Christian Science also must be described as making liberal use of corporeality. Like Omar Khayyam, who constantly advises us to forget death, thereby indicating that it is the one thing he cannot forget, so the Scientist constantly cries Spirit, Spirit, all the while blaming the rest of us for our refusal to be forever concerned with healing our bodies.

Art & Religion

In the main, however, historic religion has always displayed one or another of the three types of physical appeal we are chiefly considering. Some kind of formal element religion has always had. I am not objecting to these forms; the thing I am objecting to is that we have given them up. At least the bulk of present-day Protestantism no longer makes any very large or interesting use of them. And this is one of the things the matter with us. We do not have statues and paintings, nor a noble liturgy; we no longer devote ourselves to the great Reformation creedal formularies; even the Methodists have largely left off the very emotionalism that gave them such great power; we are too spiritual; we have a religion that won't work except in a realm of disembodied spirits.

Without detailed analysis, and not to anticipate, there would seem to be more hope of future improvement along the lines of the first type rather than the others. The third form, that of Crude Excitement, is too low and primitive and never has appealed permanently to the better spirits of any people. Moreover, its intellectual content is always too meager and shifting and personal to be long utilized on a general scale. Which is not to say that at its highest it is not to have a powerful place in religion. We still hope that there may be many in the succession of Chrysostom, Savonarola, Whitfield, and Moody.

With the second type, the modern man and his contempt of creeds has perhaps too little sympathy. We need creeds, but we are properly too humble to complete and compress our faith in finished creeds: we want sun parlors and open porches in our house of faith, always inviting the visitation of newer and later revelations of the Spirit. For after all, the humility of agnosticism, so far from being inimical to worship, is perhaps its natural beginning. Which is not to say that we can get on without slogans and mottoes and working statements of common faith. But these can scarcely supply the emotional fire necessary to popular religion. The first type, however, can be utilized with vastly greater power and variety than ordinary Protestantism has ever considered.

Chapter VII: The Sensational Character of Art

THE first force of a work of art is its appeal to the senses. This is direct and immediate. It is the physical effect, almost utterly unescapable whenever there is presented to anyone a vigorous composition in color or in tone or a strong rhythm of song or of motion.

Religion which has disdained the arts as sensuous has not, therefore, escaped sensationalism. It has developed the sensational preacher. He is the man who preaches for a sensuous effect. He has greater success usually in getting people to come to hear what he has to say than in having something worth while to say when they get there. This is not always true but it is so very commonly. Our most thoughtful ministers, those under whose preaching the more serious-minded people desire to sit, are little given to sensational preaching. Their form is good form but it is not nowadays florid, overly dramatic, or eccentric form. They touch upon timely themes of the day, not as advertising captions but for real discussion. Your true and proper sensationalist develops rhetoric, gesture, perhaps even hair cuts, newspaper themes, and peculiar exercises calculated to rouse interest and produce a momentary enjoyment or excitement.

Sensationalism is necessary for religion, but not this kind. I would rather that my boys should be appealed to by the noble sensationalism of excellent paintings, brilliant music, and noble ritual than by the sensationalism of an evangelist crawling about on all fours like a bear show.

However much we may desire to spiritualize our religion, we are not disembodied spirits, we are compact together of flesh and spirit—

“Nor soul helps flesh more now, than flesh helps soul.”

Our view of human nature and of the bodily life is very different from that of the Reformation theology. Our new

Art & Religion

utilization of the fine arts is to be based upon the new psychology and upon the new theology rather than upon Calvinism.

The impulses of the flesh may develop downward. But also every human instinct may become the root of a possible spiritual virtue. If our task is still partly to mortify the flesh, it is also to understand it and use it for good. If spiritual experience is an incorporeal thing, its beginning is usually something born in the mystery of the bodily being. We do not have the same reasons for fearing the arts that the Puritan had, as he did not have our reasons for using them.

Sensationalism has always been deep and constant in human life and in religion and always will be during the life of earth. The Hebrew prophets not only used abundant imagery in speech but actual physical objects and eccentricities of conduct to capture attention and press home their message. It seems questionable whether Jesus performed his works of healing for this purpose, but hardly questionable that his approach to the city on the Day of Palms was a form of sensational appeal. It may be said of it, as it may be said of other sensational conduct, that it was done for effect. Precisely so, for that is the way to be effective.

Our modern church has rather too little than too much of appeal to the senses. It is not sufficiently interesting or sufficiently thrilling. I do not at all object to the sensational methods of the orator or of the evangelist in their proper place. But the sensational preacher should not be the pastor and teacher of a normal church, large or small. That form of appeal to the senses is in the long run neither so effective nor so beneficial as quieter forms—music, decoration, architecture, and liturgy. The oratorical type may be more thrilling at the moment but less lasting than the rhythms set going by the finer arts.

The older religions all make more effective use of the noble and more commendable forms of appeal to the senses. One would not expect to get the following testimony from a modern free churchman, but here it is: "The Japanese know how to produce effects, they have a sure instinct as to the moods in which a person should stand before a temple or

The Sensational Character of Art

shrine. Hence they study the approaches to their sacred spots almost as much as they do the elaboration of the spots themselves. The Shintoists have their torii or more likely lines of torii before each shrine; the Buddhists love to place their houses of worship and meditation in the midst of great trees or on the tops of hills which they approach by moss-covered staircases of stone. . . . When one has removed his shoes and penetrated to the inner shrine and stands on the soft matted floor before the image of the Great Buddha, the subtle power of idolatry when wedded to high art becomes apparent in an unmistakable way. The sense of solemnity, of quietness, of peace is in the very air, and there comes to one a new sympathy toward those who know only this way of consolation.”* These beautiful and skillful arrangements are planned for their direct and immediate effect upon the senses and they are effective.

Nor would one naturally expect the testimony written by one of the most distinguished New England clergymen of the nineteenth century, a leader and representative of the best thought of his day. Dr. Theodore Munger describes the cathedrals and cathedral services of the English Church. And then he adds: “Here lies the secret of public worship; we do not worship because we feel like it, but that we may feel. The feeling may have died out under the pressure of the world, but coming together from mere habit, and starting on the level of mere custom, we soon feel the stirring of the wings of devotion, and begin to rise heavenward on the pinnacles of song and prayer. This is well understood in England, and underlies the much criticised ‘Cathedral system.’ . . . Here is a mighty fact tremendously asserted; it forces a sort of inevitable reverence, not the highest and purest indeed, but something worth having. It becomes the conservator of the faith, and in the only way in which it can be conserved, through the reverent sentiment and poetry of our nature. . . . The main value of the established church is its lofty and unshaken assertion of the worth of worship—keeping alive reverence, which is the mother of morality, and furnishing a public environment for the common faith.

* Cornelius H. Patton in the *Congregationalist*, September 11, 1920.

Art & Religion

This system of form and worship is kept up because the highest culture and intelligence in England believe in it.”*

Sensationalism of some kind we must have if religion is to be effective. It is simply a question of a critical examination of the best kinds of appeal to the senses that may be properly developed for our own time and temper. Human nature is what it is, we must touch it where we may. There is not only an attracting power, but an educating power, in right devices of artistry carefully and conservatively handled. I am not disposed to quarrel, though I cannot agree, with the objector who does not wish to use any form of appeal to the senses. But let not the man who objects to a richer development of the fine arts in religion ask approval for the coarser arts of rhetoric and eccentricity on the part of sensational preachers or the more bungling arts of worship current amongst our American churches.

The question before us, if we are candid, is not whether we shall have sensationalism in some sort, but whether we shall have it in the more refined and improved forms which are at once just as effective and also more natural and productive of the healthy emotional life.

* Munger, "The Freedom of the Faith," pp. 209-211.

Chapter VIII: A Brief for the Cultus

EVERY religion maintains a system of religious acts and exercises: this is its Cultus. When religion becomes so largely practical as greatly to minimize the enjoyment of it, there arise differing forms of Cults, systems of self-realization. Every nation which arrives at self-consciousness does so by some process of "Kultur," the total system of patriotic values. Culture is a perennial human interest, the enjoyment of the "history of the human spirit." Modern Protestantism is becoming weak on the side of its Cultus. It needs freshly to consider the necessity and character of religious culture.

First of all, religion is an experience of Divinity before it becomes righteousness in the midst of Humanity. The old antinomy between action and contemplation is ever with us. Fought out many times in the history of religion, it will doubtless be fought out many times more. Always the practical moralist accuses the religious mystic for his lack of interest in development, morality, the timely issues of the day. Always the mystic wonders what the practical man is driving at, always questions the truth of progress. Always he asks concerning mechanical inventions, "Do they cultivate the soul?" Each party has almost wrecked religion many times. Artists and mystics have often made religion formal and unmoral, needing reformation. Moralists have never been able to establish and conserve their new systems without the aid of artistry and of worship.

It is a great mistake to regard a system of ethics or a code of laws merely from the point of view of utility. It is rather more true to regard moral systems as the means to religious ends. Religion is the end, morality the means, rather than contrariwise. The whole history of culture, religious, ethical, and artistic, testifies this. We have just fought a great war for our faith that the State with its "Kultur" is secondary

Art & Religion

and the fortunes of persons primary. Persons are the ends for which the State exists, not means to be sacrificed to the god of the State.

Even codes of laws reveal an aesthetic interest. The animus of many regulations, not only in primitive sacred law, but in modern statute law, is not merely utilitarianism, but an interest in orderliness for its own sake, good form, decorum, beauty. The world of the arts *in toto* is not a practical world. It expresses and reproduces experiences of the spirit, leisure for which has been purchased by the active life. The artist is not interested primarily in activity, or in the results of activity. His interest is personal or universal. No great novel, for instance, holds our attention by a recital of accomplishments. Even the stories of adventure and bold achievement care not so much for the value of the achievement as for the moving portrayal of the hero's stout heart. The novel is not interested in what a man does but only in what at last he is.

Religion is not religion unless it is primarily the cultivation of the divine experience, fostering the culture of the soul as its supreme end.

Secondly, all religions have so regarded themselves, and have sought and have cultivated the religious experience. They may or may not have had a good effect upon morals, they have invariably reproduced for themselves the purely religious experience. The survey of these facts is the source of the oft-repeated assertion that man is incurably religious. Every historic religion has insisted that life was not all work, but also worship. Even the most prophetic periods in religious history have speedily established some form of *Cultus*, some awareness of self in the approved rôle, some system of enjoying the ideal of action set forth in the prophetic word. No religion has become so thoroughly moralized as to lose its sense of the value of the religious experience. Even the Ethical Culture Society, not claiming to be religious at all, by its very style and title publishes its belief in the "culture" of its standards, not merely in the prosaic discussion of them. That is, it seeks to bathe itself in an experience of contem-

A Brief for the Cultus

plation as well as to inform itself concerning the rights and wrongs of human action.

The purely religious experience is, of course, never wholly divorced from the moral ideal. Even devotion to a Cultus which seems to include no moral laws involves a moral choice. Every religious experience thus contains moral implications. In Christianity, the moral ideal is very completely involved in the religious faith. So the culture of religion includes the culture of the accompanying ideals of conduct. This is only an added reason for that culture, for right attitudes of the spirit toward problems of the practical life need to be not merely discussed but cultivated. Great moral principles and precepts need not only to be formulated and proclaimed but also to be viewed imaginatively, attended to and inculcated.

Thirdly, for assisting the reproduction of the desired religious experience, all religions have used some form of Apparatus, some Ritual. No social, spiritual experience has been maintained without external and formal aids. Merely getting together is the first of these aids. Merely keeping silent is a ritual in itself, and by no means the least formal or difficult exercise. The Society of Friends in devising this usage did so not because they would minimize spiritual culture, but precisely because they would magnify it. The singing of a hymn is both easy and informal compared to a public exercise of silence. The Quakers, incidentally, developed other and powerful ritual forms, such as peculiar dress, speech, and manners. So whether the Apparatus used be simple and bare, or whether it be a highly elaborate drama utilizing all the fine arts, it is, nevertheless, Apparatus for the purpose of assisting the culture of the religious experience.

Fourthly, these exercises might in the main be classified as religious acts in contrast to those doings which might be called moral acts. All human action is in some sense moral, it has to do with human relations. There would appear to be some elevated persons capable of casting upon all the acts of their common life some religious significance. Yet for the sake of clearness we are justified in making distinctions,

Art & Religion

and in holding that there is such a thing as a religious act, an exercise of the human faculties, whether with or without bodily action, such as is something more than mere thought, and something other than can be described in terms of human or moral relations, though it may include these. Prayer is such an act. The singing of a hymn might be such an act. The joint recital of a creed is such an act. Swearing allegiance to a moral program may be such an act. The administration of a sacrament and participation in it are such acts. All such acts, of however great or small physical expression, are more or less religious according to the inner and real participation. The sum total of the public religious acts of a religious society or of a community constitutes its Cultus.

Fifthly, some system for the culture of the religious life, maintained by the exercises of a Cultus, is necessary to the perpetuation of religion. To begin with, this is religion, this is the experience of divine communion for which the moral life is only the means. It is this Cultus, moreover, which makes religion popular because enjoyable. Moral tasks are irksome, the requirements of duty are severe, the vicissitudes of life are often painful, the record of achievement is usually unsatisfying. Only an experience of religion, only the committal of all to God and the fresh vitality by Him bestowed can yield the highest joys. I know that many people come to church out of habit and some out of duty; I believe that most come for the joy of it. Whether the Cultus consists of fervid, free, and easy recitals of conversion experiences; or of a simple, dignified service of hymns, readings, and prayers, together with a strong and enthusing sermon; or follows the canon of the Mass, it is the emotional lift that the people come for.

This enjoyable experience is necessary to the life of religion, not only as a perpetual attraction, but as an unfailing source of vitality in the personal lives of the worshipers, and vitality in the life of their common cause. Moral tasks are not only irksome but exhausting. The religious experience recreates the power for them. In the long run, the energy for reforming society and evangelizing the world

A Brief for the Cultus

comes from the continued exercises of devotion which constitute the religious Cultus.

Sixthly, modern religion has a deficient Cultus. If our ordinary American churches had in themselves sufficiently supplied human need in this direction, there need not have been developed the so-called Cults. We have only ourselves to blame that we have given cause for these one-sided movements by our own one-sidedness. The intense modern interest in the moralizing of religion has undoubtedly swung the pendulum far away from the culture of religion. We are not yet through with this moralizing process, in some ways only beginning it. The social gospel is the cry of the hour, and rightly so. It needs no denial of this to sound a warning respecting the other side of religion. Indeed, secular sociologists themselves are in these days beginning to revalue the instructive, holding, dignifying, stabilizing worth of public religion. Meanwhile, the best Protestant minds are so engrossed in the all but overwhelming demands for the development of a new and more thoroughgoing Christian morality, that little attention has been given to the cultural promulgation of the principles and standards already achieved. We need a bigger and better Cultus. We need a more successful Apparatus of self-realization and of God-realization in these times.

Moreover, the culture of religion relates itself always, not merely to exercises in contemporary moral conviction, but also, or perhaps rather chiefly, to those timeless interests of human life, those forces and factors of human nature and divine nature which are so largely the same in every time and place. The bulk of the literature of the world revolves not about the innumerable divergencies of times and places, but about a few great themes of universal human experience. If this be true in the spiritual life of humanity as expressed in its letters, religion cannot do otherwise than take account of this testimony and this perennial human need. It is this fact which makes it possible for religion to develop a series of exercises which will set forth its faith and revivify its convictions and apply its solutions re-

Art & Religion

specting these few great themes and problems of human existence.

It is commonly admitted that in the average Protestant worship, the chief dependence for whatever heightened experience or *afflatus* is enjoyed, is upon the sermon. The sermon is becoming more and more inadequate to the task. As the level of education in the community rises, and especially the level of cultivation in the arts and letters, this is the more true. Why depend upon the art of rhetoric alone, when other arts also afford rich resources of inspiration? And it is the experience of many that to carry in the sermon the burden of the emotional effect often injures its usefulness as instruction and its candor as discussion. If it is to inspire, it cannot also sufficiently inform. Turn about, its task of instruction gets often in the way of its function of emotional uplift. It would not necessarily minimize the sermon if there could be also a highly successful and moving religious exercise. We have too commonly regarded the other exercises as preparation for the sermon. It is possible to make them complete and wonderful in themselves.

Even to regard them as preparatory to the sermon demands a vast improvement. The average exercise of public worship today constitutes neither a finished *Cultus* by itself nor a pertinent, skillful, and dramatic preparation for the sermon. The sermon, at its height, as a great prophetic utterance, is sufficient unto itself, and needs no considerable preparation or outside assistance. But we would do well to recognize the irregularity of the prophetic gift. It is an extremely conceited and presumptuous claim, which is frequently asserted, that the preacher's voice is regularly the voice of the prophet. The words teacher and priest suggest a more humble and accurate description of what the minister is in the usual services for public worship. But if this be true, it is fatuous to allow the most of all conscious and subconscious judgments about this matter to fall under the category of prophecy. It is better to aspire to be a good teacher and priest than constantly to assume the rôle of prophet while the people for long-continued periods suffer the dearth of any genuinely prophetic word, and at the same

A Brief for the Cultus

time are poorly fed and faintly stirred by a bungling and amateur exercise of devotion. These times of instability need amongst other things a more rich and full and dependable presentation of the rounded and complete message of the Christian faith than can be derived from the average sermonizer.

They certainly need, also, a more quiet and informing presentation of truth than can possibly come from the highly picturesque and rhetorical style of utterance which so often characterizes the exceptionally brilliant preacher. The culture of the spiritual life is insufficiently assisted by the ordinary sermon; by the extraordinary sermon, it is often misled, neglected, or directed into incidental and spasmodic considerations. Moreover, almost by definition the culture of the spiritual life is partly a matter of self-energy, and self-realization, and self-devotion, and not altogether a thing that can be done for you. The most stimulating sermon in the world leaves much to be desired as the only method of the Cultus. Response, meditation, participation on the part of the worshiper are more profound and beneficial than fitful excitement. Silence and composure, self-exercise and spiritual effort are greatly lacking in our American life. We are little practiced in the tutelage of the spiritual faculties and the discipline of the spiritual powers.

Adequate provision for these things needs something richer, something at once more stable and developing than brilliant sermonizing. Those churches whose vitality seems to depend upon a succession of exceptional orators are not well-grounded institutions. As a matter of fact, they are disappearing one by one, losing out to the slow but sure competition of a more churchly and broader based program of spiritual culture.

Seventhly, objections to the Cultus have been largely based upon its alleged nonmoral and unchanging character. There is undoubtedly a tendency for anything admittedly an end in itself to disregard its relations to other desirable ends. Every system of Cultus has displayed this tendency, the evangelical types no less than the ritual forms. Enjoyed for its own sake it easily becomes an oft-repeated celebration,

Art & Religion

its own justification, withdrawn from the concerns of practical life.

The first thing to say is that in a measure this is not only good but also right. One sometimes wonders why the worshiper in the church, accused of fostering his own pleasure and failing in the application of his faith to the affairs of institutional and public life, does not sometimes turn and demand that the accusers give him a little peace while they direct their efforts against the actor and the painter and the singer, and other devotees of the spiritual life. From one point of view, people have at least as good a right to enjoy the worship of God in a church as they have to enjoy a play, or an opera in the theater. It seems not to occur to anyone to accuse the regular attendant upon the productions of chamber music of being uninterested in social settlements or prohibition campaigns. It were better for religion not to be ashamed but to glory in the Cultus for its own sake.

In the next place, it is not true historically that the Cultus has been nonmoral. The primitive priest and the typical priest has been always a lawgiver and teacher. The cults which come nearest to being unmoral are not those most highly elaborated but rather the modern non-Christian movements centered in narrow forms of evangelicalism or in revived forms of apocalyptic hope. No religious movement is weaker ethically than the present-day revival of Messianism, centering its religious experience about the expectancy of world renewal by the literal reappearance of Christ in physical form. Of commendable piety on its religious side, it is deadening in its moral effects. It tends definitely to the withdrawal of its devotees from the strenuous human effort to improve society and all its institutions by the divine powers given to men to these ends.

The other objection is that the Cultus historically has been too unyielding to change. Two things are to be said concerning this charge.

The objection is not really against the use of forms but rather against the premises of thought behind the forms. Perhaps forms need to be changed, certainly the content of ideas in them needs to be changed, but not the use of forms.

A Brief for the Cultus

In another chapter I am presenting some facts which display the historical influence of the artist, that is, the formalist, as a prophet of change. That whole argument might well be inserted in this brief at this point.

The other thing to say is that the charge is partially admitted and claimed to be valuable rather than otherwise. Surely at a time like this, so confused in morals, so lacking in generally accepted ethical standards, the stabilizing value of any great system of Cultus is not to be underestimated. The prevalent individualism in ethics needs no encouragement but rather a tighter rein. The weakness of liberalism is its divisiveness. If the best moral aspiration of the day could be defined, crystallized, and promulgated in a great system of Cultus, its aims could be given far more practical effect in the national life. No liberal wishes to curtail the liberty of prophesying, but the voice of prophecy is by very definition the voice of protest, the cry for change. The very name of Protestantism declares its one weakness. Can the permanent nurture of the spiritual life be founded upon protest alone?

Morality is always suffering the dilemma of the old and the new. The conservation of the elder values, and the admission of the newer lights seem always to be contending factors. It is certainly no solution of the dilemma simply to choose sides. Some day concrete religion must solve the problem of being and becoming.

It is a practical no less than a philosophical question. Cannot the lovers of liberty and the claims of prophecy admit the necessity of establishing for at least a brief space from time to time, a system of dogmas, set forth and taught for the guidance and the stability of customary life? Cannot the conservatives, who fear change, be willing to incorporate amongst these dogmas themselves some principle of change that will serve to guarantee freedom and introduce the desirable new? A world fixed and set by the culture of old experience is stagnant and tyrannical. But a world perpetually agitated by discordant voices of change is a no less unhappy state in which to live.

We value the Old Testament prophets and applaud their

Art & Religion

protestantism. We take sides with them against the unmorality of the ancient Hebrew Cultus. It is, nevertheless, a profound mistake not to value that Cultus. Without it there had been nothing to protest against. It was the establishment, the crystallized experience, the holding, stabilizing force, which unified and centralized the national life. If it taught the wrong things, it taught something. If it resisted change, it was at least a power of resistance. It made of the people of Israel a powerful nation and did not leave them in the half-barbarous life of contending tribesmen. So always, if every historic Cultus has been chargeable with formalism and conservatism, it has also been chargeable with unification, cohesion, racial integration, and national survival.

Becoming is nothing if there is no Being behind it. The Cultus is the perennial Background of Change.

There is another fact of current life which needs notice in this connection. If our churches are in these days under-interested in anything that might properly be called a Cultus, preferring rather everything that has to do with the timely issues of practical life, this condition is vaguely unsatisfactory to the flower of our youth.

If the young are the great adventurers into the unknown and untried paths of the new, they are also generally occupied with the discovery of the precious treasures in the inherited culture of civilized life. Without exactly knowing it, they come back from college and find the churches lacking in culture. They are offended at the crudity of the speech, manners, and forms of religious life. Having found delight in the artistic and literary deposit as opened up to them in the schools, they find no comparable satisfactions in the religious world.

If the schools have failed to give them this delight, then the schools have failed. If they have succeeded, it is a loss to the society of the time if that early prompting to culture is submerged and inhibited in the practical world. Or, if it is not lost, it turns for sustenance away from the churches to theaters, or clubs and other secular centers of the cultivated life. I have failed to be clear at all, if it is not by this

A Brief for the Cultus

time apparent that Cultus and Culture have deeper connections than a common derivative root word.

Eighthly, a modern Cultus is possible. We have perhaps too easily assumed that it is no longer possible to devise anything in ritual comparable to the great systems of Cultus in times past. We think we are not sufficiently naïve, that we are too introspective and analytical and unchildlike to share the pageantry of a great celebration. Our enactments are dramatic and not ritualistic. We look upon pageants rather than ourselves participating in the original primary human actions of which pageants are only the pale representations.

Nevertheless, I should like to have walked in the Panathenaic Procession. I should like to have made the devotees' progress through the great pylons from lower and larger court to higher and smaller court, and on so far as I could go toward the last and inmost shrine of such a temple as that of Medhinet Habu. Certainly it appears difficult to conceive of man, thoroughly modernized, as ever again capable of enjoying the breathless delay and anxious expectancy with which the reappearance of the high priest on the great Day of Atonement was awaited by those who stood in the court of Israel celebrating their most solemn sanctification and renewal.

We seem to be incapable of so keen a feeling as the hazard of life, the danger of divinity, or the peril of godlessness. We enjoy these things only in reproductions of the drama or of the imagination. Yet I am not content with Miss Jane Harrison, unless I misread her, to describe the history of these things as the story of the perennial necessity for ritual to become merely art. Is there no way to complete the circle by utilizing the arts to bring us again to hours of noble worship? Despite the fact that we may be no longer childlike, that we seem to be such inveterate self-observers, I believe it to be possible to proceed in the direction of a genuine Cultus.

But we must begin very humbly and simply. It is easy to become artificial and bizarre. There are three open opportunities for improvement and growth.

Quietly and naturally we can improve our ordinary pub-


Art & Religion

lic worship in many ways—by simpler, nobler, and more beautiful church buildings; by altogether more pertinent and better disposed religious music; by high points of stimulus in the placing of a painting, a window, or a statue if we can afford it; by a more unified and climactic order of service; by patient attention at many little points in the administration of the sacraments; by better prepared prayers; and by more instruction for securing spiritual effort and reverent expectancy on the part of the people.

Another opportunity is that of making the most of special occasions. In almost every church and community through the years, there are occasions and days which can be more effectively celebrated, special union services between churches, community recitals, community discussions, patriotic meetings, festivals of the church year, and other such like. These will afford many a chance for some simple common recital, mutual avowal, or even dramatic representation.

In this connection, we should much more frequently call upon musicians and composers for especially prepared works. The organist of a great city church should be capable of preparing fresh music of his own writing for responsive services at the Christmas, Lenten, Easter, and other seasons, for memorial or dedication exercises, services in which some of the great themes and experiences of the spiritual life might be set forth with moving power by the combination of all the arts. We are undoubtedly entering upon a kind of life in which the community consciousness will play a great part and demand its appropriate and adequate expression by these means.

In addition to these, there should be many more experiments and efforts in the way of small groups and classes gathered for the culture of the spiritual life, such as Mrs. Porter's Discussion Clubs in New Haven. Perhaps we should all copy and extend the Methodist class meeting system. Special services for the unwell and the tired may be held in churches strong enough to provide a varied ministry. There should be week-day hours of prayer in the open church. Our larger and better Protestant churches have



CARVED OAK TRIPTYCH

*"The Supper at Emmaus," for Emmanuel Church, Baltimore, Maryland.
Waldemar H. Ritter, Architect; I. Kirchmayer, Sculptor.*

A Brief for the Cultus

already revived the older custom of keeping the church building open and ready for meditation and prayer all the days of the week. This will be greatly extended in the early future.

Moreover, there is need for a new prayer book. The modern cults with their manuals of private spiritual exercise and devotion have not made great inroads upon the bodies of Christians furnished with a book of prayers. It is to be hoped that soon some group of gifted and progressive leaders will begin the preparation of a Christian's Book of Devotion, which will contain a modern guide to Bible reading, a collection of prayers new and old, and perhaps other material. Meanwhile every family may be urged to possess a copy of the Book of Common Prayer; or "Prayers, Ancient and Modern," selected by Mary Tileston; or some other collection of prayers and proposals for meditation.

These suggestions by no means exhaust the possibilities. They are merely intended to intimate some simple and for the most part modest ways in which it is possible to begin an extended revival of the culture of religion. Let anyone utilize them all, and he will have a noble Cultus already. Whatever else hereafter may be, no one can tell. The temper of the new age will be far different from that just past. It will find itself and express itself according to its own genius. But there are already many signs, unless we fall backward into discordant and chaotic life generally, that the new age will seek to cultivate its ideals and hopes in more brilliant forms than we now use, and inculcate its standards by a more effective mode of religious education, and devote itself to enjoying the "history of the human spirit" and the presence of the Divine Spirit by usages and forms that will constitute a great historic Cultus.

Chapter IX: Prophet and Priest

THE conflict between priest and prophet is as old as history and it is not yet settled. Priests and prophets are always at odds. They always have been and they are now.

Priests have always stood for order and stability, the maintenance of things as they are; prophets have always produced disorder and change and hoped for things as they should be. Priests are conservers and instructors; prophets are radicals and destructors.

The conflict goes on because we have not yet learned to conserve the ancient and at the same time take on the new; we have as yet failed to solve the dilemma of stability and progress. We think we believe in progress, but usually resent it when we see it, for it always hits us at the sorest spot, it always strikes where we least expect. We assume that we have an open ear to new teaching, but when it comes, we cry out in dismay: Oh, yes, I believe in progress, but I had no idea you meant that. I can't accept that. We go on to complain of the new doctrine: Why, that subverts everything. Where are we, anyway, if that is adopted? But that is precisely what prophecy is, some new doctrine that is strong enough to subvert everything.

There was in an ancient day a priest by the name of Amaziah at the famous sanctuary of Bethel. His king and patron, Jeroboam II, was strong and successful. Commerce was good, the arts of life were advanced, religious observance was popular and elaborate. Amaziah conducted the burnt offerings and peace offerings, taught the children to observe the fast days, instructed the people in the moral law, and passed to and fro in the solemn assemblies. He was evidently a faithful priest. Then along came Amos the prophet and criticised everything. He said that the poor were being oppressed and the needy exploited and that the women

Prophet and Priest

were too luxurious. Moreover, he claimed that the Lord had no delight in their priestly offerings, anyway, and would not smell in their solemn assemblies. Yea, rather, for all their sins the Lord would destroy the house of Jeroboam and lay waste the land. This was more than Amaziah could endure, so he "sent to Jeroboam king of Israel, saying, Amos hath conspired against thee in the midst of the house of Israel: the land is not able to bear all his words. Also, Amaziah said unto Amos, O thou seer, go, flee thee away into the land of Judah, and there eat bread, and prophesy there: but prophesy not again any more at Bethel: for it is the king's chapel, and it is the king's court." To this Amos replied that the Lord had sent him and proceeded with his denunciation.

This story is a typical picture of prophecy and its obstruction by the priesthood. The priest teaches personal and individual matters; the prophet carries these up to some national or universal view for fresh examination and revision. The priest seeks the prevalence and power of present morals and customs as they are maintained by rites and forms; the prophet breaks present forms to lay foundations for a better morality that shall be. The priest relies on some ancient sanction for his sacred authority; the prophet claims the authority of immediate inspiration.

It is a small and inadequate conception of the prophet to regard him as one who foretells events. The true prophet is not concerned with foretelling events, but with foretelling the destiny of the new view of life which he has received. The true prophet receives the divine inspiration of some great new truth, some new way of looking at life. Thenceforth life as it is appears wrong to him; he criticises and condemns it. He does not know future events. But what he does know is that somewhere, sometime, all things, government and commerce, morals public and private, must come round to his idea, must square themselves with his new truth. He throws his word into the stream of history and lets it work. This is what Elijah did, and Amos and Jesus, Luther and Wendell Phillips.

We have thought of prophets as religious leaders whose

Art & Religion

inspiration was acknowledged and whose word was received. This is because we look back so far on the most of them, and also because it is hard to believe they have anything in common with us nowadays. The fact is that, at the time, the prophet is almost always unpopular and rejected. The New Testament honors the Old Testament prophets, but in their own days the Old Testament prophets were not so honored. Jesus often thought of himself as a prophet and had the usual prophetic experience—"A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country." And out of his own bitter experience of rejection he thought of the prophets of old as he wept over the great city, "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee."

Priests are teachers of the laws of life as they are received, upholders of the current customs and practices, mainstaying traditions, conservative because their business is to conserve the good that men already have. They are therefore none too friendly to prophets who protest and oppose tradition, who try to break down forms in the name of inner and spiritual light. The appearance of the prophet has always troubled the priest. What shall he do? If the prophet begins to gain popular support the priest declares that he is crazy. This has often been done and is not unlike the suggestion which President Hadley says that "hard-headed business men make regarding poets, professors and other idealists 'That they have a bee in their bonnets.'" If this ridicule does not succeed, the prophet is persecuted. Amaziah the priest ordered Amos out of Bethel; Isaiah probably died a martyr to his prophetic truth; Jeremiah was tried for his life in the royal court in Jerusalem; Socrates was poisoned; John Huss was burned alive; Luther was hounded and excommunicated; and more than one professor has been driven from his university chair. Yet the word of true prophets has prevailed and is prevailing. People are always looking back to old prophets to honor those that are dead, and failing to see the live ones present with them.

And yet—there is something to say for the priest. If the true prophet often suffers persecution and martyrdom, he

Prophet and Priest

usually receives, at last, superior honors. The priest is never likely to receive either. When the prophetic storm has passed and the church and state are strewn with wreckage, the priest must take up the slow, hard work of reconstruction; he must gather up the fragments of old and new and make a practical building. When the final issue of anti-slavery prophecy had been settled by the Civil War, there remained the wreckage of the old South, and long pains of reconstruction were necessary before the new South began to appear. When the great prophets of the Reformation pulled down the whole structure of the mediæval church in several nations, someone had to go to work to build another structure that would preserve the results and pass them on to other generations. This has proved to be so hard a task that the priests of Protestantism have not yet devised as good a system for conserving sanctions and standards as the old one was.

The work of the priest is a difficult one. He must take the new truths of the prophet and the great general principles laid down and he must study and apply them to particular conduct. He must tell people just what the great principle means in their homes, in their work, and in personal morals. He must say what is right and wrong in each special instance in such a way as to induce general agreement. The prophet disintegrates old standards; the priest must integrate new ones; and that is a very hard thing to do. It is disastrous to life to be all the while in a prophetic whirlwind. Society needs a hundred years or so of quietness and stability to make civilization possible.

The Priest is a Teacher. But how shall he teach the youth, if there be no general agreement about right and wrong which can be conserved and maintained for a season? How shall he instruct if there be no structure to put in? How shall childhood be guided and builded up into the right if you cannot say: This is the truth accepted among us, these are the standards society holds, this is the way you should go, walk ye in it? The priest is not therefore to be too seriously blamed for becoming a dogmatist. This is the function we have assigned him. He must integrate and construct,

Art & Religion

collect and sort and arrange his materials, and build a habitable house of truth. He can, of course, do much more than priests ever have done to prevent the tyranny of old dogmas. He can say at the end of every list of standards or ideals: Moreover, it is one of the tenets of our system to be always expecting change and always working for progress; it is one of the articles of our faith to make earnest with the doctrine of the continued revelations of the divine Spirit. This, too, is a dogma, but one that turns the flank of the dilemma of prophet and priest.

Yet the solution is easier in theory than in practice. Protestant ministers are expected to be both priest and prophet, but few succeed. Many are greatly to be blamed for becoming no less priestly, dogmatic, and crystallized than the Catholic type. Others have become so individualistic and prophetic as gravely to threaten the whole stability of Protestantism. Witness the independent movements of theater and hall in every large city, the prevalence of timely topics in innumerable pulpits, the many popular preachers who center attention and devotion upon themselves to the weakening of the institution, and, in general, the failure to recognize the priestly element in the function of the modern clergyman. It is not for social reformers and zealots to be too severe in their condemnation of men who know what they are doing and why, when they hold steadily to their humble priestly task of teaching the youth standards and ideals as they are, while waiting for the prophets to agree among themselves about the faiths and works that are next to engage human devotion and energy.

The Priest is a Spiritual Adviser. As such, he has to do not so much with those timely and social questions which are the interest of the prophet as with the timeless concerns of the individual life which are essentially the same whether the person live here or in Mars, in one age or another—birth, death, and the beating sun, and the arts of gracious living. With what spirit and fortitude shall a man be prepared to meet loss and defeat, sickness and death, and every evil hour? With what spiritual mastery shall a man control

Prophet and Priest

the experiences of temptation and success and riches? With what faith and hope shall a man envision his destiny?

Admonition and exhortation, comfort, the resolution of doubt, the healing of the inly blind, these all are the uses of a good priest and true. He is friend and fatherly confessor, counselor, guide, and man of God, bringing near the fresh peace and joy of the timeless and eternal world. He invites the strong to bear the infirmities of the weak, and in his church provides them a definite and ever ready medium for that ministry, varied, adaptable, and permanent. He carries to lonely, sick, and sorrowing persons the assurances of the faith, assurances, believe me, out of my own humble experience, more than doubly strong because not merely his own and personal but rather of his office, representing the strong body of believers and loyal workers behind him and around him in the church, whose servant he is, of whose word and faith he is but the mouthpiece: assurances received also because conveyed by one set apart to ponder holy things and pray for all souls. This makes very respectable the quiet men who prefer to give themselves to this sacred calling rather than to become sensational preachers or meddling politicians.

The Priest is a Pastor and Bishop. He is a shepherd and overseer, keeping watch and ward of the flock committed to his care. He is an evangelist, seeking the wandering and the weary. His business is the cure of souls. Always at the background of his consciousness is concern for the growth and development of persons. He sees others as they cannot see themselves and longs to help them correct their faults and enlarge their ideals. His interest is, like the novelist's, in his characters; an artistic interest not in what a man does but in what he becomes, not in what he accomplishes but in what at last he is. But his interest is not aloof as is the novelist's, for it is sometimes given to him to play, not fate, but divinity in the human story around him. More often than you suppose, a minister will decide some practical question, not according to expediency or organizational efficiency, but according to the yield of character influence upon the persons involved.

Art & Religion

The Priest is an Artist. He is charged with the development and maintenance of the cultus, the offices of public worship, marriage and burial, and the administration of sacraments. He addresses not the mind alone but the feelings and the imagination. He uses the arts of speech and of ritual to aid in the reproduction of spiritual experience. With the problems of public worship other chapters are concerned. Here may well come in a word respecting the more private functions of the priest as artist, as on the occasions of marriage and burial.

A ceremony of the priest is precisely like a poem or other work of art in that it enables us to say to each other what we should otherwise leave unsaid or conceal. One of my friends who sent his only son to the war has written a little book of very beautiful sonnets setting forth some of the noblest feelings and faiths I have seen expressed. He would hardly bring himself to say baldly and nakedly in bare prose and open statement what he has told in the poems. He would feel an immodesty in such an utter exposure of his deepest heart. The form of the verse is a cloak partly concealing the passion beneath, yet enabling its release and expression. So are we all reticent, bearing in silence what we cannot speak save with tears, not wishing to wear our hearts upon our sleeves. The ceremony speaks for us. We cannot utter all or a part of that majesty of respect we feel for a human life that has left its house of clay, or that solicitude and love with which we would follow lives newly wedded, nor can we willingly keep silence. The ceremony speaks for us, its cloak of form at once concealing and expressing our inner passion.

So, also, every other cultural exercise of religion is a work of art and the priest is an artist, not only in presentation like the actor and singer, but in origination and creation as sculptor and composer. His work should be approached with the same canons of appreciation as that of other artists nor should there be anything falsely sacrosanct about him to ward off judgment on the success or failure of his artistry.

All these things may be regarded as priestly functions without any claim to peculiar power or authority, and with-

Prophet and Priest

out any denial of the typical Protestant doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. They might perhaps as well be defined under the terms *pastor* or *minister*. But they are certainly not prophetic functions. The term *minister* in its specific meaning includes the prophetic. I do not favor the official designation of the clergyman as *priest*, pleading only a more general popular sense of the labors, responsibilities, and values suggested by that name.

The pastor of a modern church must be jealous of his work and word as a prophet, a severe and perilous calling. It is disastrous for religion if the voices for social justice, the prophetic demands for righteousness in all departments of life, be found chiefly outside rather than inside the institution of religion, and we are, alas, close to this disaster. Yet some of these voices are not worthy of attention when they lightly estimate the quiet, patient, and regular work of those who aid in the maintenance of public order and morale through established institutions. It is always easier to stand off and criticise than to share the long labor of successful moral integration, construction, and conservation. It would be a profound benefit to society if there might develop among prophets outside and inside the church, laymen and artists and ministers and all, a fuller appreciation of the worth of such priestly functions as I have merely sketched.

Part of the failure of the ministry is not its own, but the excessive demands upon the thought and labor of a single person. It is enough to be a good priest. Why expect the minister to be also several other things? He himself will wish sometimes to speak as a prophet, a prophet of the most high God, but his usual and daily labor is that of a priest, not a worker of magic nor a monger of breaking authority, but a priest after the order of the endless life.

Chapter X: The Artist as Prophet

ONE of the most important objections to the greater development of the arts on the part of religion is the alleged conservative character of art. Forms are fixed. They perpetuate the ideas which fashion them. They conserve the traditions prevalent at the time of their creation. They maintain in human life, by the power of their beauty, faiths and ideals that otherwise would be discarded.

There is much evidence in support of this objection. It is questionable whether mediaeval religion would still be so prevalent in many nations were it not for the vast and impressive character of the mediaeval church buildings. Rituals and liturgies tend to be continued in use, however archaic in style, resisting change long after innumerable changes are demanded on the part of progressive spiritual experience.

Before coming to the main suggestion in reply to this objection, it is worth noting that there is something good as well as something unfortunate about this conserving power of the arts. Many good things of the past are worth conserving. Human nature and human experience do not so profoundly change in the course of a thousand years as to invalidate all the elder insights. The religious culture of the future will ever be enriched by the spiritual values of the Bible and also by other expressions of the spiritual life in various older and later times. Many of the prayers in the Anglican Collect are derived from the older liturgies. They belong to us all. They give voice to perennial needs of the human heart and to many of the permanent values of spiritual experience. In these times of superficial culture, it is more than ever worth while to be surrounded by something that is memorial of the august life of the past. There is a conservatism not narrowing in its effects but broadening. The tendency of religious art to perpetuate the force and

The Artist as Prophet

prevalence of the faiths of the past is very far from being unfortunate.

There is another tendency of art and of the artist, however, which in the long run is a more sufficient force to counteract any losses ascribed to the conservative character of the arts. The artist is a prophet in his own right no less than are other innovators. There are two ways in which this is true. Artists are not only constantly saying new things or devising new forms, but they have, in the past, many times expressed by their manner something different from the subject matter of their work.

First, the artist is one who sees things that other men ignore. If he expresses what he desires to express, it is always some fresh way of looking at things. He is always adding to the world of created beauty. Standing apart from practical life, at least imaginatively, he is little hindered by the prejudices and concerns of the ordinary man. He is not himself in the "game." Sitting as a spectator, his eyes are clear of the dust and passion of the struggle.

I am keenly conscious of a great difficulty here. There is much bad art in the world because of this separation on the part of artists. Perhaps there is no moral evil greater than that of looking upon life as a spectacle. It is contempt of persons. Every artist is in constant danger of this evil point of view. As a man and citizen he is required to be a man among men. As an artist he is required to stand apart and to be an onlooker. I believe that it makes a profound difference as to which is the real self of the artist and which is his assumed dramatic rôle. If his real self is the spectator, and he merely makes dramatic excursions into real life, I think his art will be bad art. If his real self is man and citizen, and he makes the supremely dramatic effort of imaginative withdrawal, I think his art will be good art.

In any case, whether the aloofness be real or assumed, it must be in some profound sense real for the purposes of good artistry. It must be a genuine attempt to see more things and to see them differently than they are seen during the actions of common life. As already suggested in another chapter, this is why the artist has always been accused of

Art & Religion

lawlessness. And this is why there is no need for liberals to be afraid of him. The historic freshness of art is a great fact, as well as the historic conserving power of the arts. Mr. Bertrand Russell says that "art springs from a wild and anarchic side of human nature; between the artist and bureaucrat there must always be a profound antagonism."

The artist is almost always a prophet of change, being dissatisfied with the world of ugly facts, loving the more romantic world that is potentially beautiful. It has been a matter of frequent observation among critics that great artists have oftentimes anticipated by the reach of their imaginative intuitions, points of view later conceived or confirmed in science or politics.

Secondly, the artist early began to depict things for their own worth rather than for the purposes of his patron, the religionist. His subject matter immemorially has been the succession of divinities and saints to be represented by statues and paintings, to convey the faiths of religion. But from very ancient days, the artist seemed to peep out from behind his subject matter. He has spoken his own independent word, proclaiming by his lines and colors a message of his own, sometimes even contradicting the subject matter of his work. One or two allusions will illustrate the point.

The earlier wall relief drawings amongst the Egyptian antiquities are vigorous, simple, childlike, unsophisticated pictures. It is hard to discover in them—as, for example, in the tombs of Sakkara—much of any separate feeling for beauty on the part of the artist. But the later works of the imperial age are very different. Such wall reliefs as those of the Temple of Seti at Abydos are religious in theme, and strictly religious in the conventional treatment of the figures, but they reveal highly self-conscious canons of artistry on the part of the designer. Despite the subject matter and despite formal requirements as to its treatment, there is a lyrical feeling about lines, and a very advanced conception of composition which conveys to us across these many centuries the artist's separate satisfaction in pure beauty. It is almost impossible to draw any other conclusion from the skill with which the artist has elaborated the various

The Artist as Prophet

borders about his space and utilized repetitive forms to make a successful decoration. The walls are very beautiful in themselves as decorated surfaces.

The same tendency is amply displayed by the Greeks. Perhaps, at the highest point, form and content are so unified that there is no suggestion of the matter we are here discussing. But it is scarcely conceivable that Praxiteles was as much interested in representing the god **Hermes** as in representing an ideal man. At least, so the great statue at Olympia appears to me.

The same is true of many of the great works of the Italian Renaissance. Even very early the separate impulse of the artist was manifested. For example, in the Crucifixion scene on Nicola Pisano's pulpit at Pisa, the figure on the cross is not drawn true to life, but gracefully, as though to make a decoration. So also, other figures in the bronze panels by the same artist on the doors of the Baptistery in Florence.

I believe that the greatest art is that in which form and content are so thoroughly at one that the total effect is unified. Artists should not be required to say things which they do not themselves believe. The history of their work in the world testifies their revolt when they have been called upon to do so.

In this way, the artistic work of many times and places has been definitely prophetic; that is, it has criticised by its own independent interest in life and the beauty of life, the particular conceptions of the religion of its day. The suggestion I am trying to make is quite precisely stated in an address of J. A. Symonds on the New Spirit. "Whatever the subject matter, . . . silent and unperceived, art, by its naturalism, sapped orthodoxy much in the same way as scholarship, by its rationalism, was serving the same purpose."*


There is, therefore, on the whole, nothing to fear from the conservatism of the artist. His conservatism is never so objectionable as that of the credalist. If works of religious art set forth the conception of the times, so do creeds. But

* Symonds, "Last and First," p. 40.

Art & Religion


when creeds are gone they are of little further worth, while the artist's formulation contains not only a perpetual message of beauty but a proper conserving memorial of the former values. I seldom read the Nicene Creed or the Heidelberg Catechism, but very frequently get pleasure and benefit from an excellent copy of one of Bellini's Madonnas on the wall of my study. Perhaps the artist helps as much as anyone in solving the ever recurrent dilemma of conservatism and change. He represents the great conceptions of faith and preserves them, but also by the values of his beautiful form he transcends the particular ideas intimated.

There is a permanence about any work of beauty. It is ever old and ever new. High art conserves the apprehensions of the elder ages; by it we have communion with the fathers. And the highest art never fades. It is always second sight, always revealing, with true prophetic spirit, that things are not what at first sight they appear to be.



SILVER CROZIER

Made by Charles Thomae.



CHRISTMAS IN HEAVEN

Woodcarving by I. Kirchmayer, in George G. Booth Collection, Detroit Institute of Art.



ST. PETER

Carving in wood by I. Kirchmayer.

Chapter XI: Symbols and Sacraments

THE artist has usually used one of two methods. He has begun with an idea and then selected some specific object to represent his idea; or he has looked upon an object in such a way as to see its ideal significance. In the one case we see his idea objectified, in the other the object idealized. These methods are Classicism and Romanticism in the history of the arts. In religion, they are Symbolism and Sacramentalism.

Almost everyone will readily think of examples of this fact. A mural decoration in a courthouse, for instance, begins with a conception of the majesty of the law and portrays the theme by a series of figures intended to symbolize it. Statues, paintings, tableaux, certain novels, certain music, or other works of art definitely represent "Justice," "Peace," "Autumn," "War," "History." Such works are Scopas' "Demeter," the most of the early Italian Madonnas, Breton's "Gleaner," Puvis de Chavannes' "Physics." Other works seem not to have been conceived in this generic manner. They, rather, picture some specific object, call our notice to the object that we may look upon it until we see that it is infinitely significant. Such objects are "The Dying Gaul," a bowl of "Roses," "Gleaners," as Millet sees them, "Burghers of Calais," persons in the "Spoon River Anthology."

We are not here entering a fine or elaborate discussion of these facts, nor attempting to catalog the arts. Perhaps innumerable works of art do not fall under either of these categories. We are not here discussing decorative, realistic, lyrical, or other sorts of beauty. But a very large part of all the art objects of the world have been fashioned by one of these two processes. In the one case, a great conception of universal range, of far and high reality or import, is communicated by near and specific representation. In the other case, the seer asks us to look upon a near and familiar object, and so por-

Art & Religion

trays that object that we, too, may see that it is more than it seems to be, investing it with import and significance high and universal. Browning's "Fra Lippo Lippi" describes the effort of the Italian painter's mind to change from one method to the other.

"Suppose I've made her eyes all right and blue,
Can't I take breath and try to add life's flesh,
And then add soul and heighten them threefold?
Or say there's beauty with no soul at all—
(I never saw it—put the case the same—)
If you get simple beauty and naught else,
You get about the best thing God invents:


* * * * *

But why not paint these
Just as they are, careless what comes of it?
God's works—paint any one, and count it crime
To let a truth slip.

* * * * *

How much more,
If I drew higher things with the same truth!
That were to take the Prior's pulpit-place,
Interpret God to all of you!"

Religion has always used and must always use both of these methods. Symbolism in religion is of the nature and of the perennial need of the classic method in art. The person who claims to have no interest in symbolism talks nonsense. He cannot read the morning paper—for every word is a symbol. He could not sing "The Star-Spangled Banner." Some sort of symbolism is necessary to communication of any kind. Heightened and pictorial symbolism is necessary to vivid and forceful communication. The theater, the army, the government, the commercial world, all make constant and varied use of symbols to remind people of their existence and character. Religion also must communicate itself by powerful and beautiful symbols. Even those who do not take kindly to the use of an actual wooden cross upon an



Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue, Architect.

PULPIT · FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH · PITTSBURGH · PENNSYLVANIA

The statuettes in the sides of the octagon are figures of St. Augustine, St. Bernard, Luther, Roger Williams, Count Zinzendorf, and Adoniram Judson.

Symbols and Sacraments

altar or gable of a church readily sing "In the cross of Christ I glory," and "O make thy church a lamp of burnished gold." Christianity is represented to the consciousness of millions of people by the sign of the cross. Should Constantinople again fall under the governance of Christian powers, it will be symbolized in the East by the taking down of the Crescent from the ancient church of Haggia Sophia and the raising of the Cross upon the noble dome. Symbolism is not, of course, confined to the instrumentality of physical objects, but includes also the use of great symbolic conceptions. A creed is not the faith itself, but a symbol of the faith. In his religious teaching, in his attempt to make God conceivable and real and near to ordinary people, Jesus was constantly using the symbol of Fatherhood. The inventor of new and true symbols of the truth is a great benefactor.

If symbols are powerful, they are also weak and inadequate. No symbol can present the fulness of the reality. No particular can contain all the nature of the universal it seeks to represent. It is useful, however, and true, if it leads in the right direction, if its partial and pale reflection is correct so far as it goes.

And if symbols are powerful they are dangerous. They tend to take the place of reality. They tend to become idols. They are likely to attract the devotee to themselves, failing to lead him on to the larger realities they stand for. No one denies this danger, but no strong man or no vitalized community has ever been disposed to reject powerful and useful instruments because they were dangerous. The surgeon's knife may be used for murder, but it must still be kept sharp as an instrument of good. Human passions are dangerous, human liberties are dangerous, but for their several possibilities of good we value them all. If you want an instrument of power, you must risk an instrument of danger, understand it, master it, and use it aright.

And there is something to say for idolatry. It is at least an open question whether it may not be as well for a man to bow to an idol as not to bow to anything at all. An examination of the psychological history of mankind would probably reveal that, up to a certain point, the experience of

Art & Religion

people under the sway of heightened emotion is much the same whether set going by a modern rhetorical address or by Aaron's Golden Calf. Whatever takes people up and out of their workaday world to a desirable place of changed outlook, where they are dissatisfied with that ordinary world, where their imagination is expanded with the intimations of an Over World, and sends them back refreshed and revived, is so far good, whether the apparatus be of one sort or another. The moral value of the experience will be different according to the moral equipment of the society or persons involved; the energizing value may be the same. It is by no means certain that the moral ideas suggested at an opera or even a symphony concert are greatly superior to those which were intimated to the people attending the rites of Ammon-Ra or a Feast of the Passover. Nor is it certain that the moral worth of the fervors of tabernacle devotees is greater than that of the theater. The experience of worship must always be divided into its two parts, its energizing value and its practical value. On the energy side, the idol worshiper may often make a better showing than the intellectualist and, even on the moral side, not all the idolaters have carried away a less humane point of view than some modern religionists who are out of touch with the best morals. I am trying to suggest here that the danger of the symbol becoming an idol is no greater than the danger of impractical and unmoral religious excitement stirred by different means. And also that this danger is no more undesirable than the danger of coldness and hardness and materialism without any emotional stir at all.

If the symbol is at times likely to take the place of the reality, there is also a sense in which the reality does reside in the symbol. A soldier on patrol duty, guarding whatever he is set to guard, might well say, "Strike me and you strike the United States." Christians have always conceived of Christ as the great symbol of God, but also have always conceived of God as being in some profound sense in Christ. To reject him is to reject the Father, to see him is to see the Father. With this suggestion, we turn to the other side of the artistic and religious method.

Symbols and Sacraments

As the artist portrays a particular object, lifting it into its universal import, so the religionist performs a specific act which he calls a sacrament.

Protestants in general do not have a very clear conception of what a sacrament is. We do not understand the meaning of the word and we are suspicious of it. Certainly it is used oftentimes to mean something entirely foreign to our whole conception of religion. Possibly the word should be entirely discarded, as being obscure and misleading. Possibly, also, there are important meanings in it which we have forgotten or undervalued.

To begin with, the word is derived from the same root as the word sacred, itself only slightly less obscure in our thought. Yet we do recognize the necessity of making some distinction as between sacred and secular. If in some sense all things are sacred, the result of attention to this side of the truth is really to conceive of all things as merely secular. There are many conceptions and the words which represent them that merge into each other or that are simply the opposite sides of the same shield. Nevertheless, the shield has the two sides. A sacred thing is a thing dedicated, belonging to God, partaking of the nature of Divinity. A sacramental act is an act of dedication. In some sense the converse is true, that every act of dedication is a sacrament, because it partakes of the nature of Divinity. There are things in human life which ordinary men generally feel to be sacred, holy, beyond cavil, inviolate. The burial field of heroic warrior dead is somehow sacred soil. The birth chamber is a sacred place. A great vow is a sanctified thing, such as the "Oath of the Tennis Court," the Declaration of Independence which pledged "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." The giving of self to serve a cause, the laying down of life for another, the self-loss, peril, and pain of motherhood—these are sacred things, in some sense the manifestation of Divinity in human life, in some sense placing the devotee beyond praise or blame. In a slightly more restricted sense, any conscious and formal act of dedication is sacramental, such as the mutual vows of marriage. If the dedication is to God it becomes a definite sacrament.

Art & Religion

It is a religious view to hold that God is literally present in the sacrament. A human being in the act of consecration, putting forth the spiritual effort of self-offering, is then and there godlike, then and there partakes of the nature of Divinity, then and there has God in him, and is seen to be God possessed. As the artist portrays a particular object to help us see that it is more than it seems to be, so the priest draws his people to the performance of an act in which they are seen to be not only human but divine. In the sacrament of Baptism the child is dedicated to God; his life is seen to be of divine as well as of human origin; his life is recognized as belonging to God as well as to his parents, the state, or to himself. His parents dedicate themselves to the task of bringing him up in the "nurture and admonition of the Lord." They are seen to be not merely and physically father and mother, but priests of God entrusted with a holy office.

In view of the paucity of ritual material amongst the Protestant churches, and of the difficulties in the invention of new exercises instinct with deep and moving meaning, it may be well to consider increasing the number of sacraments. Perhaps one or more others of the early seven could be reëstablished. Perhaps two sacraments should be developed out of the present usages connected with the sacrament of Baptism. It would simply involve our all becoming Baptists in the matter of the restriction of that sacrament to believers only. It would constitute a more notable form to mark the matured acceptance of the Christian life and thus go far, as the Baptists have always held, to safeguard the purity of the church and its regenerate life. In this case, we should stand greatly in need of a sacrament of Christening to take the place of infant Baptism. Such an act, to mark the Christianizing or the inclusion of the child in the Christian community, the recognition that it belongs to God, and the vow of responsibility for its Christian nurture, would constitute, as at present, a beautiful and holy presentation.

In the formal sense, a sacrament has an outward as well as an inward side: it includes physical elements. There is nothing especially mysterious about the nature of the ele-

Symbols and Sacraments

ments, except in so far as the nature of matter in general is mysterious. Nor is there anything exceptionally mysterious about the nature of the influence or purpose of the material elements, except as the nature of all sensational influence is mysterious. The formulas that are spoken, the water that is poured, both physical act and material element, these call for, signify, and express the inner effort and act of the spirit. And if they do so successfully, then God is in the sacrament. If the outward acts, elements, or symbols do not serve to produce any motion of the spirit, either in the heart of the priest or of the people, then no sacrament has occurred, and no grace of God has been imparted.

It is only by long association that many have come to regard the material element as sacred. To the Protestant experience, the material element is essentially only a matter of artistry, a symbol, an idealization. The use made of the material element is not a matter of artistry, but a sacrament in which Divinity is present. In other words, the view of many Protestants that God is not in the sacrament is not the view here expressed. The conception here set forth is that Divinity is actually in the sacrament, as being in the spirits of persons performing the religious act which we call the sacrament. On the other hand, the view excludes the conception of any sense in which Divinity is extraordinarily resident in the material elements. Of course our conclusion comes from our definition. Otherwise define a sacrament and you must otherwise conceive the elements. Or begin with another conception of the outward form and it would be difficult to define the sacrament, in our manner, as a dedicatory religious act of persons.

The sacrament of the Eucharist is more complicated and so more mysterious than any other. Just as with some works of art it is difficult to decide whether we have the idea objectified or the object idealized, so here we halt between the symbolic and mystic conceptions. Both are involved. If even in Protestant feeling the strictly symbolical is minimized and merged into the sacramental or mystical, it is not difficult to see how the Romanist has confused the self-offering of the devotee with the formal offering of the

Art & Religion

elements, taking the elements out of the realm of symbolism into that of idealization and transubstantiation.

It is essentially the same point of view, often expressed by Protestants when they refer to the actual bread and wine as "the sacrament." In our view these elements are not the sacrament, but the symbols idealized to call forth and assist the inner and profound sacramental act. In whatever sense sanctity may be said to attach to the elements, according to the practice of some after they are set apart and thus consecrated, in actual usage amongst the reformed churches, the prayer of "consecration" expresses only a slight interest in the setting apart of the elements and a deep interest in the consecration of persons.

The abundant danger of this view is the danger of subjectivity and informality; the danger of placing a too slight value upon the external and formal administration, and the danger of a merely humanized experience. We do not sufficiently believe in or expect an actual visitation of Divinity in the sacrament, thinking rather of the experience as our own. And so, thinking of the experience as our own production, we have too little considered the powers of the church and of the formal administration.

There is an objective value in the historic sacraments. The nature of the spiritual life in a material world is ever a profound mystery. The nature of human salvation and sanctification is mysterious. One of its problems Mr. Hocking has stated thus: "To be disposed to save others we must first be saved ourselves; yet to be saved ourselves, we must be disposed to save others." This is the perpetual dilemma of salvation. If not a vicious circle, it is a circle outside of which it would seem many men stand. The sacraments are administered to break the circle. The sacrament bears the burden of initiation. It is not complete without the actual presence of God to give power to carry out the dedication that has occurred. But the power to make the dedication is lacking without the divine presence, and this visitation cannot come without humility. But even your humility you cannot produce of yourself. It is induced in you by your appreciation of something outside that makes you humble.

Symbols and Sacraments

This is the function of the material elements and the formal administration of the sacrament. They are symbols which bring near to you and represent the sacrifice of Christ. Through them you are helped to "be in contact with the real and living Christ." That contact begins in you a process of divinization which is partly your act of consecration and partly the action of the divine grace toward you and within you. "What we consecrate, God will sanctify." The transubstantiation which occurs is not that of the material elements, but a real transubstantiation of persons, a real change of human nature into divine nature. This is the essential miracle. It is this experience of the satisfaction of spiritual hunger, the transformation of pain, the purification, dedication, and so the sanctification, of heart and mind, which has enabled unnumbered Christian mystics to say that they have partaken of the "blessed sacrament" "to their comfort."

Religion always offers more than ideas, and more than moral precepts; it supplies the energy to live by. It cannot be described in terms of truth or in programs of right conduct, but rather and chiefly in manifestations of power. It is for this reason that Miss Harrison has emphasized the likeness of the latest and highest evolutions of spiritual experience with the most primitive. The magic of savage religion, if it could be called religion, was operated in the interests of power, power in war, power over private enemies, power over the gods, or the power of the gods. Of not very different sort are, and should be, the highest religious exercises. They are religious acts, performed in the sense of weakness and need, to gain the vitalizing forces of the great unknown "power not ourselves." The world of the unknown is larger than the known. Known forces we can begin to understand and to manipulate; it is the vast unknown with which we must come to terms. It is this which leads Miss Harrison to suggest that our gods become non-religious by becoming known. She little regards the ritual of eikonism, that is, the worship which centers round a too clearly defined and represented deity. She more highly values the ritual of aneikonism, as being, like magic, aimed

Art & Religion

at the control of the unknown forces, of things that are, by a sacramental and mystical union with the highest. Eikonism is symbolism; aneikonism is sacramentalism.

Two things, therefore, I am trying to suggest: that religion must use symbols, definitive, concrete representations, to set forth what it knows or definitely believes; and that it must use sacraments as exercises of personal consecration to the highest reality, whatever that reality is, however much unknown, that the presence and power of Divinity may become more fully operative in human life. The first usage is merely artistic, the embodiment of ideas in objects, after the fashion of all Classic artists. Such embodiments may be in the form of pictures, or creeds, or more familiar concepts, or statues, or classic music, or the elements of a sacrament. By all these forms, fairly clear ideas are objectified and symbolized. The second usage quickly becomes more than artistry, more than the idealization of particular objects. The Romantic artist portrays objects so that we can see them in all the reaches of their relations, idealizing them. Religion takes hold on a man by a sacrament and not merely idealizes him but transforms him into the ideal. The process is carried out of the realm of artistic idealization into that of religious transubstantiation.

Chapter XII: Religious Education

THERE are very few things, perhaps nothing, more important to do for a child than to help him to see that the world is beautiful. The habit of observing, not for the sake of reporting facts, but for the sake of enjoyment, is a great blessing to any person. It may be formed in youth. It may be in part the beginning of a permanent pursuit of that life which is more than meat. It may become a constant source of many spiritual experiences and virtues throughout life. The public schools are doing much to help their scholars form this habit. Many churches also are aware of the powers of beauty for good in life.

For the most part, however, the conscious usage of the arts in the religious education of Protestantism has been limited to the singing of songs, and a meager amount of pictorial illustration. There has been little conception of the worth of sheer beauty. There has been little attempt to develop in any critical way such exercises as children and young people will find beautiful and hence enjoyable. These things are now rapidly coming to the fore.

One of the principal points of merit in the modern conception of religious education is its emphasis upon expression. The expressive or moral side of the religious life has been now for a number of years prominent. Children's societies and young people's work and the organized classes of the Sunday schools have been devised for the expressive life of the youth. Meanwhile this education has been of late but weakly impressive. There has been little analysis and until recently little experimentation in the arts of impression. Paradoxically, the impression that I am speaking of involves expressive exercises of worship, expressive in the religious rather than the moral sense. It is by the power of ritual that lasting impressions are made. Religious education needs to take account of such profound studies of the

Art & Religion

social traits of man as those of the late Professor William Graham Sumner. He vigorously describes the influence of ritual, by which he means not only the performance of religious acts, but the detailed manner of life in many relations. "The *mores* are social ritual in which we all participate unconsciously. The current habits as to hours of labor, meal hours, family life, the social intercourse of the sexes, propriety, amusements, travel, holidays, education, the use of periodicals and libraries, and innumerable other details of life fall under this ritual."*

In the more restricted religious sense, ritual is very powerful. "Ritual is something to be done, not something to be thought or felt. Men can always perform the prescribed act, although they cannot always think or feel prescribed thoughts or emotions. The acts may bring up again, by association, states of the mind and sentiments which have been connected with them, especially in childhood, when the fantasy was easily affected by rites, music, singing, dramas, etc. No creed, no moral code, and no scientific demonstration can ever win the same hold upon men and women as habits of action, with associated sentiments and states of mind, drilled in from childhood. . . . Ritual is so foreign to our *mores* that we do not recognize its power. . . . If infants and children are subjected to ritual they never escape from its effects through life. Galton says that he was, in early youth, in contact with the Mohammedan ritual idea that the left hand is less worthy than the right, and that he never overcame it."†

I know that this is precisely the reason why many people do not wish to use ritual. They fear that it is too powerful. Yet, at the same time, they go about hunting for something else that will be powerful enough to interest and hold the youth. It is surely absurd, on the one hand, to bewail the lack of devices for holding the young and, on the other hand, fail to use an admittedly powerful instrument for it. Probably the subconscious mistake in this connection is the identification of ritual in general with the particular rites

* Sumner, "Folkways," p. 62.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 61 and 60.

Religious Education

of the Roman or Anglican churches. Even Professor Coe, in his recent valuable book, "A Social Theory of Religious Education," seems to make this mistake. In his chapter on "Ritualism," he assumes a very narrow definition of the term and then, of course, very properly criticises that conception, knocking down the straw man that he has set up. I should do the same, given his premises. But the premises are wrong. It is entirely possible to develop beautiful and effective forms, such as may be truly described as rites, which would have little of the unfortunate effect he suggests but rather be calculated to impress and to express the very sentiments and attitudes he considers desirable.

Even so, Professor Coe is ready to admit the naturalness and the effectiveness of the ritualistic method. Like every other psychologist, he understands the imitative tendencies of little children and the formality loving character of the adolescent period. "The church and its services offer material of instruction that the pupil can experience as present and concrete. The church building and its furniture, to begin with, meet the pupil as a visible expression of religion. . . . Small children are fond of action and of repetition. When to the sensuous impressiveness of a churchly interior, music, vestments, processional, and responsive actions of priest, choir and congregation, we add opportunity to take an active part in the whole, important conditions of a child's interest are met. . . . Many adolescents welcome symbols for longings that they are not as yet able to understand. For adolescence not seldom brings idealistic longings that crave expression though they cannot as yet define themselves. Symbols offer one mode of expression, especially symbols that are stately and sounding, but not too literal."

The first opportunity of improvement is the service of worship in the Church School itself. At this point, no one has made so fine a contribution as Dr. Hugh Hartshorne. The results of his thinking and, better still, of his experimentation and actual practical experience, are available for everyone in his books, "Manual for Training in Worship," and "The Book of Worship of the Church School." These contain not only psychological analysis and constructive

Art & Religion

theory, but also definite and detailed material for the practical worker. There is nothing else available anything like so valuable as these publications.

Another of the most competent workers and experimenters in this field is the Rev. J. W. F. Davies of Winnetka, Illinois. His service of worship for the main Church School is conducted in the church building itself. The order of service is usually the same in form, but considerably varied in content, always fresh and vivid. He has of late developed an exceptionally beautiful brief ritual for the further worship of the junior scholars after they have withdrawn from the church services. It consists of the lighting of four candles in the hands of chosen scholars, from the light burning in a model temple, together with the words which described the symbolism of the candles as representing the parts of worship. This ritual, meanwhile, is accompanied by the four corresponding exercises of song, reading, prayer, and giving. After the children's sermon, there is a brief corresponding closing exercise.

There are other excellent usages of similar character. This is one of the most simple and effective I know of. It has several points of excellence, and is mentioned here merely by way of illustration of the kind of care and dignity in the matter of children's worship which is needed in every place. It is a genuine ritual, without any objectionable features. It is interesting and enjoyable because beautiful, and impressive because compacted of an external fascination and a self-expressive exercise.

The next opportunity for the greater usage of the fine arts in the religious education of the young is the church service itself. Amongst the best leaders in Church School work there is a growing emphasis upon the attendance of the scholars *en masse* at the worship of the church service. The simple device of processional and recessional marching cares for the practical side of the matter and tends to secure the attendance of the whole body of scholars. In many places both the interest and beauty of the plan are augmented by the development of a large children's choir,

Religious Education

which may have a modest but effective part in the church service.

One of the reasons for this development is the superior beauty of the church building itself. Is it fair to the children for the church to construct a costly and beautiful house of worship, and then proceed to conduct the exercises of worship for children in another part of the building not nearly so beautiful? Few churches can afford to build two sanctuaries, and none ought to. If the rooms of the parish house are devised for general assembly, lectures, secular discussions, social affairs, dramatics, and other such purposes, they cannot at the same time be made so beautiful for worship as the church itself, which is made primarily for worship. Beginners and primary scholars have attractive rooms of their own. But if the juniors and intermediates do not attend the regular church service, then their own service of worship should be held in the main church and not in a hall or other lesser room. In any case, the superior dignity and beauty of the church building itself should be brought to bear as an influential force upon the lives of the children. It is throwing away a great opportunity not to do this. Without any danger of superstition, we may yet develop something of the attitude of reverence in the House of God which the older churches demand. It is easier to do this if the building itself is a noble structure.

If the children attend the church service, the church service must be planned for their needs as well as for the adult experience. To this end many ministers preach a children's sermon. There are many things to say for this practice. A still better method, however, is to have the children's sermon in their own room, by themselves, immediately after they have marched out of the regular church service. The chief difficulty is in finding someone to do it. With the larger parish organization and the varied ministry that will characterize the future church, this plan will be more widely utilized.

Meanwhile the usages and practices of the regular order of worship in the church can be greatly improved in the direction of their appeal to the young. For this reason, it

Art & Religion

becomes desirable to use every opportunity that is dignified for the development of color, symbolism, and movement, in the regular church service. Whatever adds to the interest of the service to the eye as well as to the ear is pertinent at this point. And those who make experiments in this direction will probably discover that the children are not the only ones for whom things to be seen as well as things to be heard are interesting.

Religious education is not a limited process. It is a life-long enterprise. It is not for children only, but for all of us through all our years. Here enters another important fact which bears directly upon what we shall do or not do about the development of the arts in religion. The fact is this, that younger communities in our country are free and easy in their manners and conservative in their thought; older communities are conservative in their manners, all the while that they are also inclined to be more liberal in their thinking. The liberal theology is more developed in the churches of the East, and also the better usages in the art of worship. In the West, the preaching is more conservative, while the forms of worship are less conventional. The older communities are superior at both points.

The place for new thought is the pulpit. The pulpit stands for prophecy, for proposals of change, for fearless examination of truth, for an outlook toward the future. Yet the religious community desires also to value the past. It needs to revere and to conserve the great spiritual victories and judgments of the fathers. It needs to preserve and pass on its great wealth of inherited devotion. The place for this conserving force is the service of worship. Here is the proper vehicle of transmission. Here is given abundant expression, in the elder forms, of the great answers that religion always has to the few primary, personal problems of existence. The new things are not yet formulated. They need examination and criticism. The place for setting forth new proposals is not in forms and exercises, but in the free utterance of the free preacher. Religious education, like all education, will always include the culture derived from the

Religious Education

past and the scientific examination of proposals for the future.

The children and the youth have a right to expect that we will convey to them the riches we have received. There is no better way than the direct contact of reverent worship, as that utilizes the literary treasures of the Bible and the later Christian centuries, together with the reverent exercises of devotion.

How much better for adults, also, if they get their conservatism in hours of worship rather than in preaching. If the preaching is conservative and the forms are free and easy, the people never will be religiously educated. They will get neither the new nor the old. They will hear no fresh discussion of the new things they ought to be considering if they are to grow in the knowledge and the practice of the truth. Nor, on the other hand, will they ever be truly cultured in the old things, for by no possibility can the inherited devotional riches of the faith be transmitted and ever freshly enjoyed in a free and easy exercise of worship.

Part of the fault for the situation just described lies in the theological seminaries. They are in these days open-minded and abundant in their teaching of the new things. They set forth the forward look in matters of science and ethics and theology. They are deficient in their treatment of the past. This seems a strange thing to say, when it is popularly supposed that they are too much rooted in the past. They make much of the past, to be sure, but in the wrong category. They connect with the theological thinking of the past more successfully than with the spiritual culture of the past, two quite different things. There is instruction in the thinking and the action of the past, together with slight conveyance of the feeling of the past.

Religious history is set forth too largely as something dead and done for, something with which you should be familiar as an educated man, but not something that need enter deeply into your life as a cultured man. There is not a sufficient alignment of historic facts with those permanent elements in human nature which perennially appear and reappear. There is no sufficient sense of the swing and re-

Art & Religion

swing of the pendulum of human feeling, and the reappearance of many problems and the reappearance of many solutions in the spiritual life of the race. The courses of study are not lacking in mentality or in historic information; they are lacking in culture.

They have often sent out men to preach old thoughts but not equipped to conserve old feelings. It should be just turned about. They should send out men thoroughly equipped and competent to bear to people the noble worths of the Christian treasury in superior forms and exercises, while at the same time equipped freely to engage in problems of the new thought and the new morals. The true religious education must include not only scientific thinking and social conduct, but also religious culture.

Lest I seem to be too harsh respecting the provision of theological schools in this matter, the last catalogue of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago lists more than four hundred courses offered by its regular faculty and the allied religious houses. Among these there are just two which are devoted to the subject of public worship.

Besides all this, many students of society are beginning to realize afresh that education in general is not complete without religion. There is rapidly developing a widespread dissatisfaction with the seemingly unavoidable secularity of the great state universities. These big institutions are magnificent embodiments of American idealism as well as of American ambition and efficiency. There is, nevertheless, a highly unfortunate weakness about any educational system inhibited from a free display of the history of the human spirit and from anything but a meager provision for conveying to the maturing citizen a moving sense of the highest values. It will some day be disastrous to the life of the state if this condition becomes accepted as a possibly permanent one. It need not be permanent except for the divisiveness of religion itself. It is an ever present challenge to the church to become unified, and that not merely respecting Protestantism, but rather respecting the whole of Christianity.

Meanwhile, there are untried opportunities for enriching

Religious Education

the cultural standards of these universities by a greater notice and tutelage of the fine arts. Something of the same amplitude which is accorded literary studies needs to be provided for in other artistic fields. Without taking the place of religion, such a procedure would, nevertheless, go very far in the direction of emphasizing value judgments and value experience as compared to the preponderance of study in the world of facts. Meanwhile, also, the demand for education is so great that philanthropists may well give renewed attention to the smaller Christian college. The population of our great western states will be so large that all will be needed. The college which is free from political connection is free to develop not only religious teaching, but the great cultural exercises of religion, in which alone the whole personality comes to the highest self-realization.

Religious education is a concern of statesmen as well as of churchmen. The last word has not yet been said concerning the relations of church and state. Among the categories from which light on these vexed and intricate problems will be derived are not only goodness and truth but also beauty.

And in this whole matter of the relations of art and education, the primary need is a change of attitude toward beauty. Like truth and goodness, it is an end in itself. It is one of the supreme values. We try to help children to be good for practical and social ends, but also because goodness is ultimate, because it derives from a divine mandate. So, also, art will help us as an excellent means to other ends, but this is not the chief reason for its being. By this I do not mean just what the old cry "art for art's sake" demanded; yet something very like it. One of the essentials of education, both general and religious, is beauty. To help young lives to see and enjoy beauty is to help them apprehend God.

Chapter XIII: Church Unity

THE possible union of all Christian churches is in the minds of many men. Definite practical proposals on the part of great religious bodies are more and more hopeful of progress in this direction. Definite attempts and experiments in local communities are numerous. The relation of the arts to this situation is vital.

The experience of those most interested to promote church union has revealed the difficulties of success in the intellectual area. Despite the prevalence of scientific assumptions, the times are still unfavorable for getting together on the basis of extensive definitions. All the hopeful efforts are reducing to a minimum the required points of creedal agreement.

It is somewhat easier to promote unity on the basis of common moral effort. Federations, both great and small, are making useful contributions at this point. Vastly more is needed. How shall the voices of the divided churches be heard with effect respecting the rights and wrongs of a world torn by industrial dissension? The crying needs for innumerable reforms constitute perhaps the greatest pressure for a united Christendom. There are yet many possibilities of attaining the desired unions through the joint enterprises in which men of differing creedal standards learn to understand and respect each other as they work together. Yet the appeal of duty does not have the welding fire in it except the situation be critical. There is a third region in which there may be expected important contributions to this need of the times.

The unities of feeling are more profound than those of thought and more stirring than those of work. Thought often divides, feeling unites. If people can be led to share a common emotional experience they have already been touched by the welding fire. One of the resources for the

Church Unity

creation of such experience is that of art. There is something about art which lifts people for a time out beyond the categories of thinking or those of doing. Morality, as C. A. Bennett points out, demands choices, decisions, the taking of sides. These are in themselves divisive. The region of art is a region of composure, the meeting place of the sentiments of common humanity. "The artist demolishes the barriers which morality or convention or prejudices set up, showing us that if it is necessary to establish distinctions, it is just as necessary from time to time to rise above them."*

If this be true of art in general, may it not be true of the supreme art of worship? The experiences of worship are independent of the character of definitions and of activities. Reverence, exaltation, dedication—these may be the same as to disposition and intensity, whatever the worshiper's faith is about God or about duty.

Part of the pressure, therefore, toward church unity, and one of the great aids to its coming, is not economic or practical, but artistic. People of one strain of spiritual experience are wanting the more abundant life to be had in fellowship with those of other types. Moreover, a greater development of the arts by each type will tend to diminish the differences and assist the coming union.

First, then, there is a widespread desire for a more inclusive religious experience. Every merger of religious bodies tends to an enrichment of their expressive life. The divisiveness of Protestantism has brought about a meagerness of experience, a thinness of emotional life, limited usually to one type only. Church union will bring together the valuable contributions of different groups, resulting in a more abundant life for all. In discussing the federation of Christian churches in America, Professor George Cross of Rochester Seminary writes of the natural tendency of Protestant worship: "In public devotions it sometimes degenerates into irreverence. . . . The federation will tend to modify greatly the worship of the churches which come within it. . . . Out of the richer sense of spiritual communion is

*"Art as an Antidote for Morality," *International Journal of Ethics*, January, 1920.

Art & Religion

supplied a corrective of the deplorable common looseness of public devotion in many Protestant churches. . . . While, therefore, the future liturgies of the church must be free from the sacramentalism that regards any rite as essential to salvation, or that allows proxies in the religious life, and while they will be various and flexible, in keeping with the variety of types of spirituality in the churches, they will, on the other hand, take on that more stately and dignified character which flows from the consciousness of a broader and more comprehensive unity.”*

One of the most deep passions moving the spirit of that bold experimenter, the Rev. William E. Orchard, D.D., of the King's Weigh House Chapel, London, is at this point. His interest in church union seems to be an interest in the larger life to be made possible only by the blending of separatistic experience and the moving forward of many elements into the fuller Christian abundance. “Every type of Christianity is failing today just because it is a type. The excellences of each are negatived by its partial and uncorrected witness.”† It is precisely the sin of dividing experience which he describes as “. . . the far worse schism of setting themselves to minister only to a part of human nature, either the craving for authority or the demand for freedom, the longing for mystical communion or the desire for rational understanding. The churches have not only divided the Body of Christ; they have divided the soul of man. If one sets out in this modern world to find a church which shall provide real spiritual fellowship, one soon discovers that in every church that exists we can have freedom *or* authority, mysticism *or* rationalism, the supernatural *or* the natural, liturgical *or* free prayer, trained and prepared preaching *or* untrained and unprepared preaching, a worship dominated by awe *or* directed like a public meeting; whereas a human being wants all these things at one time or another.”‡

Undoubtedly, one of the greatest urgencies toward the coming together of divided Christendom is this demand for

* *American Journal of Theology*, April, 1919.

† Orchard, “The Outlook for Religion,” p. 73.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 264.

Church Unity

the fuller Christian life and experience. And this demand is not only on behalf of the insider, but in the name of the outsider, "that the world may believe."

A thoroughly modern man surveys the churches of a great city only to discover that none of them is satisfactory. He is not attracted by the dun-colored mediocrity of the average church. It is neither sufficiently clear and progressive, intellectually and morally, nor rich artistically, to be interesting. He turns to the especially liberal church or to a theater independent for a satisfaction of his mental needs. But there his emotions are starved. His modernity is not only intellectual but artistic. He finds no reverence, no high art, no worship, in the lecture hall. He swings back to one of the old liturgical churches. He is momentarily pleased with the excellent forms, only soon to be freshly disturbed by the conservatism of thought still characteristic of all the old form bodies.

In hundreds of communities there are, on the one hand, centers of liberal thought devoid of the artistry of worship and of the devotional life; and on the other hand, altars where the service of old rituals is accompanied by the setting forth of old ideas. Unfortunately, moreover, too many Protestant churches which claim superiority as not going to either of those extremes, possess the virtues of neither and the faults of both. Their ideas are old and their liturgy ugly. Many an outsider would like to come in if he could find a place where his whole nature could be satisfied.

The more emotional churches are no more satisfactory to the seeker. Says Dr. Shakespeare: "I am inclined to agree with the late Ian Maclaren that as the level of culture rises, the desire for liturgical worship increases, simply because breaches in reverence and taste hinder and offend the cultured, and these are almost inevitable in non-liturgical worship."* Sir John McClure, the recent chairman of the Congregational Union of Great Britain, in his retiring address discusses at length the necessity for improving the art of worship. He calls attention to the widespread development of wretched hymns and hymn tunes supposedly in the inter-

* J. H. Shakespeare, "The Church at the Cross-Roads," p. 112.

Art & Religion

est of popularity. "But it is urged, 'we must consult all tastes.' I agree. In the application of the principle, however, it too often happens that only one taste is consulted, and that the worst. Are we not suffering from a slothful tolerance of a poor second best?"*

In the last analysis nothing but the actual union of differing strains of religious experience will accomplish any large scale improvement of the religious experience fostered in the local parish. Individual churches are already making brilliant experiments. Some of these serve to point the way, but the national life cannot be touched without the greater union of sectarian bodies so desirable from this point of view. First, then, part of the pressure toward union is the desire for better worship, the desire for the more abundant life to be had by the blending of divided strains of spiritual history and experience.

Secondly, this desirable union will be much furthered by a greater interest in the arts on the part of non-liturgical churches. I do not mean by this the adoption of the liturgies of the older churches, either the Roman Catholic Mass, or the Anglican Prayer Book, or the Greek Rite. What is required is much more difficult than this, a new study of the psychology of worship and of the applications of the findings to definite orders of worship.

The old liturgies contain not only abundant material for revived usage but many important suggestions on the psychological principles involved. They were developed through the operation of those principles. Our orders of worship are recent and comparatively undeveloped. Many a free church would find itself far closer than it thinks to the historic liturgies of the church if it would, on the one hand, freshly and freely study the principles of worship, and on the other, take the trouble to discover how much good there is in many of the older formularies.

If such effort could be promoted on a large scale, I venture that it would have a more remarkable effect on the promotion of church unity than similar efforts either in the intellectual or moral areas. Sir John McClure in the same

* Reported in the *Christian World*.

Church Unity

address mentioned raises this expectation: "There is steadily growing amongst us a conviction that the advantage of a liturgy greatly outweighs its defects; and that by enabling all to join more heartily and more intelligently in common worship it provides a much needed spiritual uplift for both minister and congregation." He suggested that "a liturgy might help, in however small a measure, to the attainment of that unity for which we long and pray."

Churches will be brought together according as they become similar through the effort to develop a more inclusive experience and appeal. "It is possible that the Protestant world now stands on the eve of some transition, waiting for the manifestation of its full content in a consummate act of worship. It has been said that worship is one of the lost arts; but if so, it is not to be found by compressing the spiritual wealth secured by the Protestant Reformation under the Providence of God into the moulds of ages inferior to our own. Religion must now go forward, taking all that the past can offer, in so far as it can harmonize with a greater ideal, but reconstructing in some more comprehensive way the worship and the conception of the sacrifice acceptable to God. From which sacrifice cannot be withheld any contribution made by the human mind toward the solution of the mystery of existence. The sacrifice will include every department of human interest and inquiry, music, art, and poetry, as well as science, philosophy, and theology."*

Mr. Allen is here hinting at more things than at first appear. On the one hand, he has in mind the tendencies here and there to revive mediaeval usages without so very much change. On the other hand, he sees the necessity of developing something greatly superior to the Protestant usages current among us. His hope lies in the direction of a newer and richer development in the future, with something of the abundance of the old liturgies, drawing upon them for many materials, but freely developed to meet both new thoughts and new psychologies.

Two more or less opposing movements are interesting at

* Alexander V. G. Allen, "Christian Institutions," p. 564.

Art & Religion

this point. I do not believe that either of them quite possesses the key to the future. Both are significant, both will make large contributions to the church of the new age. The first is what might be called a Revival of Mediaevalism. The second is a growing interest in the so-called Community Church.

The Revival of Mediaevalism is manifest in two striking movements, the character and success of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the extensive drawing upon mediaeval forms on the part of some free churches.

I am not disposed to argue at length with anyone who denies the fact, but I am acquainted with a very large number of personal transfers from other bodies into the Episcopal Church. Especially is this true in the older American communities. A still more striking fact is the maintenance of the strength of Episcopacy in our older and larger cities contemporaneous with the disappearance of other churches. There are some cities in which the decline of parishes in other denominations, witnessed by withdrawals, mergers, and the sale of old buildings, has been going on the very while that Episcopalians have been erecting the finest churches in America. Possibly not all the factors involved are entirely creditable. The influence of fashion may account for some of it. The strange perversity of human nature not to resent but to respect pretense and exclusiveness also accounts for some of it. Superior organization and foresight are an important part of it. But the most important factor is the appeal of the richer spiritual culture and the superior artistry, both architecturally and liturgically.

Meanwhile, there are extremely notable individual experiments among the free churches in the greater usage of mediaeval forms. The most extensive of these is undoubtedly that of Dr. W. E. Orchard at King's Weigh House Chapel, London. The published liturgy of his church contains ten regular and several special orders of service, litanies, daily offices, and collects. In the main its prayers follow those of the Book of Common Prayer. The order for the Communion services follows the Roman Catholic Ordinary as nearly as Protestant doctrine will permit. Orders of service in



Allen & Collens, Architects.

SKINNER MEMORIAL CHAPEL · HOLYOKE · MASSACHUSETTS

A Congregational Church with a chancel. True to the Gothic spirit in its proportions. It is long, narrow, and high.



Church Unity

the Second Parish Church of Boston, Massachusetts, and in the Second Parish Church of Newton, Massachusetts, are distinguished by extensive drawing upon mediaeval liturgical sources, forms, and customs. The services of the Union Church of Winnetka, Illinois, and others, contain prayers from the Book of Common Prayer, together with congregational responses from the same source, or rather from the more ancient sources.

The illustrations of this volume will amply reveal the fact, also, of the revival of mediaeval forms in church building. Several liberal churches have restored the altar, some make use of candles, and many have revived the chancel. The rapid increase in the choice of the Gothic style of building, not only amongst the Episcopal churches, but by Methodist, Presbyterian, Congregational, Lutheran, Reformed, and Baptist parishes, is a notable fact which no one who wishes to study religious tendencies can afford to ignore.

These things are very powerful. A solid structure of brick and stone, of large size, and of great beauty, spreads an influence and speaks its message for many years. A Gothic building is in itself a definite message, and probably many of those who have chosen this style were well aware of what it means and deliberately desired to say that thing to the people. All these facts, taken together, constitute a remarkable tendency of many modern men to revalue some of the excellencies of pre-Reformation religion.

Meanwhile, other modern men are seeking a way out of the unhappy divisions of Protestantism by the hope of a church which may gather to itself all the spiritual elements and traditions of the community, including the aspirations of the outsider as well as of the churchman. The Community Church idea is in the air and is in some important instances a concrete experiment. No one has as yet just precisely defined what it is with sufficient clarity to be convincing. In general, it is not a Federated Church, nor a Union Church, but something inclusive of these and of other factors besides. I do not know that there is as yet a single organization, strictly speaking, in existence in any community. There are communities in which there is only

Art & Religion

one Protestant church, having no particular denominational connection. There are towns where there is only one church, and that one connected with a denomination, though some of its members may be active in the national affairs of other bodies. I know of no Community Church which includes Roman Catholics and Jews, unless they have left their previous standing.

Portland, Maine, has a town music hall, municipal organ, and organist, where at the public expense there are conducted programs of music, at which also—and this is the significant point—there are addresses calculated for the public good, by clergymen of different sects. Something very like this seems to be forecast by the plans on foot in many towns for the construction of Civic or Community Centers. If you will follow the architectural journals for a while, you will run upon designs for a good many such buildings. It is not to be supposed that these buildings will house a program of merely physical or social activities. They will also develop community dramatics and probably many of them become forums for the discussion of public affairs.

Here are two definite tendencies in the life of the day, seemingly entirely opposed to each other. But the urgency under each of them is probably much more nearly the same than appears. They are both, at least, profound expressions of the inadequacy of typical Reformation Protestantism as it has been worked out by the logic of individualism, separatism, and the consequent starvation of the fuller manhood. Both are dissatisfied with the final product of the Reformation age.

The one group would find a more abundant life by the recovery of some of the lost treasures in the total historic spiritual experience of Christendom. The other would enlarge the basis of its spiritual life by reaching forward to give expression to the more inclusive and the more coöperative ideals of the new democracy. No one can now say how, but it is open for all to forecast and to labor for the inclusion of both forms of riches in the life of the future church.

The protagonists of the Community Church have not as yet sufficiently valued many of the timeless elements in

Church Unity

historic Christian experience. They have not sufficiently weighed the profound conservatism of human nature. They have not sufficiently studied history to understand that almost every reformer and prophet has turned to some more ancient and venerable age for the sanction and authority of his message. As Jeremiah recalled the primitive pastoral life of his race, as Jesus quoted the great eighth century prophets, as Luther passed over mediaevalism to rediscover the Scriptures, so every reformer the more readily persuades conservative human nature to the acceptance of his new truth by asserting that it is really not new.

The history of human culture is a continuum. Culture in general, including religious culture, will always draw largely upon the past. This does not mean that the values to be discovered in the past are merely antiquarian or artistic either. The moral message of the Hebrew prophets is still pertinent and will continue to be so for many generations. The moral implications of the teaching of Jesus are still revolutionary.

But if the life of the past is still valuable to us in the sphere of action, where presumably there are to be expected constant changes of standard, how much more may the life of the past be valuable to us in the sphere of beauty and human feelings about it, which is more nearly unchanging in its quality. This means that humanity will still continue to be inspired by the moods, passions, apprehensions, and inner joys of the great souls of the race. Why should this be less true in religion than in literature and the other arts?

The plain conclusion of these facts is that we do not want any Community Church if it means that we are to be cut adrift from the inestimable treasures of devotion that are our Christian inheritance. The inheritance of the near past will perhaps be destined to be no less powerful than that of the more remote days. The average American Christian has no intention whatever of giving up his connection with historic Christianity. However lacking the common American church may seem to the critical analyst, whether of the riches of the historic church, or the riches of the coming social light, it is still the most powerful thing in the national

Art & Religion

life. It can be changed and improved; I do not believe with Mr. Jackson, the author of "The Community Church," that it can be obliterated. It is a going concern, and with all its weaknesses, it is after all the nearest thing we have, both to the historic treasures and to the future free thought.

The ordinary American town still receives more enriching contact with the past and more enlivening ideals for the future from the average church than from any other source. It would be folly for statesmen, political or religious, to underestimate the resources whether of material property or of moral idealism in the Protestant churches of America.

The recent vigorous book of the Rev. John Haynes Holmes, "The Revolutionary Function of the Modern Church," also is skeptical of the values of the old organizations as a basis for the church of the new age. He appears to be endeavoring to justify the development of a religion so far eclectic that it no longer regards itself as specifically Christian. He sees the individualistic method, as well as the individualistic philosophy, as the only characteristic of Christianity. He is hopeless of organized Christianity getting away from the sole function of saving persons. "With the weak, tempted, imperfect individual, the work of the church must begin; and beyond this weak, tempted, and imperfect individual, I cannot see that this saving work can ever go."* For this reason he says that "the churches of today are not worthy of support."

I fear the prosperity of the typical American Protestant church, as it is today, almost as much as he does. I also believe it to be inadequate to the new age, but I am not hopeless of it. There is in it more than he credits of the very social spirit which he sets forth so cogently. There is in it also a very reasonable conservatism which is not willing wholly to lose the continuity and power that it has until the proposals for change are made much more clearly. And this conservatism is the more reasonable, when the carelessness of the average unchurched person is more clearly recognized than by these writers. Criticism of the church is often born

* The Revolutionary Function of the Modern Church," p. 18.

Church Unity

of irresponsibility. The wise social student is cautious about expecting too much from the Outsider, as well as willing to credit the virtues of the Insider. Even Dr. Holmes appeals to Jesus the reformer. He draws a true and moving picture of the supreme effort of Jesus to reform the legal and moral system of the nation as well as to reform persons.

Why, then, abandon the Christian Church? There is a genuinely hopeful movement in the Protestant world, which I expect will some day spread into the Roman Catholic world, for a new loyalty to the real Jesus and to his religion and ethics, including their thoroughgoing applications to industry and government, including the imitation of his life of reform as well as his life of personal piety.

The Community Church idea would come to us all more commendably if it were presented in a more unbiased way. There are many men no less interested in the improvement of society than these men, and no less interested in a future free thought in all directions. But the very reason alleged by some advocates of the Community Church for leaving off the distinctive appeal to the inner and spiritual authority of Jesus, is our very reason for retaining it. There is no fellowship so liberating as his. If ever there was a fresh and free mind it was his. To some of us there is no imaginable symbol of liberty and progress and free-mindedness so true or suggestive as that of the personality of the real, historic Christ. It is just because we want to be guarded against narrownesses, rather than the contrary, that we hold to him.

There is much more yet to come, however, from the community religion movement, both of ideas and definite experimentation. The writings of Mr. Joseph Ernest McAfee along these lines, lacking in concreteness partly because it is not yet time to be concrete, are especially valuable for their urgency of inclusiveness and their hopes of religious democracy.

Meanwhile we are not going back to a papal Catholicism, nor even to forms and assumptions that are chiefly mediaeval without being papal. And it is inconceivable that the bulk of American Protestantism, so various in racial and

Art & Religion

ecclesiastical traditions, can be compressed into the moulds of the Anglican forms. The authoritative assumptions of the Episcopal body are entirely unacceptable to the typical American Christian. He cannot accede to the conception of a faith once delivered to the bishops. Nor can he be satisfied with a compression of his modes of utterance, either architecturally or liturgically, into the too rigid forms of that tradition.

Why, then, bother about it? Because these forms are the best perpetuation among us of the total history of Christendom. Because, though our fathers may have been French, Swiss, Bohemian, Norwegian, or what not, we speak the English tongue. Because the English Prayer Book is our most direct point of contact with the devotional treasures of the Christian ages and because the best psychology of worship is found in the usages under discussion.

I have always been a believer in the flank attack in debate. It is better not to contend all your opponent's points of view, but to admit all you can, holding out against the irreducible remainder. It is a quality of human nature to hold more steadfastly to its customs than to its ideas. If the future Protestant churches of whatever denomination could revive every possible mediaeval form or custom judged to be valuable on its own merits, the movement would go very far toward promoting church union. The Lutheran bodies have all retained a larger usage of past forms than the more free churches. The Reformed bodies use a liturgy based upon the common mediaeval sources more nearly than do Presbyterians or Baptists, Bucer of Strassburg having been in England as a consultant at the very formation of the English Prayer Book.

Moreover, what is to be the future of the Roman Catholic Church? Must we forever assume an insoluble dilemma of divided Christendom? Can we afford to concede that we are at a permanent *impasse*? In a fair and vivid paragraph, Dr. Newman Smyth describes the divergent ideas of the church as held by Catholics and Protestants, closing his series of contrasts with this: "According to the one, the outstanding Church figure is the priest; according to the other,

Church Unity

the prophet.”* It would be valuable if we might all so far lay aside prejudices as to consider what further he has to say about the future mergence of these two conceptions. “The Catholic idea is certainly here to stay. But so is the Protestant. . . . A fundamental education in religious values alone can cause these two ideas to coalesce and point the way to their final union in the truly Catholic Church. The Protestant must come to apprehend the indispensability of the Catholic position; and the Catholic must learn to recognize the validity of the Protestant witness; and together they must mount to the higher Truth which includes them both. . . . What we need to pray for, then, is not that this or that experiment of reunion shall succeed, not that this or that plan of an interlocking Church relationship shall work out, but that these two great contrasting Church positions and ideas, each with a noble history, each with spiritual first-fruits to justify its truth, each firmly imbedded in the religious consciousness of our time and of all time, shall come to understand each other; more than this, shall come to understand that each has that to give the other without which it cannot fully realize its own true, best life.”†

If anyone is able to share such a grand hope, it is indeed an added reason for finding and using all the possible good forms of the old body. If the Protestant world could freshly study the whole subject of the art of worship openly, there is no question whatever but that it would produce new inventions of form. There is equally no question but that it would also revive much good psychology and much detailed material from the usages of the ancient Church. In this attempt, I mean not merely a study of artistry, superficially, but of the meanings of symbols and of sacraments, both old and new, which in a general usage of the words are comprised in the category of the art of worship.

Such a procedure would not only immensely forward

* “Approaches towards Church Unity,” Newman Smyth and Williston Walker, p. 86.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 87-90.

Art & Religion

efforts toward Protestant unity, but would also place the whole of Protestantism in a most favorable position for the future possibilities of a genuinely united Christendom. Moreover, such a procedure would not discourage, but rather foster, the development of a united Church of Christ expectantly open to the newer and later lights of the Divine Spirit.

What I have been trying to say might be summed up in the remark that the mystic experience is much the same thing, whatever its mental content either theologically or morally, and that this experience is therefore the natural meeting ground of union. I have already suggested certain identities of the aesthetic and mystical life. In a later chapter is described the psychological order of the experience.

That order is the same emotionally and vitally, whatever realities or conceptions originate it or whatever ethical purposes eventuate from it. Mysticism alone has never yielded a distinctive theology, but rather a distinctive psychology. The world of the arts by itself has never yielded a distinctive morality, but rather the passion for whatever morality is carried to it. Men may differ in their beliefs and in their ethics; the inner process of the enjoyment of their faith is the same. As the conscience tells all men *that* they ought, but not to all men, in the same way, *what* they ought, to do, so worship is the same whatever its content. No category of thought, therefore, nor of ethics, can yield the same hope of union as that contained in the essential commonness of the nature of worship.

Chapter XIV: Technique and Freedom

THERE is no more important practical subject than that of freedom. We of the "free churches" value our liberty. Constantly we reiterate the fact and the virtues of free, spontaneous prayer and unsteretyped public worship. We are prone to consider a liturgy or a rite as a form of bondage. We claim the right of free thought unauthorized by bishop or Bible or creed. We almost wholly misconceive the nature and the source of freedom. Our conception of spiritual and ecclesiastical freedom is often as childish and wrong as many popular notions of personal, industrial, or political liberty.

Freedom is not acquired simply by release from law or sanction or authority or technique. Liberty is not negative but positive. It is derived, always, from some new and commanding principle or from some new mastery of technical processes. Freedom is not the gift of formlessness but the mastery of form.

The effect of the teaching of Jesus was to free the Christian community from the old Jewish law. What was the thing that made them free? Certainly not simply making a declaration, certainly not a mere "kicking over the traces." They did neither of these things. The thing that made them free was their own inner acceptance of the new Christian principle of love. Without this, they had far better have stayed under the holding authority of the old law.

The acquisition of a positive freedom is always harder than it appears to be. We are wrongly given to regard the release from the old tyranny as the essence of liberty. It is rather only the opportunity of liberty. Liberty must be acquired and established by some new and self-imposed regulation. The American colonies were not really free and independent states until the struggles of the Constitutional Convention had given them a new instrument of cohesion

Art & Religion

and stability. The criminal released from prison is not really a free man until his definite devotion to a new labor has reestablished his feet in the path of hope and progress. The scientist is not free to move with authority and precision through the mazes of his material until long toils have given him mastery over that material. The baseball pitcher is not free to place the ball exactly as he desires until long practice has given him the reward of a nearly perfect control. I am not free to paint a picture nor to play an organ because I have not acquired the necessary technique in these arts.

It is a question whether the so-called free churches are free to do anything but perish. Independency can be developed to such an extent as entirely to nullify the very freedom sought for. Premature revolution has oftentimes defeated itself. In the hurly-burly of history, more than one group of protestants has separated itself only to find that its new organization was too slight and shifting a thing to sustain itself amidst the vast complications of civilized life. During several years of travel throughout our country, I was amazed at the remarkable intellectual and civic influence of the New England and Puritan heritage in our national life. It is a grave question whether this brave and adventurous individualism, philanthropic in practice and progressive in thought, can sustain and perpetuate its own strain in the face of the competition of thicker-bodied movements.

There is no citizen who so misreads the meaning of freedom as the typical modern liberal. The "independent" in politics oftentimes discovers that he has no effective instrument whereby to influence the affairs of state, frequently being reduced to an obnoxious choice as between two almost equally offensive programs. Even more so, the moral and religious independent is ineffective in the deeper life of society.

There are very large numbers of men today, men of public spirit and intelligence who stand outside the organized efforts of moral education and social control. They are asserting their freedom. They think they have found a liberty of conscience and of action untrammelled by the

Technique and Freedom

alleged narrowness of any ecclesiastical organization. But their freedom is a very specious thing. Instead of acquiring freedom for themselves they have thrown it away and placed it where it ought not to be. Without even a fight for it, they have given a "free hand" to the forces of conservatism or of reaction.

There is no more profound problem in sociology than just this matter of the incoherence of liberalism. Men of independent mind are by their very nature individualistic. And, unfortunately, the revolt of each is likely to be due to some slightly different cause. It is hard for liberals to agree, harder for them to accept any new partisan bondage. But without agreement and without definite organizational instruments there can be no positive freedom.

These men are, strictly speaking, not free at all to affect the life of the state as they would like. They have misinterpreted freedom. They are only free to wring their hands in futile protest. They should, rather, intelligently face the fact that a large part of the moral education of the youth of America is in the hands of religious and moral conservatives.

The liberal vainly wonders why he cannot affect the prejudiced minds of adult citizens, the same while that he allows the minds of youthful prospective citizens to be bent in wrong directions from the very start. In other words, the freeman is not free to affect the life of his time until he has acquired, perhaps at a cost that seems to limit his freedom, an instrument which he can use effectively to promote his ideals of the social welfare.

These remarks I am making for two reasons. They suggest a line of thought and a series of problems pertinent to the general point of view of this whole book, the view that the individualistic temper of the Reformation age must be modified by new forms of coöperation or cohesion which will be characteristic of the new age. The most of these problems lie outside the range of the artistic interest we are pursuing. They form, however, a line of reinforcement to the urgency for church unity. And they serve to answer some of the objections to it. The free churches will be not less, but more,

Art & Religion

free to wield the influence they desire according as they shall be willing to develop modifications in the direction of the new age commonality.

The other reason for these remarks is that they constitute another illustration of the necessity for free ideas to find adequate symbols of expression or a definite technique if they are to be communicated in ordinary life. These considerations require an improved technique of worship in the Protestant world.

The chair of homiletics is an old institution in our schools of theology, a recognition of the necessity of technique in the sermon. Not nearly enough instruction in the technique of public prayer has been provided. On the whole, the average minister's sermons are far superior in variety, structure, diction, and good taste, to his prayers. The prayer is far the more difficult exercise. The limits of propriety as to its form of discourse, choice of words, imagery, and other factors are much more narrow and exacting than for that of any other human utterance.

Almost all those who attempt a critical improvement of public prayer have found it valuable to requisition more or less material from the old books of devotion, the Psalms or other prayer books. They have done this, not by way of displacing spontaneous expression, but rather by way of an added value and an improved background, as Dr. Orchard suggests: "the intention being to create an atmosphere of devotion and to provide a background of prayer, rather than attempting to force individual aspirations into a prescribed form, or pretending to cover the complete exercise of prayer. Rightly understood by those who lead, liturgical prayer may therefore be a greater encouragement to 'free' prayer than the often too dominating, individualistic, and complicated utterances which have come to be thus exclusively described."*

It is highly questionable whether the new technique can be adequate without a new service book. So-called non-liturgical churches have been proud of their freedom from a prayer book. Yet more and more it becomes evident that

* W. E. Orchard, "The Order of Divine Service," Preface, p. 5.

Technique and Freedom

some kind of public liturgy is necessary. Most of our denominational publishing houses issue books of prepared service forms. The Reformed Church has always had a liturgy. The Presbyterian Book of Common Worship was copyrighted in 1905. The Unitarian hymnal contains a complete order of service for each Sunday of the month. Notable publications have been issued by local parishes such as that of the First Congregational Society, St. Louis, Missouri, in 1845, and of Second Parish Church, Boston, in 1914. The most recent published liturgy is the Order of Divine Service for Public Worship, Oxford Press, 1919, following the usages of the King's Weigh House Chapel, London.

None of these will be found wholly satisfactory by the average Protestant church. It is noteworthy that all of them draw heavily, both as to form and materials, from the English Book of Common Prayer. I have already suggested why the great Prayer Book cannot be used as it stands. Dr. Percy Dearmer in his recent and valuable book, "The Art of Worship," suggests important improvements in the English ritual.

Considerable changes and additions are proposed by official bodies now at work on the subject. The English "Report of the Archbishop's Committee of Inquiry on the Worship of the Church" and the American "Report of the Joint Commission on the Book of Common Prayer" were both published in 1919. But the changes suggested are insufficient for winning any considerable following outside the Episcopal Communion. If the Episcopal Church could more fully understand the points of view of the free churches, it might be persuaded of the great opportunity before it, should it be willing to make important changes in the liturgy. If it does not do this, we need a new service book.

Perhaps such a book is an impossibility for the early future. Its preparation would require not only study and collation, but wider popular experimentation, before a usable and satisfactory manual could be produced.

It is earnestly to be hoped that some great university may establish a Chair of Liturgics in order to centralize scholarship in the subject and also promote popular experimenta-

Art & Religion

tion and collate its results. If such a foundation could also be related to university extension work, it would constitute a great aid to one of the deepest needs of the times in the religious and moral world. The ministers are thirsty for help in this department. The character of the subject is such that popular experimentation is insufficient; it requires also scholarship. The historical and psychological studies, together with the philosophical and aesthetic considerations involved, are of such a nature as to call for the coöperation of the centers of learning, as well as the actual practice of ecclesiastical institutions.

I do not mean to suggest that a new service book is all that we need in this direction. The worship of the future church will include many varieties of expression not to be compacted in any formal liturgy. It will always have need for the free, spontaneous, public meeting style of exercise. It will develop many kinds of specially prepared orders for occasional uses, some of great elaboration. It will call forth gifted individuals, who will devise original usages as they go along. An example of this last suggestion is the work but recently opened in London by Dr. Percy Dearmer and Miss Maude Royden.

All these considerations do not render less desirable a service book which can be the steady "Ordinary" of the usage. Such a book, however, should contain a variety of services, both as to form and content. The old Book of Common Prayer does not have sufficient variety in either. Dr. Orchard's book contains a number of services with differing content, but none sufficiently differing in form from the regular service.

One of the important needs, demanding a variation in form, is that of the small church, which may be oftentimes without a minister. Some of our home mission churches would be greatly benefited if they could have a service book which contained a simple, practicable order that could be read by one of the elders or deacons. Many of our average churches would not wish to use an order that could be well managed only on a larger scale. The book needed should cover these varied requirements for usual Sunday services,

Technique and Freedom

without attempting to provide for the more extraordinary occasions.

Meanwhile, there is needed among the free churches more attention to the psychology of the subject, both in the large and with respect to seemingly trivial details. One illustration will suffice to indicate the kind of analysis needed at many points.

Not long since, the choir director of our church desired to place a particular solo immediately before the sermon in the regular service. We tried it, but the effect was decidedly unfortunate. And the reason is perfectly clear. There should not be a work of art of this kind immediately before a long address. If the music is not good, it should not be there, anyway. If it is good, if it succeeds in giving to people the imaginative lift which any work of art should do, the following moment is not the one for the opening of a sermon. An imaginative preparation of that sort should be followed immediately by something impressive, a prayer, a scripture, or a very brief and quiet word of address.

A sermon should not begin impressively. It should begin interestingly, but the heavier burden of impression should come with the climax and at the close. Therefore, some more common and ordinary exercise, such as a hymn, should immediately precede the sermon. If the order of worship has developed an imaginative outlook and an emotional power by itself, the cycle of its psychological course should be brought to a certain conclusion before the beginning of the sermon. There should be something to ground the attention after the first emotional lift, something to bring back the whole situation, so to speak, to "neutral clutch." An artistic solo does not do this. It does too much. Something else is required, which will enable the sermon to begin lower down as it were, and then lead to a fresh ascent of the emotions. I speak of this in detail merely to indicate the necessity for a similarly critical examination of other materials which the artist in worship may utilize as he becomes proficient in the technique of his art.

These materials of the artist in worship consist of other things besides music, readings, and prayers. They may in-

Art & Religion

clude also any little physical exercises such as receiving the collection plates, and placing them upon a table or treasury; appropriate vestments for minister and choir; a processional movement of singers; or other devices which add objective interest to the service. It is becoming more and more common for churches of various denominations to clothe their choir in some uniform garment. The reasons are obvious. It not only nullifies the disagreeable effect of otherwise discordant colors, or differences of richness in personal apparel, but gives a positive effect of order and harmony, and hence of beauty.

There are also an increasing number of churches which appreciate both the dignity and the modesty of having the minister wear a quiet robe. Meanwhile there are some churches in which the beauty of the service is increased, according to their taste, by certain appropriate and interesting usages of color. The joy of religion is not sufficiently symbolized if the prevailing note is black.

Even the most independent of all the churches have never felt the necessity for discouraging any of these developments. In the "Handbook of Congregationalism," by the Rev. Henry Martyn Dexter, D.D., is the following paragraph: "As already suggested, Congregationalists enjoy a larger liberty in respect to all things which have been in this chapter discussed, than is within the constitutional reach of Christians of other polities. Any Congregational church, whose taste and sense of expediency may so incline it, is at perfect liberty to order its worship by the liturgy of the Church of England, or the Protestant, or Reformed Episcopal Church of the United States, or by a liturgy of its own. So long as it do nothing which shall give reasonable ground of offense to the other churches with which it is in fellowship, it may order its prayers, its praise, and all the methods of its worship, to its own entire content; and its pastor, remaining true to our fundamentals of doctrine and of polity, though enrobed and endowed with 'Chasuble, Albe, Amice, Stole, Maniple, and Zone, with two blessed Towels, and all their Appendages,' would remain, in good faith and entirely, a Congregational minister still."



SILVER ALMS BASIN
Made by Arthur J. Stone.



ALTAR CROSS
IN SILVER, IVORY, AND ENAMEL
Made by Arthur J. Stone.



CARVED AND GILDED
CANDLESTICK
Made by G. Troccoli.

Technique and Freedom

The very words of Dr. Dexter's paragraph indicate, however slightly, some of the rich things in the past of the Christian Church which Protestants have largely forgotten or have never known. Some of these past riches are wonderfully worth recovering; other such like riches we may create for ourselves, and indeed are beginning to create. It is not generally known how many works of artistic merit are now being produced by the different societies of arts and crafts for the churches, many of these for the free churches. Excellent handwork in silver, precious stones, glass, metals, textiles, oak, brass, and printing is being done in larger and larger quantity. The revival of artistic interest in the older churches has called forth a steady stream of chalices, crosses, pyxes, vestments, reredos, pulpits, altars, windows, altar books, Bibles, and other objects, each of them designed for a definite and fitting place in a finished technique of worship.

Not only in ritualistic churches, but amongst the free churches, are there many new buildings where the minor objects are finely and beautifully wrought, although properly subordinated by the simplicity of the larger structural lines and spaces. Symbolic carvings in the stones of doorway arches, pier heads and towers; figures in relief on pulpits, chairs, tables, screens, or pews; candlesticks, candelabra, and hanging lamps; plates, fonts, panels, hardware, and organ cases; embroidered bookmarks and altar covers; pictorial figures or significant designs painted on glass and in some cases on walls; all these are more and more being recognized as important adjuncts to the materials in the hand of the artist in worship.

It is easy to condemn this tendency out of hand. It is better to try to understand it and use it aright. The hunger for beauty is a God-given desire in human nature. It may be denied and sacrificed when pressing concerns call for stern and heroic measures: it is to be feared when it becomes gluttonous: in healthy normal life it must be satisfied. I have not denied that beautiful symbolic objects are dangerous. But they are at once less dangerous and far more refining than other modes of the corporeal display of religious faiths and feelings. If it is possible for a love of beautiful things

Art & Religion

to become debased into merely sensuous pleasure, that same love of beauty is for many a religious soul a genuine spirit of reverence. Protestants would do well to recognize a certain profound piety moving in and through the impulse to beautify the House of God and all things that have to do with the setting and scene where people meet to worship God.

The necessity for improvement in the art of worship is evident to larger and larger numbers of clergymen. There is on the whole a large amount of experimentation going on in all these matters. It is not desirable to curtail but rather to promote this. Much more is needed before any general unification of forms and usages will be either possible or desirable. The broad principle which I have to suggest for the study of the liturgy as a whole is developed in the next two chapters.

But improved forms there must be and will be in the great new age before us. The lover of freedom who wants to get on without form is not enough of a lover of freedom for the new day. He needs to enlarge both the scope of his own desires and the price he is willing to pay for their satisfaction. Freedom is not derived simply from absence of form, either in prayer or ecclesiastical organization or in any other category: it comes from the mastery of form. Bad form is ugly and tyrannical. To live without form is to live futilely. Good form may be the very vehicle and guarantee of freedom. Freedom in the experience and in the expression of worship is the gift of technique in the art of worship.

Chapter XV: The Mysticism of Isaiah

POSSIBLY the experience of beauty is the same thing as the experience of worship. Some of its elements, at least, would appear to be identical with the course of that illumination described by Isaiah as the mystical source of his prophetic insight and power.

The experience begins with attention to some object, that body of beauty or reality outside us which induces the experience. I do not pause here for any discussion of what might be called the mystic's preparation, the process of elimination, the cutting away of other objects and interests and desires, both outer and inner, which would prevent entire absorption in the single and supreme object. The great worshipers have always insisted upon this preparation and have themselves practiced the most severe rigors to ensure its character.

But we are here, rather, beginning on the lower and ordinary plane of the experience of beauty, which may befall without any preparation. The object presents itself; we are passive. "Sir Henry Irving 'presents' Macbeth." So a flower, the light on a wide water, an opera, a poem, a statue, a song, a noble building, a symphony, a mountain, presents itself to us; it comes forward to meet us, it enlarges, it draws and absorbs, it becomes for the moment our world. So, too, if the object be seen of the inner eye only—humanity, the universe, God.

The first reaction or feeling is that of self-abnegation, littleness, humility. You go to the opera and say, I could never write an opera like that if I lived a thousand years. You ride alone over the desert. The weight of years, the spaces of land and sky overwhelm you. This body of loveliness, a rose, a sonata, so finished and exquisite, this indescribable perfection of form or color or sound, this is of another order and another world than your own. It humbles

Art & Religion

and belittles. You are outclassed. You feel small; your own life and labor and lot are not right or good to you now that you have seen this excellence. You are dissatisfied with yourself and all your works. You have no taste for common life now that you have tasted God. Here—say you—here let me abide; here is life, life desirable and original and sweet, immortal life; here is my true home and dwelling place. Your common life seems pale and awry and wrong. You are ashamed of your achievement in the presence of this perfect beauty; you are humbled and penitent before the awful sublimities of the divine presentment.

Then a strange thing happens, strange for its swift and powerful force. This body of beauty, this symbolized idea or truth, this great existence comes into you, fills and possesses and enlarges you. You say, No, I could never write such an opera—no, but something I can do, something I, too, can make, with the same finish and power; I, too, can produce a noble work, perfect as this vase or tower or starry heavens. Your humiliation is changed to dignity, your dejection to exaltation.

St. Augustine very precisely describes this swift change from penitence to salvation in the experience of worship, the experience of God. "I tremble and I burn; I tremble feeling I am unlike Him; I burn feeling that I am like Him." Self-abnegation is followed by self-realization, weakness by power. Your smallness is gone, your shame removed, and your sins forgiven. You experience ecstasy, renewal, salvation. Warrior kings have always known and used these power-engendering arts. The pipes and drums and bugles have always gathered troops and led them to the fray; they have put fire in the blood, courage in the heart, and probably actual physical strength in sinew and muscle. I believe that one of the unfailing accompaniments of a genuine experience of beauty or a genuine experience of worship is a heightening of all the vital powers.

Swiftly still the experience moves forward to another stage and scene. Between the single object and the fascinated eye there moves a screen of memory. Into this holy place obtrudes the common world. That ordinary life from

The Mysticism of Isaiah

which you have come and to which you must soon return breaks in upon your mystic hour. But what a strange world it is. It cannot look the same, for now you have new eyes. You see it as from the heights. Your new vitality has given the imagination an unwonted lift and range. Here between the masses and harmonies of a symphony and your rapt sense there floats in the world of practical life, but it floats like clouds with ever changing shapes. Its values shift and change. The unworthy sinks, the true and the good emerge and grow. Faiths and hopes are given new life. Certain realities are freshly freighted with import and significance. Old things pass away, all things are become new.

The mystics have always claimed new revelations. According to the view we are considering, it is not really a new scene that is given in the experience of worship but a new eye to see; not new truths but a new seer. The actual increase in physical and imaginative power in the midst of the experience enables men to see their world more clearly and truly. It is questionable whether the experience of beauty as such gives any entirely new world, any improved morality. It seems rather to clarify the world that is brought to it. If that world already contains a noble and adequate ethical principle, it will be revived and expanded, but not necessarily changed fundamentally.

This would appear to be the explanation of the very different thought content set forth by equally devoted and assured mystics. This would appear also to explain somewhat the lack and shortage in the merely aesthetic world. The enjoyment of beauty is sought for its own sake by those who come to it without any previous moral ideal or purpose. To such the experience does not necessarily offer any moral content. The power and vitality engendered is consumed in its own fire and has no valuable practical issue. Many have defended this very conception as the true and characteristic aesthetic experience. I do not believe that it is, even from the strictly aesthetic point of view, certainly not from the fuller view of a more rounded ethical person.

The experience, if true to type, then passes, still swiftly, to its final stage. Not long since you were saying, Here is

Art & Religion

life, desirable and original; this is the moment I desire to stay, it is so fair. But into that moment came drifting the world of common life, faint and shadowy, obscuring the great object, perhaps to pass and return and pass again. At length it must remain, changed, clear, alluring, illumined. At some point comes the choice. You cannot stay in the theater all night, and soon you will not want to; the flame dies out of the western sky and you are ready to let it pass; the singers wind out of the sanctuary, the temple courts will be silent soon, but not sooner than you are eager to be off on the enterprise you have seen to be right and good by the mystical light. In your heart is new loyalty and dedication, a clear and practical attitude toward the common world.

If this is not good aesthetics, it is good religion. There is no sufficient reason to deny that it is good aesthetics, save an arbitrary definition and the limitation of the effect of beauty to the static only. So to limit the content of the experience is to foster aesthetic debauchery and the literal dissipation of the noblest human powers. The true experience of beauty and of worship would seem alike to have issue in this mood of consecration and purpose.

Just this course of experience is described by the great eighth century prophet Isaiah as having been his "in the year that King Uzziah died." I know of no other writing which so brilliantly, briefly and completely sets forth the nature of a human experience of God, its character and consequences. With few and bold strokes, he draws a picture of religion—ecstasy, humility, salvation, clarification, consecration. He reports the power and effect of public worship and the whole course of his own repentance, cleansing, illumination, and enlistment.

Isaiah was a man of extraordinary gifts of mind and person. He was a leader in the nation, a courtier, close to the throne and the affairs of state. On the death of his king, after a long and prosperous reign, he was disturbed and troubled by internal conditions of wrong and by impending perils from without dangerous to the nation and the royal power. Pondering these things, he went up to the temple of his God. There, whether it was the smoke that rose from the

The Mysticism of Isaiah

great altar of sacrifice, or the music of the singers responding from side to side of the temple courts, or the golden figures of the winged cherubim, or all these together, something set his thoughts and imagination rising. He had a sense of the divine. He had an experience of the presence of God, ineffable and awful, like those of Paul and Augustine, Tauler and Saint Theresa.

“In the year that king Uzziah died I saw . . . the Lord . . . high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphims: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory. And the posts of the door moved at the voice of him that cried, and the house was filled with smoke.”

Such an experience few men have in the course of mortal life. Plotinus said that in his lifetime he had enjoyed only four such supreme seasons of divine communion. Bernard wrote that only once or twice could a man rise to such a sense of the mystic union with God as he tried to describe. Yet something like this many men have and many times.

Isaiah's first response to this sense of God was a feeling of great humility and sinfulness. He beheld how high and holy God is; how unapproachable and awful and dangerous is his being and presence:

“In the year that king Uzziah died I saw . . . the Lord . . . high and lifted up . . .

“Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts.”

Then swiftly—as winds fly to fill the empty space, as waters rush through opened gates, swiftly as the Spirit of the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity ever moves to visit contrite hearts, so swiftly—

“Then flew one of the seraphims unto me, having a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar: and he laid it upon my mouth, and said, Lo,

Art & Religion

this hath touched thy lips; and thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin purged."

To have some sense of the universe, to behold the starry heavens, to see the lifted Christ, to think on God, and so to be overwhelmed, humbled, shamed at the littleness and sin of your life is to invite the coming of power, the rush of the wind of the breath of the Spirit of God to heal and cleanse, to fill and enlarge and restore and leave the joy of salvation.

And then Isaiah remembered his common world, his city, his king, his nation with its troubled and perilous life. It had become clear to him what word needed to be said and he knew that he must say it.

"Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, Here am I; send me."

This is the course and order of an experience of worship, an experience of the sense of God—up from the world of the many to the overworld of the One, back to the world of the many to fulfil the will of the One.

Something like the great experience of Isaiah is what the worship of the church ought to help people to have. Something like that experience people do have over and again outside of the church, not always or even usually complete, but rich, varied, overwhelming, exalting, enjoyable, vitalizing, in their contact with nature or the arts.

We who love the church have ourselves chiefly to blame if so large a part of the community finds its instinct and desire for worship satisfied by the theater and the music hall, the museum of art, or the free and individual enjoyment of the out of doors.

Yet the world of the artist and nature lover is also to blame that its culture of the spirit has so often stopped short of the true heights of the spirit. It has too often been content with an experience of lifted feeling without valuable practical issue. It has tried to persuade itself that its own world is the only real world, a world of refuge from common life, a compensation for common toils. Religion would take up the common world and look at it with new eyes and go back

The Mysticism of Isaiah

to it with new power and commitment, not compensating for common toils but suffusing them with its own glory.

There are important differences between the aesthetic and the religious experiences. We are rather here interested in these points of likeness or perhaps more properly of identity. Entirely apart from the nature of the absorbing object, whether it be finite or infinite, and apart also from the moral or intellectual content of the experience, there would appear to be an identity in course or process or in some of the major elements of the sense of beauty and the sense of God. There is something about the experience, whether of art or of worship, to be enjoyed for its own sake, an end in itself, but also something essentially untrue and wrong in any claim of mystic communion which does not result in new values seen in the common world, cleansing from littleness, sin and isolation, and the definite dedication to some service of that enlarged vitality engendered in the experience.

Vision, Humility, Vitality, Illumination, Enlistment—these constitute the experience of worship, and these may all be kindled in the experience of beauty.

Chapter XVI: The Order of the Liturgy

THE order of service for public worship cannot be much improved until we discover or select a principle to go upon. There has been more or less attempt at defining the functions of different liturgical parts and some analysis of their emotional effects. Here and there much good psychology has been applied to the betterment of ugly and disjointed orders of common worship. There has been discarding, enrichment, elaboration. But on the whole there is everywhere evidence of the merest patchwork and carpentry in the arrangement of the exercises of Protestant worship. What we first require is some guiding theory to help the practical problem of developing a unified, beautiful, and effective liturgy.

The theory here proposed is a very simple one—that the outward expression in the service of worship should parallel the inner course of the experience of worship. The difficulties of this are many and great. The experience itself is complex and elusive and largely uncontrollable. It may happen on a sudden and unexpectedly; it may come when desired and prepared for; it may escape just when all the conditions seem most favorable. It may be long-sustained and filled with a variety of intellectual contents; it may be brief and pointed, its whole course finished in a few moments. How, then, give it concurrent expression in any manner so set and prearranged as an order of public worship? Nevertheless, through all the innumerable variations in stimulus, tone, intensity, content of ideas, recurrence, duration, conclusion, there would appear to be always in its normal course something of each of the elements suggested—Vision, Humility, Exaltation, Illumination, Dedication.

If this analysis of the experience is anything like correct, it would suggest, first of all, as applied to our practical problem, public expression of that humility and sense of small-

The Order of the Liturgy

ness which is the first natural response to the realities that induce the experience. This is precisely what all the old liturgies of the Christian church contain—Confitorium, Kyrie Eleison, General Confession.

It is true that the "sense of sin" seems not very prevalent, and is in some quarters thought to be an unworthy and unnecessary part of the religious experience. But if we are at this point getting off the track religiously, a study of the artistic experience will speedily restore our spiritual normality. It would appear to admit of no doubt that a sense of weakness, inadequacy, imperfection, is the first and often very powerful reaction to the presentation of whatever body of beauty really succeeds in reaching us. How much more is the same effect induced when we find ourselves set over against a real presentation of the whole of reality, of the being and presence of God. The sense of sin, the sense of personal delinquency and shame, of moral imperfection, of metaphysical smallness, of inconsequential selfhood, of individual guilt in social tragedy—this sense is neither unnatural nor forced nor weak nor out of date. It is a permanent element in the spiritual experience of mankind, involved both in the experience of moral evil and the substance of metaphysical limitations. If this be true, the expression of the experience is a proper and necessary part of the exercise of worship.

The most of such exercises do include an expression of penitence. Usually, however, it receives too slight attention, a few phrases in the midst of a long prayer including many other feelings and ideas. Such a brief and incidental expression of humility is altogether inadequate and ineffective. It should be one of the principal liturgical parts,—if possible expressed by all the people, rather than by the minister only,—though not necessarily a long part. And so it is in the old liturgies, which are at this point right, as the most of non-liturgical practice is wrong. Some of our recently improved Protestant services have therefore restored the use of the General Confession from the English Prayer Book. Others use the beautiful prayer in the Fifty-first Psalm, either in

Art & Religion

unison or responsive recital. Others use freshly written prayers of confession.

But this prayer should not be the first part of the service. The sense of smallness or the sense of sin or humility is not something you can produce out of your own consciousness; it happens to you. It is induced in you by the contact of something larger which humbles you, something better that shames you. Just here is a weakness of the Episcopal liturgy. There is nothing sufficiently impressive preceding the General Confession to make you feel like confessing your sins.

There is commonly a Processional Hymn, but the value of this is largely its effect as a curtain raiser that serves to focus scattered attention, merge the individuals into a congregation, and generally to warn everybody that the exercise has begun. Following the hymn there is a call to worship and summons to repentance altogether too brief and too slender to work the miracle expected of it.

This is probably the point of greatest weakness in most exercises of public worship. It would not be so if some spiritual preparation on the part of the average worshiper could be expected or counted upon, but it cannot be. People do not, as a matter of fact, arrive at church, after a late breakfast and the Sunday morning paper, at all prepared in spirit to fall upon their knees and confess their sins. I have at times felt like devising some sort of ante-chamber to the Lord's House, some place of purgation, some door of leaving behind, in order that people might be prepared worthily to worship and happily to enjoy its benefits, but this is doubtless impractical. It is altogether possible, however, greatly to improve the opening of the service.

A Processional Hymn, as suggested, is the oldest and best means for the very initial matter of unifying attention, without too much demand upon it at first. The usual Protestant practice opens the service with three or four items, each too brief or too familiar to be either very interesting or very impressive. They fail to take sharp hold upon the attention or to stir much of any movement amongst the emotive faculties of the worshiper. The Invocation is the only opportunity for fresh material, but so brief a prayer must needs be

The Order of the Liturgy

supremely well done to carry its effect. Not many men can do it supremely well.

In the Roman Mass the priest's Preparation followed by the Introit is a more extended and impressive exercise, serving also to prepare the people to offer their own first prayer of confession in the *Kyrie Eleison*. All these parts are the same for every day except the Introit. This latter is a very interesting number, a curtailed relic of a longer antiphonal exercise used in the earlier days of the church to open the service, different each day, in general announcing the special character and ideas of the day; this in turn going back to the antiphonal psalms of the Jewish liturgy.

Here is something that can be effectively restored, yielding the value of ancient usages, but capable of fresh content. Why not displace the three or four ineffective items with which our service is usually opened, by a solid number, longer, more beautiful, more timely, more gripping and impressive? Such an Introit has been tried with very decided improvement in the dignity, interest, and imaginative content of the early part of the service. It is a simple responsive service between minister and choir, the minister reading, the choir singing; two or three responses for each. It sets forth the theme of the day, or at least the area in which the theme lies.

In actual practice it has been found eminently worth while freshly to select material for the Introit each Sunday, as nearly as possible that which would form an introduction to the thought of the sermon. There is a difference of opinion as to whether the service of worship should revolve about the same theme as the sermon. There are evidently advantages in a seasonal development of spiritual themes set forth in a church year arrangement of the liturgy independent of sermon themes. Such a plan assures a comprehensive character to the worship of the year, perhaps more full and better balanced than the sermon subjects are liable to be. Also it provides for a more or less complete setting forth of helpful spiritual suggestion for the worshipers, no matter what the subject matter of the sermon may be. On the other hand, there is undoubtedly great force in the arrangement of a

Art & Religion

unified service from organ prelude to benediction, the sermon included.

It must fairly be charged that in altogether too many free churches, the service of worship is neither one of these things. It does not form an interesting or a comprehensive course of experience by itself; it does not form a very exact introduction to the sermon. On the whole, it will probably be found that the average preacher covers a fairly wide range of ideas in the course of a year's work. He very naturally takes advantage of the more notable seasonal feelings and makes occasions for the presentation of those matters which relate to the practical parish life also. Some sort of church year plan is therefore very natural, if not inevitable. It need not be rigid, as the old liturgies are, and should not be.

It is possible for the most of the Sundays of the year to have a service of worship which fits naturally into a comprehensive year plan, and which also is in itself, with the sermon, a completely harmonious presentation. I believe that each service should be a dramatic unity from start to finish. It is very difficult for this unity to make itself felt by all the worshipers unless at the very beginning of the service there is a strong, pertinent, and fairly full introductory announcement of the thought of the day.

The first value of an Introit is the increase in the sense of unity throughout the service, if this opening number has a sufficiently distinctive intellectual content to be noted at the moment, and later remembered, when the same thoughts appear in Scripture lessons, prayers, and in the sermon. There is certainly great value also in the fresh ideas of such an exercise as compared with the familiar material of the usual opening numbers—Call to Worship, Doxology, Invocation, Choir Response, Lord's Prayer, Gloria. The desirable sense of familiarity may be derived not from its content but from its form. In any work of art, form and content work together toward the total impression, the form serving to elevate and intensify the content. It is notable that the brief responses by the choir quiet and attract the hearers so that the intervening portions, as read, carry a more weighty im-

The Order of the Liturgy

pressiveness. And if the content be fresh and pertinent, its ideas are eagerly attended to.

Another great merit of such an exercise is the improvement in the dignity of music in the service. Members of the choir, singing in such a responsive service, seem not to be artists rendering a concert number, as too often they do in many church services, but rather ministers in the sanctuary taking part in the service of God.

Another more subtle effect of the exercise is the result of its declarative character, the feeling that the Church has something definite to say. The sermon is the minister's word, the word of the prophet; the Scripture reading is the Bible's word; the words of the Introit, though they be taken largely from the Bible, seem somehow to be so set forth as to represent rather the present faith and pronouncement of the Church, proclaiming the reality and nature of God. Such a note and such an impression are in this day of uncertainties more than ever needed.

In our view, then, the ordinary Sunday service should be opened, not with the several brief and for the most part familiar numbers of the usual usage, but with a longer, more rich, freshly prepared exercise, presented by the minister and choirs, which is at once praise to God and pronouncement to the people. If this is successful, it becomes the presentation of that reality over against which the smallness and weakness of human life become evident. It is the necessary antecedent to the experience of humility and the expression of penitence. This expression should come next, in some prayer of general confession, as has been suggested.

The low point in the experience does not last long, nor should its expression. The mystic alternation moves swiftly; the sense of fulness and the rushing tide of revival flow fast upon the acknowledgment of emptiness and unworthiness. Whoever beholds the truth and is humbled by it is speedily enlarged and elevated by it. Nothing is more universally testified by artists and mystics alike than the heightened vitality and increased imagination produced in any real moment of direct and immediate experience of reality.

Art & Religion

This sense of fulness must find early and rich expression in the service of worship. Only long experiment and patient observation can determine the best manner of this expression. A doxology, a noble hymn of praise, a worthy anthem, may follow the prayer of confession, to give expression to the exaltation which presumably is the concurrent element in the experience as we are following its unfolding course.

Henceforth we are on more difficult and complicated ground. For here begins occurrence of the practical world, the process of filling the imaginative forms with a definite intellectual content, the process of the back and forth swing between the One and the many, the peace and fulness of the One, the remembered urgencies of the many.

Here lies the inadequacy of the world of the arts without religion and the definite morality demanded by definite religious faith. It has not provided a sufficiently thoughtful moral content. In the order of worship, there should come, therefore, as they usually do, after the expression of exaltation, Scripture lessons and prayer. These exercises serve to fill with definite ideas the uplifted consciousness which is nevertheless as yet a vague and unordered one. They serve to call up the world of the many into the illuminated state and to begin the formation of working faiths. Miss Underhill refers to them as "a group of actions which seem a fitting symbol of the varied powers and duties proper to that illuminated consciousness, flowing out in charity to God and man, which has now been achieved."*

In any case, the nature of the experience at this point is characterized by illumination, clarification, the rearrangement of all things as seen in the new light of all things. This is therefore the point in the service for whatever presentation will help to make this experience definite. The reading of ancient Scriptures may serve to continue the declaration of universal or divine truths; or it may serve to set forth the record of previous human experience of the divine realities and powers; or more probably it may do both for such of the hearers as have made a successful adventure thus far.

* Underhill, "The Mystic Way," p. 348.

The Order of the Liturgy

So, also, the prayers and collects in this part of the service should be largely of a pastoral character, serving to continue the sense of the divine outlook and to express the desires of the worshipers for the world and those whom they love in it, according as those desires have now been purified and intensified in the experience.

Both of these exercises, presumably begun after the infilling and enlargement of the vital powers, constitute the remembrance of the practical world, now changed, revalued, glorified, as seen by the eyes which have been opened to the mystic vision. They fill with a definite moral content the otherwise vague and unreflective imaginative outlook.

According to our theory, there should follow next an expression of faith. The worshiper having had presented to him a declaration of truth, or, inwardly, a vision of Divinity; having expressed the humility and penitence that is his natural reaction; having shared the service of praise for the revival and enlargement next swiftly following; having seen with fresh eyes a new earth as well as a new heaven; he is prepared to say what it is that in the light of all these things he now believes. This is the point for whatever Credo the service contains.

Protestantism, historically, has made much use of the recital of some creed. Of late larger and larger numbers of churches have omitted any such exercise, moved by the changes in thought and the frequent deprecation of creeds in general. It is, of course, only weak and foolish to be too easily swept off our feet by unintelligent outcry against creeds. You have to believe something or other before you can walk around the block. You certainly have to have some sort of working philosophy of life, however tentative or temporary, to form any kind of society. One of the effects of the artistic experience, as well as the religious experience, is to fix, at least for a time, a sense of whatever seems at the time to be valuable or real or important. This is precisely what a creed is. There is unquestionably very great good to be derived from the attempt to state as definitely and clearly as possible from time to time the central matters of one's belief. And if anyone objects too seriously to this, he may

Art & Religion

always—after the fashion of Cicero concerning Carthage—write down as the last clause of his creed his belief that all these statements will some day be changed for the better.

At this place in our own order of worship, we are just now using an arrangement which serves at once two or three purposes. After the period devoted to Scriptures and prayers, the people stand for a triple exercise, the familiar Doxology, a Confession of Faith, and the Gloria Patri. One of the uses of this plan is to relieve the recital of a confession from a certain abruptness and coldness which it might have by itself alone. A much more important purpose is the need for continuing throughout the service the sense of elevation and the praise expressing it which is, so to speak, one of the two poles of the alternating experience. Another purpose also achieved by this simple arrangement is the lessening of the number of times the congregation is required to stand or be seated during the service.

There yet remains a final stage of the experience to be expressed in the service of worship, the mood of dedication, into which both the power and the ideas of the experience should be directed. The natural outlet for this mood is the offering. By itself, however, this is not sufficient to stand also for the larger consecration of the whole life, which should be felt and in some way symbolized in the service. There are interesting possibilities for experiment in the direction of a more complete expression of consecration than the most of our services contain, centered about the otherwise ugly exercise of taking up the collection. I have not met with any usages of this kind which are satisfactory. There is a fair field for any and all to try their hand at improvement in this particular.

I am in this chapter not attempting to suggest precisely what details or features can best be utilized to carry out this conception of a liturgy, nor is this the place to discuss the innumerable possibilities of exceptional services prepared for occasions which contain in themselves rich suggestiveness of material. Nor am I here interested to promote any practices which might be called bizarre, or even to discuss the

The Order of the Liturgy

more brilliant possibilities open to such great churches as have at their command extraordinary resources of artistry.

The object of this brief study is rather to propose a simple theory which can be used as a guide in our experiments for a more unified and beautiful order of worship. The changes involved in following this guide might not be so very great in many churches, superficially considered. The matter of particular importance just now is the discovery and application of such a guiding principle, which, if a true principle, may be applied to modest forms and materials and also to the use of the most difficult and extensive literary, musical, or ritualistic exercises. The theory we have been describing is that the order of worship should parallel the experience of worship.

There should be, then, in any liturgy, first of all, some form of Presentation. How this shall best be accomplished is a matter for experimentation. Some will wish to include under this caption such items as Call to Worship, Invocation, Scripture Reading, and Anthem; others may consider sufficient a brief Salutation before passing on to the next main division of the order; others will wish to make further trial of some such exercise as above described and called an Introit. In any case, assuming that we are attempting to follow this theory, the items of the first division of the service must be chosen for their usefulness as presentative or declarative material.

The second main division in the order, if we are to parallel the experience, is a Prayer of Penitence. This may be spoken by the minister only, as representative of all, or by the whole congregation. It may be the same prayer for every service, or several prayers may be used in order.

The third division is Praise. Here also different items may be included, such as a doxology, hymn, prayer of thanksgiving, anthem, or responsive reading. Whether one or all of these are used, the function and purpose are the same, to give utterance to the sense of revival and enlargement which is itself the most notable and characteristic element in the mystic experience.

The next section should relate itself to that Illumination

Art & Religion

which presumably has been achieved, in some measure at least, or else the whole exercise is worthless. Here also there may be great difference of opinion as to what may best be used, both to further the experience and to express it. The ones I have suggested are Instruction and Petition; the one calculated to fill with a definite content of ideas and moral ideals the expanded but empty, imaginative house; the other devoted to setting forth common desires and hopes for persons who now seem more worth saving, and for the prevalence of the forces which now seem the most good. The close of this division may well be signalized by whatever kind of Confession of Faith may truly represent the realities believed and trusted by the people.

The closing element of the cycle is Dedication. This may or may not be expressed in the Offering. There is certainly much to be desired in the matter of fixing and pointing purposes and leading on to decision and consecration in our services of worship. The value of the experience is lost if it is not successful at this stage. Perhaps someone will write new hymns or responsive exercises of enlistment and self-offering. On special occasions a common vow recital might be asked and registered with great power. Here we see that the most complete worship requires the sacrament of Communion. The offering of self in the sacrament of the Eucharist is the climax of Christian worship.

This theory of the order of worship has been the basis of our own experiments for more than three years, with very modest materials. Its application has resulted in an order of service which is a dramatic unity, simple and dignified, interesting and smooth. What has been done in our church can be done anywhere, and very much more can be accomplished with more artists to help.

I have nowhere seen another statement of this simple principle, except that of Miss Evelyn Underhill, in her volume "The Mystic Way." In the chapter called "The Testimony of the Liturgy," the author analyzes in detail the functions of each liturgical part in the canon of the Mass, in the light of precisely this theory. "The mass," she writes, "is a mystical drama enacting the necessary adventures of the

The Order of the Liturgy

soul.”* “All the way—from the first turn in the new direction—to the final consciousness of world renewal—the changing liturgy tracks out the adventures of the soul.”† The annual program includes many “partial repetitions of the pattern career—the attainment of sanctity, the ascent to the eternal order and heroic descent in charity to man.”‡ “The developed sacramental act presents, in more intimate and detailed drama the Mystic Way trodden by each spirit in its movement from partial to complete life.”||

Following out this theory, Miss Underhill applies it in detail to the different exercises of the Mass, separating for this purpose the Mass of the Catechumens from the Mass of the Faithful, suggesting that each of these is a complete cycle in itself, one a preparation for the other. Of the first cycle she says, “On its psychological side it recapitulates that sequence of mental states which prepares the movement of consciousness toward new levels; the opening of the eyes of the soul, the leading, as it were, of the self to the frontiers of the Spiritual World.”§ Her chapter cannot be extensively quoted here, nor do I agree with her analysis at various points. But the theory, I believe, is the true one, both historically and psychologically. A few sentences will display her method. Respecting the very beginning of the order, she goes back to an earlier mystic writer: “‘It is the business of the first psalms and hymns of the liturgy,’ says Dionysius the Areopagite, ‘to harmonize the habits of our souls to the things which are presently to be ministered, establishing an accordance with things divine.’”¶

When the vision has been seen, there follows swiftly the sense of imperfection and sin: “The joy of the discovery of Perfection is here balanced by the sadness of the discovery of self: the drama of the mystical life process moves to that first complete realization of disharmony, of the profound need for readjustment, which introduces the soul to the Pur-

* Underhill, “The Mystic Way,” p. 335.

† *Ibid.*, p. 339.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 340.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 341.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 344.

¶ *Ibid.*, p. 344.

Art & Religion

gative Way. . . . The Confitor is the ritual equivalent of this backward swing; of the sudden vision of self, perceived in the light of reality.”*

As the experience moves forward, so also its expression in the liturgy. The Gloria in Excelsis is the “fit image of the joyous vision of the universe which is characteristic of the illuminated state, the abrupt dilation of consciousness, the abrupt reaction from pain-negation to the positive emotions of approbation and delight.”† In the Scripture readings she finds the expression of that desire to publish the good news and consecrate the life above suggested as a necessary part of the normal experience.

I have not myself had exactly this feeling, and question whether it is associated in the mind of the ordinary worshiper with the Scripture lessons. Details, however, are unimportant, as compared to the truth of the principle that the mystic experience, and also its expression in the liturgy, should include the outgoing desires for the good of the world, as well as the enjoyment and adoration of the moment. The complete exercise is “a compact image of the illuminated life in its wholeness; its attitude of rapt attention to, and glad adoration of, the Transcendent Order, its perpetual effort to share with others the secret which it has received.”‡

There are undreamed possibilities of noble worship before us. Our opportunities and advantages are many. At the opera, at the concert, the people are given no share in the production. The experience, more or less stifled within itself, tends to grow less and less in its most valuable elements, and to center itself on the enjoyment of the technical and formal merits of the work of art. The church has a chance to present its great conceptions in forms of beauty no less enchanting than any others and to enhance the imaginative grasp of those conceptions by the vivid processes of their popular expression and celebration. I believe that it is not only possible for the church to offer higher and better enjoy-

* Underhill, “The Mystic Way,” p. 346.

† *Ibid.*, p. 346.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 348.

The Order of the Liturgy

ments than any of the arts, but also to claim the moral superiority of its exercise of worship as having a definite intellectual content and suggesting a definite practical issue.

Anyone who has attempted to improve an order of worship is well aware of many practical problems involved. People do not wish to stand up and sit down too many times in a service. There must be opportunities for late comers to be seated with the least possible intrusion upon the attention of all. The order must be easily followed. Strangers and visitors do not enjoy the embarrassment of intricate ceremonies which can be followed easily only by those familiar with them.

Whatever forms are used, their purposes and functions should not be too critically understood by the people. They should get the effect without being called upon to notice the management that produces it. It is easy for the planners of public exercises to produce an artificial effect. This is the risk of all analysis and of all painstaking. But the lack of analysis and of painstaking has in many churches brought about usages which are ugly and unendurable to larger and larger numbers of people.

I am not claiming that the most beautiful order of worship can cause everybody to worship. The experience is ineffable and awful, mysterious and blessed always. But very much can be done to help people to have it. The experience may not move concurrently with its expression in the service. But I am entirely persuaded that no other suggestion will so help us in arranging better exercises of public worship as this principle to which details can be referred and by which simplicity and unity may be maintained—the parallel expression in the order of worship of the most significant elements in the experience of worship.

Chapter XVII: Introit and Antiphons

THERE is needed a brief further word about the usage of an Introit as suggested in the last chapter. The logic and function of its place in the service was perhaps made sufficiently clear there. It is calculated to do what a prologue or first act of a play does. It sets forth the theme of the whole service with sufficiently rich material, carried by beautiful antiphonal music, to capture attention and begin the process of the total presentation of the hour.

Such an exercise should be confident in spirit and declarative in manner—a work of art never argues but simply presents. In style and diction it should be preferably archaic or poetic, though not metrical. In tone of utterance it should not be modulated nor weighty, but straightforward and clear and even, confidently declarative.

In form, a tripartite arrangement seems to be a natural one, each of the three readings of the minister being followed by the antiphonal response of the choir. A reëxamination of a considerable number already used discovers a marked tendency in the character of the three parts. The first reading sets forth some statement of faith or some attribute of Divinity. The second relates to the corresponding human obligation, some statement of the moral implications of the divine character previously testified. The third reading then expresses the hope of triumph for the truth proclaimed or reward for the virtues admonished.

Materials for these parts should be taken largely from the Bible. Some churches will, at least occasionally, be willing to have other religious writings drawn upon for such declarative statements as they regard to be truthfully and beautifully set forth. One of the best collections of material of this character has been made by Mr. Stanton Coit and published in the volumes on "Social Worship."

Good music for responses is hard to find. We use some-

Introit and Antiphons

times that which is included in the "Selected Readings" published by the A. S. Barnes Company. Most of it is very unsatisfactory, although the plan is good. Mr. Clarence Dickinson has prepared similar antiphonals for use in the Brick Presbyterian Church, New York, which are being published. Our own organist is composing new ones, according as we are able to develop the material in harmony with the services. Two of these are presented below in this chapter. It is hoped that these can sometime be published in form suitable for choir usage.

If any church desires to make use of such an introductory number, it should possess, sooner or later, a sufficiently large variety of music to cover the main themes of the Christian year. Oftentimes the same musical response will serve for somewhat different selections for the readings. It is less difficult to find readings more fully pertinent to the theme of the service. If the words which are sung are reasonably in accord, the spoken material will sufficiently carry the burden of more precise introduction.

There is nothing in this general plan to make it impracticable, even with very modest resources. Even without any music at all, there may be an Introit in the service, though it consist of nothing more than two or three verses carefully selected for their pertinence as a preliminary announcement of the theme of the day. It is, at least, far better to have such an introduction, fresh for every formal service, than to use a familiar stereotyped call to worship. There will always be some people who will try to be in their pews on time simply to hear what those introductory verses are, knowing that they will be fresh and appropriate. Sometimes even a single well-selected verse declaring some divine truth will secure an interest and be fixed in memory better than a longer reading or antiphonal exercise. Such a practice makes all the worshipers feel that the service has been well prepared and tends greatly to increase their expectation of getting genuine good from it.

It will sometimes be found valuable to use an antiphonal exercise in the midst of the service rather than as an Introit. Particularly is this suggestion applicable to special occa-

Art & Religion

sional services or celebrations. The future artist in worship will find many opportunities for impressive recitals of this character, including responses by two choirs and responses between two portions of the congregation, as well as between minister and people or minister and singers.

The exercises here presented were used in the regular morning service at the Wellington Avenue Congregational Church in Chicago. The music was written by the regular choir director, Mr. Leo Sowerby. The first was prepared for the service at which the sermon topic was "The Son of God," the second was introductory to a sermon on "The Communion of Work."

INTROIT ON CREATIVE SONSHIP

Minister:

Thus saith the Lord:

I am the Lord, and there is none else; beside me there is
no God.

I will gird thee, though thou hast not known me:

That they may know from the rising of the sun, and from
the west, that there is none beside me:

I am the Lord, and there is none else.

I form the light, and create darkness;

I make peace and create evil;

I am the Lord, that doeth all these things.

Choir:

Slowly

p

f *p*

Ho - ly, Ho - ly, Ho - ly, Lord God of Hosts. A - MEN.

p *f* *p*

Introit and Antiphons

Minister:

As many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are the sons of God.


For ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.

For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God.

For the creation was subjected to vanity . . . in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God.

Choir:

Moderately



The Heavens and the earth are full, Are full of Thy glo-ry.



Ho-san-na in the High-est, Ho-san-na in the High-est.

Minister:

And I saw the heaven opened: and behold, a white horse and he that sat thereon, called Faithful and True:

And his eyes are a flame of fire and upon his head are many diadems:

And his name is called the Word of God.

Art & Religion

And the armies which are in heaven followed him upon white horses.

Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be:

But we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him: for we shall see him as he is.

Choir:

Fast
f
Bless - ed is He Who com - eth in the Name of the

f
p
Lord, . of . . the Lord. Ho - san - na in the

f
ff
in . the Name of the Lord.

f
ff
High - est, Ho - san - na in . the High - est.

INTROIT ON THE FELLOWSHIPS OF WORK

Minister:

Come and see the works of God.

His work is honorable and glorious.

Introit and Antiphons

He hath made his wonderful works to be remembered:
the Lord is gracious and full of compassion.

The works of his hands are verity and judgment:

O that men would praise the Lord for his goodness, and
for his wonderful works to the children of men!

And let them sacrifice the sacrifices of thanksgiving, and
declare his works with rejoicing.

Choir:

Rather fast

Bless the Lord, all his works, in all pla - ces of

his do - min - ion. Bless the Lord, O my soul.

Minister:

God is no respecter of persons:

But in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh
righteousness is accepted with him.

For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do
of his good pleasure.

Faith, if it hath not works is dead, being alone.

Surely my judgment is with the Lord, and my work with
my God.

Art & Religion

Choir:

Moderately
mf *p*

Bless the Lord, all ye his hosts: ye min - is - ters of

his that do his pleas - ure. Bless the Lord, O my soul.

Minister:

When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, . . .
Before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another . . . and say unto them on his right hand,
Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:
For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat:
I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink:
I was a stranger, and ye took me in:
Naked, and ye clothed me:
I was sick, and ye visited me:
I was in prison, and ye came unto me.
Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

Introit and Antiphons

Choir:

Fast
mf *f*

And his ser - vants shall serve . . him: and they shall

p *f*

see his face, Bless the Lord, . . all his

p *f* *ff*

hosts. Bless the Lord, bless the Lord, O my soul.

Chapter XVIII: Music

MUSIC is the most universal and possibly the highest of the fine arts. It is the most formal and the least representative of all. It is the only one which appeals to the ear, all the others being addressed to the eye. Although some music approximates other arts in definiteness of ideas, the most of it is representative of moods and feelings rather than of concepts. It is pure beauty, of harmony, of melody, of rhythm, like a tree, a vase, a flower, or the movements of the dance.

Just as all peoples have loved music, so to the religionist, music is the most commonly acceptable art. Churches which are prejudiced against painting and sculpture and which have, seemingly, little appreciation of the importance of beautiful architecture, insist upon having good music. There is no need for argument by way of persuading even Protestants to utilize the art of music. There is much need of many very definite improvements in the ordinary use of music among us. Forgoing the desire to discuss the general aesthetics of the subject, I am confining these remarks to a few very practical matters.

First of all, the music of a church service should contribute to its unity. Often it does not do this. The words of the anthems, usually, and frequently the words of the hymns, have little or no connection with the general theme of the service. That this is difficult to avoid is no excuse for it. Although our hymn books are not sufficiently rich in expressing many modern religious sentiments, the best hymnals will yield numbers which will reasonably accord with most of the subject matter desired. It is unexceptionably worth while for ministers to take pains in the choice of hymns.

Far more difficult is the question of the anthem. Not only is the range of ideas in anthem literature more limited, but it is harder to prearrange the sermon and service themes

Music

sufficiently early to enable the choir preparation to be pertinent. Nevertheless, especially in the larger churches, the attempt should be made to fit the anthem as accurately as possible into the definite unity of the day.

As already suggested in a previous chapter, some general church year system of themes may be made the basis of the usual preparation. Even if not always followed, such a system tends to increase the number of services in which a successful unity can be developed. Our usual Protestant usage accomplishes this for the more notable seasons, such as Thanksgiving, Christmas, and Easter. It can be extended by adding seasonal themes in Advent, Lent, Whitsuntide, and other seasons.

Where it is difficult, on particular occasions, to find suitable words for the musical parts of the service, anthems may be omitted entirely in favor of organ music. This is a very impressive usage in any case. There is an abundant musical literature for such purposes. An organ number in the midst of the service may sometimes be far superior to an anthem. It may be made just as interesting, and has some distinct advantages. Having a less definite mental suggestion than the anthem, it calls more richly upon the imagination of the worshiper. If the theme of the service has already been clearly presented, that theme the more easily becomes the imaginative content of the musical presentation. Especially nowadays, when people expect so much to be done for them, it is valuable to have them drawn into this kind of share in the good of the service. Also, in this day of nervous movement, it is valuable to have in the service such moments of quietness as are effected by a purely musical number.

Not every organist is skilful in the selection of his numbers with respect to the service unity. He should not use martial music when the theme of the service is quiet and devotional, nor contrariwise. At every possible point all the music of every service should be made conformable to the prearranged theme of the hour.

The next most important manner of regarding music in public worship is its worth as the general matrix of the service. It should be used not only for its own sake, at espe-

Art & Religion

cially assigned places, but all the way through to bind the parts together. It should fill the chinks and make the transitions. It is the underlying warp upon which the pictures of the woof are woven. If minister and organist understand each other and work together, many rough places may be smoothed by a little musical transition. Not only such items as prayer responses, but also short bits of playing while stragglers are being seated or while people are changing their postures, or where the impression of one portion of the service needs for a further moment to be continued or slightly altered before another begins. As an instance of the last point, in our service the organist takes up the emotional level of the close of the Scripture lesson and plays a little climacteric interlude sweeping up into the Doxology. It does not take long and greatly assists the people to the feeling of praise they are about to express.

There cannot, of course, be good music in the church unless there are people properly fitted to produce it. The conduct of the church choir is often a vexed and difficult question. It is well to begin with a high regard for its work. The possibilities of the influence of noble music are so great that it is hard to overestimate the importance of a successful choir. If any chorister should chance to read this chapter, let him be assured of the dignity and worth of his contribution to the service of God; let him understand, also, that it is more important for him to have a truly religious spirit and reverent bearing, and to be unexceptionably faithful in attendance, than that he should be possessed of extraordinary talent.

A so-called chorus choir, even a small one, is far better than a quartet. The quartet may produce superior music; it is usually inferior in devotional feeling. The chorus is less professional and more worshipful, both in appearance and style of singing. Altogether too much church music, especially as produced by the quartet, somehow has the aspect of concert numbers. Music in the service should rather give the impression of an indispensable and closely woven part of the service as a whole. No music in a service of worship should ever impress one as a program number.

Music

Sometimes, where it is hard to maintain a purely volunteer choir, and too expensive to pay many singers, a paid soloist may be engaged as a voice teacher for the chorus. All the members then receive as a kind of payment or spur to their interest valuable instruction which at the same time improves the choir. A children's choir is often possible of development as an adjunct to the work of the regular chorus.

In any case, it is vital to the service of worship that the work of the choir be considered not merely from the point of view of artistic singing, but also from the point of view of its appearance, and with regard to an effect of simplicity and reality as compared with professionalism. The chorus choir is far superior at both these points. It makes possible a processional movement of singers and at the same time a less conspicuous impression. The children's choir, also, though their musical rendition be extremely modest, may be made beautiful to look upon and so a great addition to the sweetness and joy of the service.

In line with the importance of the worshipful character of the music, there should be a greater development of responses and antiphonals. The ambitious and elaborate anthem has its place in the music of the church, but it is greatly overestimated. It is often top-heavy with respect to the rest of the service. It is often "lugged in." Frequently it stands apart, valuable in itself, but not intimately connected with the total psychology of the hour. Brief responses, on the other hand, may serve a definite psychological function when properly placed.

Some churches have developed short antiphonal exercises between people and minister and choir, composed of reading and musical responses. Such exercises are especially valuable for occasional services. They may be made very impressive at the opening of the service, as has been suggested. Such usages leave no doubt as to the character of the music. It is obviously worshipful and not merely artistic. It is far removed from the impression of concert program character. In the performance of such exercises, the singers do not appear to be professional artists, but genuine servers in the House of God. There is not a large musical literature

Art & Religion

to be drawn upon for such antiphonal singing. It is to be hoped that composers will develop work of this character. It will undoubtedly be more largely called for in the early future.

The use of music for special occasions of the church year is often very successfully developed. There is an abundant store of good music for such uses. Yet here, also, there is large opportunity for further development. The future church, especially the cathedral-like city organization, ought to make provision for an organist who is also an able composer. The leaders of the worship of such a church will wish occasionally to arrange services to celebrate great events or set forth in a new way great themes of the Christian career. They ought to have a musician capable of providing the fresh compositions necessary for such occasions.

Sometimes even a modest and brief composition that is new in form and content is extremely effective. For example, in our own church, on last Palm Sunday, the organist prepared music for the words of the Palm Sunday story. The account was presented at the vesper service. It began with the bright morning appeal of the Day of Palms, brilliantly sung by a solo voice. Then followed a reading by the minister setting forth a reconstructed story of the day, recounting the failure of the leaders and the people of Jerusalem to accept the appeal, this reading being accompanied by organ playing. After a transitional paragraph, the keynote of the first bright passage was resumed and the words of praise by the throng sung, to express, as it were, the final judgment of history on the events. This was not an elaborate production, but it was pertinent, beautiful, and spiritually suggestive. It illustrated quite precisely the kind of thing that should be attempted much more frequently as there is developed amongst us a growing sense of the possibilities of noble and beautiful music in the worship of the church.

Some churches, especially those located on the crowded thoroughfares, realize the value of organ playing at fixed hours on week days. If people know that they may step into the church for rest and meditation at noontime or in the

Music

late afternoon, and at the same time find good music, many will be drawn to make avail of it.

Two very simple matters need attention, perhaps more than these difficult aspects of the subject. Choirs should be trained to sing their words clearly, and always to give careful attention to the hymns. Because things seem small, they are the more neglected. Many organists play difficult works better than they play hymns. And the value of much music is lost because the words are unintelligible. As in other arts, it is the little things that count. We are often too ambitious musically. It is far better to have simple, plain music, sincerely and successfully rendered all the way through, than to have occasional brilliant productions in the midst of slovenly and irreverent work in general.

Chapter XIX: Architectural Style

EVERYONE who has to do with the planning of a church building should have some acquaintance with the principal historic styles in architecture, together with some general impression of the spiritual meaning of each. Two very special facts about the artistic situation of the present day make these particularly important at this time. The first is that we are in the midst of a period of style revivals more marked and more heterogeneous than at any previous time. The second is that there is a battle of wits on amongst the architects themselves concerning this very matter of style revival.

Great architecture requires originality or genius, as does any other great production. It also requires scholarship. It is just as unfortunate for architects to be planning buildings that are not scholarly as it is for men to lecture upon philosophy without knowing Plato, Plotinus, Descartes and the other great contributors to the stream of philosophic learning. It is just as valuable for the architect to know how the Greeks built and why, and how the monks built and why, as for the preacher to be familiar with Isaiah and Paul and Luther. There is much scholarly building going on these days, and also much extremely ignorant building. Many unfortunate buildings are constructed because committees, as well as artists, are ignorant. It would be worth while for the members of every building committee to make a brief historic excursion before selecting the style of their structure. These paragraphs are intended as an extremely simple introduction to such an excursion.

GREEK

They would wish to go first to Greece. There they would find remains of the great prototypes of thousands of buildings in the western world. On the Acropolis in Athens alone

Architectural Style

they could see enough to give them some sense of the glorious life that produced the fragments which still remain there, and some vague comprehension of the great qualities in these constructions which have again and again drawn back to them the artistic imagination of the race.

There is a curious paradox just here. Some likeness to something in the Parthenon may be discovered in many structures in many countries over centuries of time, yet the Parthenon is a finished product, complete and perfect, with no possibilities of further development in its own mode. A rectangular building, of simple post and lintel system and of absolute symmetry, quickly comes to the limit of development in its own line. No structure of this kind in the world is so satisfying as this Parthenon, with its seventeen columns upon each side and eight at each end; every question of scale and proportion nobly disposed; the opposing elements of weight and upbearing force exactly balanced; every line of force and every stress of weight beautifully expressed in the structure; lavish of decorative detail, yet ample of broad light and shade; amazingly fine in niceties of construction, especially as involved by the curvatures of stylobate and columns: a complete, elegant, commanding house of worship.

This building is the symbol of the very essence of Greek life and genius. We cannot understand it without understanding that life, and yet, from it alone, we might almost reconstruct that life. Many things are to be read from the structure itself. Without yielding to the temptation to analyze them, perhaps the most important thing to say is that the building typifies in its very nature the intellectual mastery and the spiritual poise achieved, though it were for but a brief moment in the history of human life, by the great race whose genius flowered so wonderfully in the fifth century B.C. It is no derogation to them to say that they remained untroubled by many of the problems which interest us. We could not express our lives in a building anything like the Parthenon. We have not reached any such mastery or unity of life. We are troubled by the enslavements of the world as the builders on the Acropolis were not.

Art & Religion

All the writers agree in a general way in the interpretation and meaning of the Greek style. Coventry Patmore calls it a rational style, "weight of material force mastered by the mind." Irving K. Pond calls it an intellectual style, "final poise and repose," by its horizontal lines intimating restraint and restfulness. Henry Osborn Taylor describes it as expressing these elements—limit, proportion, order, finitude, perfection, simplicity, unity, intellectualism, poise. Lyle March Phillipps emphasizes its tranquillity and lucidity. He says that one "puzzled by the obscure in life, baffled by the nothings that crowd his days will find a restorative in Doric architecture, as though the great temple should speak—'Resist the importunities of the passing hours; he who has diverted man's purpose by the fugitive impulses will accomplish nothing; proportion your ends to your means and instead of frittering away energy in a thousand caprices, direct it to the proportions of some worthy design.'"^{*}

I do not myself feel satisfied with these phrases. Nor is it fair to quote them as the complete word of these critics. If the Greek temper was poised, it was not a quiet poise: if it was intellectual, it was not unemotional or inactive. The calm of the Parthenon is not the oriental calm, but rather the self-possession which includes both enthusiasm and energy. Its godlike stateliness is not that of indifference and aloofness, but rather of comprehensiveness. Moreover, the Greeks built other buildings more common and human; on this same Acropolis, the Propylaea, the temple of Nike Apteros, and the Erechtheum. We are so accustomed to thinking of Greek architecture in its practical and definitive, luxurious, Romanized modifications that we do not give sufficient credit for the mysticism that is in it. If for a brief time the Greeks seem to have reached an intellectual repose, for a brief time also, in the age after that of Pericles, they appear to have been stirred by fresh uncertainties, until the Hellenic life of the spirit was more or less quenched by the Macedonian ambitions and the Roman administration. The Greek mysteries, the Greek nature poetry, and the Greek sculpture in the post-Phidian age all represent a more Ro-

^{*} Phillipps, "Art and Environment," p. 120.

Architectural Style

matic and searching spirit than is displayed in the clear-cut and definitive Roman world. Yet chiefly the intimations of the purest Greek work are intellectual.

ROMAN

Roman architecture seems at first sight to be merely Greek, more elaborated and larger in scale. In reality, however, not only did the Romans apply Greek methods of structure and Greek motives of decoration in a greater variety of ways, but they created a new architecture by the use of the arch. The round arch enabled the Romans to vault wide spaces in their great baths and basilicas and to carry heavy loads as in aqueducts and amphitheaters. It also enabled them to beautify façades and develop arcades of great charm in both public and private structures.

The Christian churches began to build in the national and prevailing style. Although very different in some aspects to the civil buildings of the same name, the early Christian church was called a basilica, an oblong building with an interior colonnade on each side; with a high roof over the middle portion so that light and air might come from windows in the clerestory walls above the rows of columns; and with a half circle wall at the end of the nave inclosing the apse or sanctuary. Some of the very ancient basilicas still remain in very nearly the original form, and with most of the original materials. In Rome, St. Paul's Without the Walls is perhaps the most distinguished and representative of all. It was originally built in 386, once restored by Valentinian and again in modern times. Santa Maria Maggiore was built in 432, and although it has a Renaissance ceiling, it retains its original appearance. Buildings in this Roman style were constructed for Christian churches until the Gothic Age, San Clemente in Rome having been built in 1108. Two great buildings at Ravenna, San Appollinare in Classe and San Appollinare Nuovo, constructed under Byzantine influence and containing notable Eastern mosaics, are none the less basilican in form. Many basilicas were built in Syria, some of them remaining in ruins, others as the one in Bethlehem still in use. These buildings are not only stately in

Art & Religion

their proportions but they form an excellent audience room for hearing the preacher, and an excellent composition, by their length, for drawing attention to the altar or the communion table and to the symbolic decorations in the apse.

All Roman architecture seems to be touched with the spirit of practical competence and administrative ability. Probably the modern American business man would find himself more at home and at ease in the society of Romans than he would in the company of Greeks or of mediaevals. Possibly the American woman would discover a genuine kinship with the Roman matron in personal and domestic life, in virtues and in ideals. Yet the Roman had power and wealth and intelligence by which he could command a culture and a sensitiveness which he did not of himself quite possess. All this is accurately represented in his buildings, the structures of an eminently practical race.

BYZANTINE

After the division of the Roman Empire, the Greek city of Byzantium, later known as the city of Constantine, became the center of governmental vitality and so also a dominating influence in building. Byzantine architecture is an admixture of oriental and Hellenic ideals. Its greatest achievements were accomplished by the builders of Justinian, in a structure which some have regarded as "the noblest church Christians have ever built," Haggia Sophia in Constantinople, begun in 532 A. D. The building rests upon four great piers or towers forming a square of about a hundred feet on each side. From pier to pier are flung great arches. Upon the arches, spanning the wide nave and supported by huge curved triangular walls or pendentives, is the great dome, one hundred and eighty feet high. The side arches, above a two-storied colonnade of great beauty, are walled. The other opposite arches are open to receive the vaulting of two semi-domes at either end of the structure. The whole amazing space is clear to the eye as one steps through the inner portals of the narthex. The interior is splendid in the display of rich parti-colored marbles, and originally possessed extensive mosaics. Other Byzantine

Architectural Style

buildings which the traveler may have opportunity of seeing are San Vitale, Ravenna; the Church of the Apostles, Salonica; St. Mark's, Venice; the Church of the Chora, and St. Irene, Constantinople. St. Front in Perigueux, France, has a Byzantine dome and the church which Charlemagne built at Aix-la-Chapelle is an octagon, like the works in Ravenna or their prototypes in Syria. The brilliant color of Byzantine decoration is on the walls and not in the windows as in Gothic buildings. The best-preserved of these structures are characterized by an oriental and almost barbaric splendor that suggests an exuberance of vitality in the life which produced them. Their structural triumph still makes us realize the intellectual genius of the Greek builders who designed them. "It is the clearness of the art of Greece itself."* Their wide spaces and comprehending domes dispel any inclination to narrowness or provincialism in the beholder.

ROMANESQUE

After the barbarian invasions had destroyed the imperial power in the West and broken down the civil unity, the power of the church remained, and great churches were still built. But the Dark Age, roughly 500 to 1000, was in general a nondescript period. The builders of churches no longer had such fine artists or competent workmen to depend upon, nor could they find so many old pillars and capitals from earlier structures to use in their new ones. They began, therefore, to use heavy square piers instead of pillars, and archivolt instead of architraves between the piers. Some of the basilicas had used the archivolt but could not develop it because of the inadequate support of pillars. The cathedral at Torcello is a ruder church than the older basilicas, but its arches are wider. San Pietro at Toscanella, 740, still predominantly Roman and basilican in plan, has round arches, the greater spread of which is the presage of change. When, however, arches were used over the nave and then a cross vault added, as at St. Ambrose in Milan, tenth century, we have a building that stands not at the end of an old process but at the beginning of a new.

* Lowrie, "Monuments of the Early Church," p. 158.

Art & Religion

In Lombardy and in Tuscany are to be seen many churches which may be called Romanesque because founded upon the basilican idea, yet modified profoundly by the increasing use of the arch. Many of these are augmented by campaniles, lofty, free-standing square bell towers, some of them of great beauty. In this modified Roman style were constructed also, north of the Alps, many monastic churches. In Germany are many notable buildings in the later Romanesque period, such as the Church of the Holy Apostles, Cologne, the cathedrals of Speyer, Mainz, Trier, and others. In Southern France, particularly in Auvergne and Poitou, are many notable Romanesque churches. Many people are familiar with the beautiful doorway of St. Trophime at Arles. Concerning the style typical of this period Professor Maurice de Wulf spoke recently at the Lowell Institute. "It was a form, or a collection of forms, which were quite new, in which the rational and logical character of the church and its functions shines forth with great clearness. For the first time were seen two towers serving as the frame for the façade, large doorways, choirs with their surrounding ambulatories and radiating chapels, high walls ornamented within, a cruciform ground plan, and above all, a barrel vault in stone, instead of wooden vaults for ceilings."*

In the hands of the Normans the same mode of structure was rapidly developed in the energetic days of early mediævalism with brilliant results. The length of structure was increased and the height. Such buildings as the church at Jumièges and the Abbaye aux Hommes at Caen, Norman buildings with high vaults and clerestories, might be called early Gothic by some, so far has the process developed from the earliest movement of change. In England, Iffley Church, for a small building, and Durham Cathedral, for a great structure, are well-known Norman churches.

For the most part, in Romanesque and Norman construction, the arch is still a weight-carrying rather than a balanced member. In general, also, the wall of the building, rather than its pillars and arches, is emphasized. Sobriety

* Quoted from the *American Architect*, April 7, 1920.

Architectural Style

and simplicity and strength are intimated by the plain and solid masses and wall stability of these buildings. They have left behind the finish and authority and surface polish of the Roman world; they have not yet achieved the daring and logic and brilliance of the Gothic Age. There is a sense of masculine dependability about them that is protective and noble. They are not the structures of an effeminate or elegant age. Whether ponderous, as in some cases, or high and light, as at the close of their period, they are all suggestive of a well-composed power to endure, a sturdy virtue and good will, not reflective or clear of mind, but stout of heart and strong.

GOTHIC

Probably the average uninstructed notion of a Gothic church is of a building having windows with pointed arches. Nothing could be more inadequate or, for that matter, farther from the truth. To say just what does constitute a Gothic structure, however, is not so easy. Certainly the late Norman buildings with round-arched windows and vaults are more nearly Gothic than many modern so-called Gothic churches, which are nothing but hall auditoriums, though the windows be narrow and pointed. The astonishing abbeys and cathedrals of the high Gothic age came both swiftly and directly from the Norman buildings of Northern France and England after the Conquest. The transition was effected, most of all, by the construction of rib vaulting. This at once lessened the amount of masonry required to vault the aisles, and also the quantity required for the walls, by concentrating the load upon the piers. The solid stonework was still further reduced in the buttresses, as it was found that an exterior half arch or flying buttress would carry the outward thrust as safely as a right-angled wall. These devices, together with the pointed arch and sexpartite vaulting, also enabled the builder to carry the structure to greater heights. The result at last was a building in which the walls all but disappeared in favor of pillars or clustered piers and windows.

At last, also, the buildings left far behind the broad and

Art & Religion

horizontal forms of the classic world: they became long and high, the vertical lines dominant. Almost every important city in Europe can show a mediaeval Gothic building, and almost everyone with any acquaintance in architecture at all, knows the names of some of the most celebrated of early or late Gothic cathedrals.

As in all architecture, the building itself tells its own story of its own age. The Gothic structure is instinct with energy and aspiration and unrestrained emotion; it is active and unsleeping and unlimited. As the weight of the Greek entablature is carried by the columns gracefully and easily, in a Gothic building it is "totally vanquished, borne above as by a superior spiritual power."* The arch is not so much a carrier of dead weight as an active member of a logical fabric nicely balanced by an equilibrium of forces. How these incomparable works of art were raised by the communalism, the rising nationalism, and the piety of the great period which produced them is a great historic study. The story of the Cistercian monks alone would throw needed light upon many matters artistic, social, and religious during that energetic age. Students of the history of religion or of art may be well assured of the benefits to be derived by delving deep into the surging tides of life and feeling, strong enough to have set so high a mark in the artistic annals of the race.

Modern would-be builders might find it profitable to engage in another kind of imaginative effort. I could almost recommend that a church building committee secure a great quantity of wooden blocks and go down upon the floor and try to build a church in order to get ever so faintly something of the feel and thrill of composing a true structure, and some far-off sense of the builder's fierce joy in the mastery of his problem. Anything we can do to give us a dramatic entrance into the spirit of the builders would be beneficial to the art of building among us. A very short experience with our blocks upon the floor would soon show us that it is comparatively easy to build a basilica with architraves. And it would soon convince us, also, how far we

* Patmore, "Principle in Art," p. 201.

Architectural Style

should have to go before we could produce anything like a Gothic structure.

The intimations of Gothic building, then, are not chiefly intellectual, though its structural character is logical above all others; nor chiefly practical, though its structural principle is active and never passive; but emotional and mystical. The long and narrow spaces do not spread out to comprehend a many-sided experience, but point the attention, with a singleness of concentration, upon the highest experience: the high vaulted aisles do not rest assuredly upon the finite and the known, but lead the imagination to find some communion with the infinite unknown.

THE RENAISSANCE

In the fifteenth century another great change began to pass upon all the western world, that combined revival of classic learning and of timeless humanism which we call the Renaissance. Beginning in Italy, it spread to the north and, architecturally speaking, came to America at the time when the most notable churches of the colonial days were built.

Without presuming even to suggest the complex feelings and movements of the age, it is for our purposes sufficient to recall two or three of its most significant notes. It was a revival of interest in the classic grandeur and the classic learning both of Rome and of Greece. Perhaps more profoundly, it was a fresh interest in nature and in man, a reassertion of individualism and humanism as over against the authority and austerity of the mediaeval church. Mr. Symonds calls it the emancipation of reason; Mr. Phillipps, the natural succession of an age of thought after an age of action, an intellectual civilization with naturalism and realism in the arts. Professor Frothingham says that architecturally the meaning of the Renaissance is "the revival of the classic orders, and of the Roman decorative system, combined with Roman and Byzantine forms of vaulting, under the influence of an artistic sense less constructive than it was decorative and with a degree of free interpretation that often degenerated into license."* Professor Hamlin

* Sturgis and Frothingham, "A History of Architecture," vol. 4, p. 106.

Art & Religion

says that "the Italians of those days, dissatisfied with the foreign and Gothic manner which they had for more than a century been seeking to assimilate, longed for the stateliness and dignity, the largeness of scale, the breadth and repose of effect which they now recognized and admired in even the ruins of the Roman monuments."* Mr. Thomas Hastings writes that "the forms of architecture which had prevailed for a thousand years were inadequate to the needs of the new civilization, to its demands for greater refinement of thought, for larger truth to nature, for less mystery in form of expression, and for greater convenience in practical living."†

The first great architect of the Renaissance was Brunelleschi, who completed the great dome of the cathedral in Florence in 1436, who built San Lorenzo, and Santo Spirito, the Pitti Palace, the Hospital of the Innocents, and other works. His low, round arcades upon single columns were delightful and much copied. The name of Bramante stands for the higher Renaissance, with its revival of pier and pilaster construction characteristic of ancient Roman buildings. Many palaces and churches in Italy were built in this splendid age, about 1490 to 1550, including St. Peter's Cathedral. After this came baroque and decline, although contemporaneous with the beautiful and influential work of Palladio.

North of the Alps the classic revival became one of the influences in the rapid development of the Reformation, particularly through the learning of such Humanists as Erasmus and Zwingli. The architectural effects were not so prevalent. Castles in Germany, châteaux in France, and manor houses of Jacobean England are all variant forms of Renaissance influence. The churches of St. Sulpice and the Hôtel des Invalides in Paris are differing forms of French Renaissance, and the palaces at Versailles, a later form. The movement in England began with Inigo Jones, its greatest works being those of Sir Christopher Wren, who completed St. Paul's Cathedral in 1710. Wren's London parish

* A. D. F. Hamlin in the *Architectural Record*, July, 1919, p. 62.

† Hastings, "Modern Architecture," p. 6.

Architectural Style

churches, with their slender spires, especially St. Bride's, Fleet Street, and St. Mary le Bow are the direct prototypes of our early American houses of worship, such as Park Street, Boston, and the North Church in New Haven.

The intimations of the Renaissance mode of building are, like the movement itself, complex and therefore varied. At their worst, they suggest secularity, triviality, vulgarity, superfine elegance—though for that matter the decline of any artistic movement reveals these same things. At their best, they seem to convey something of the dignity of Roman Stoicism, and as carried out in a few of the finest wooden Colonial meetinghouses, a lucidity that is almost Greek, together with a Gothic aspiration in the spires. At the average they are secular and administrative.

STYLE REVIVALS

In planning a new church, shall we use one of the historic styles, and if so which one, or try to find something new? In the first place, it is most important to be aware of what we are actually doing in the matter in America just now. We are passing through a period characterized by a fresh interest in all these historic styles and a revival of them all. Everyone is perfectly familiar with the facts of this revival in domestic architecture and in house furniture. In the late nineteenth century we were producing about as bad an output in furniture as possible. It is only within the last fifteen or twenty years that Grand Rapids and other furniture headquarters have been turning out "period styles." Precisely the same thing has occurred in church architecture. On the one hand, there is a fresh usage of the Gothic tradition, genuinely informed with a real Gothic spirit. On the other hand, there have been many buildings whose mode traces back to the classic tradition at some point or other, Roman Basilican, Romanesque, Renaissance, or Colonial.


Few people are aware of the magnitude and excellence of the new Gothic churches recently constructed in America. By far the most notable works in this movement, both as to character and quantity, are those of Mr. Ralph Adams Cram and Mr. Bertram Goodhue. Amongst the most important of

Art & Religion

these churches are the Episcopal Cathedral, Detroit; St. Thomas's, New York; Calvary, Pittsburgh; The Euclid Avenue Presbyterian, Cleveland; The House of Hope, Presbyterian, St. Paul; the First Baptist, Pittsburgh; the First Presbyterian, Oakland, California; the Military Chapel at West Point; the South Reformed, New York; the First Congregational, Montclair, New Jersey; the Chapel of the Intercession, New York. These works vary somewhat in method and in feeling according as to which artist dominated in their design and decoration and according to the requirements of the parishes themselves. But they are without exception distinguished buildings, which taken together constitute an architectural influence that is likely to persist in American life for generations. To see any one of them is to be immediately aware of the paucity of noble architecture over the country generally, and to be stirred with the undreamed of possibilities before us as a rich nation beginning to be capable of expressing itself in the noblest forms for the highest enjoyments of the spiritual life.

The contributions of Mr. Henry Vaughan to this Gothic movement in the buildings of Christ Church, New Haven, the Chapel of Groton School, the Chapel of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, and others, are no less significant in their character. Allen & Collens have built the chapels of Union Theological Seminary, Williams College, and Andover Theological Seminary; the Congregational Church, West Newton, Massachusetts; and the Skinner Memorial Chapel, Holyoke, Massachusetts—all interesting and excellent examples of the Gothic revival. A structure which will draw visitors is that now slowly rising at Bryn Athyn, Pennsylvania, lovingly built by the Swedenborgian community there. On a larger scale than any of these are cathedrals designed for New York, Baltimore, and Washington.


Stirred by this movement, many other churches have set out to build in the Gothic style, some of the small buildings having great charm. Others have not come very near the Gothic spirit. Many possess excellent detail of tracery or other decoration, but are too wide or low in their proportions



Cram, Goodhue & Ferguson, Architects.

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH · PITTSBURGH · PENNSYLVANIA

The soaring of Gothic even without tower or spire except the slender fîche. The structure is as simple and direct as possible, arch thrusting against arch and cross vaults against buttresses.



Cram & Ferguson, Architects.

SECOND CHURCH IN BOSTON · MASSACHUSETTS

The spire and parish house are derived from English and American Renaissance designs. The main church, with its clerestory, is higher and narrower than any Colonial building.

Architectural Style

to claim as much kinship with the Gothic mode as they seem to have desired in the choice of details.

On the whole, considering the less successful as well as the fewer and more brilliant examples, the total number of new buildings of the twentieth century expressing this Gothic revival is very considerable, spread over the whole country and throughout differing religious bodies.

Toward other traditions, also, there is a decided tendency. The Roman Catholic Church is just now using almost exclusively basilican or Romanesque forms. Some of these buildings are in the earlier Roman style, as St. Gregory's, Brooklyn, and St. Mary's of the Lake, Chicago. Others are of the later Lombard or Tuscan inspiration, as St. Agnes's, Cleveland, and St. Catherine's, Somerville, Massachusetts.

Other classic work throughout the country is extremely varied. The beautiful Congregational Church of Riverside, California, in a region where there are still remains of Renaissance Spanish work, is appropriately Spanish in design. The Presbyterian Church of St. Joseph, Missouri, has built one of the most successful Colonial buildings recently attempted, designed by Messrs. Eckel & Boschen. It escapes a very common fault of many Colonial revivals, that of too great size and heaviness in all the details, such as frames, jambs, entablatures, and cornices. It possesses something of the refinement and excellence of proportion in the early New England buildings. The Byzantine strain has not been much attempted in this country. The most notable modern Byzantine building in the world is Westminster Cathedral, London. The new St. Clement's in Chicago is a more modest Byzantine structure.

A distinguished building which, as judged by its spire and parish house, one would call Colonial, is Second Parish Church of Boston, designed by Mr. Cram. The church itself, however, connects farther back. Unlike any Colonial American building, and unlike the typical English Renaissance church, it has a clerestory, greatly elevating the nave. The character of the interior colonnades, barrel-vaulted aisles and coffered nave ceiling, is reminiscent of San Lorenzo, an early Renaissance church in Florence. Although there are

Art & Religion

many other excellent structures, perhaps these mentioned are sufficient to establish the fact that present-day architects are finding valuable suggestions in widely differing periods of the historic development of the Graeco-Roman lineage in architecture.

Such being the fact, what about the future? Is it best to pattern after some historic style? If so, what style? If not, is it possible to develop a new and American style? Architects themselves hold all varieties of opinion.

The outstanding protagonist for the Gothic revival is Mr. Cram. His various books are almost passionate appeals for a return to the mediaeval age. With him, as with all true artists, the argument is far deeper than a love of Gothic principles in structure or Gothic details in design. He is a lover of mediaevalism all along the line, the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas, the guild organization of industry, and the feudal system in society. Given these premises one must build as a Gothicismist.

Other builders are devoted to the classic strain. Professor A. D. F. Hamlin is a vigorous defender of the Renaissance, not only admitting that it incorporates intimations that are pagan, but claiming that it ought to. "The pagan spirit, which is the Renaissance revival, is the spirit which recognizes the world and the life in which we now live, and uses and enjoys them to the full; not as an antithesis to and destroyer of the Christian hope in the life to come, but (if rightly cultivated and apprehended) as its complement and even its ally. Neither spirit alone is sufficient for the full realization of our natures and capacities: in the greatest natures they are conjoined."* Mr. Thomas Hastings bases his usage of the classic mode on the supposition that we are still children of the Renaissance and live in the age begun by that movement. "What determining change have we had in the spirit and methods of life since the revival of learning and the Reformation to justify us in abandoning the Renaissance or in reviving mediaeval art—Romanesque, Gothic, Byzantine, or any other style? Only the most radical changes in the history of civilization, such as, for example, the dawn

* A. D. F. Hamlin, the *Architectural Record*, September, 1917, p. 272.

Architectural Style

of the Christian era and of the Reformation and the revival of learning, have brought with them correspondingly radical changes in architectural style."

This is, of course, precisely the point at issue. If we are still to live in the Renaissance-Reformation age, Mr. Hastings is right. If this is the beginning of a new age in any strict sense of the term, then the door is open for the revival of any historic style and the development of new principles and new forms. Mr. Hastings continues: "The best Gothic work has been done and cannot be repeated. When attempted, it will always lack that kind of mediaeval spirit of devotion which is the life of mediaeval architecture. . . . Therefore, whatever we now build, whether church or dwelling, the law of historic development requires that it be Renaissance, and if we encourage the true principles of composition it will involuntarily be a modern Renaissance, and with a view to continuity we should take the eighteenth century as our starting point, because here practically ended the historic progression and entered the modern confusion."*

The Reverend Professor Edward C. Moore in 1894, in his address concerning the then new church building of the Central Congregational Church in Providence, Rhode Island, said: "It has been my thought for many years that there was no style of architecture so suggestive and fitting for a Protestant church as that of the Renaissance. As the rise of Protestantism itself was allied with the rediscovery of certain elements of Greek thought and the application of these to the Roman church of the middle age, so the use of pure Greek ornamentation upon the massive vault and arches of the Romanesque order seemed to express the same idea. And it will be remembered that buildings precisely of this sort were characteristically produced at the end of the Renaissance and in the time of the Reformation."

Other artists are bold enough to hope for the devising of new forms of architecture not so closely inspired by anything in the history of the art. Mr. Phillipps writes: "In these days, less than ever can Gothic content us," because religion must include the mind, the intellectual as well as

* Hastings, "Modern Architecture," p. 7.

Art & Religion

the spiritual aspects of experience. Mr. Pond would repudiate the legitimacy of a return to any historic mode, classic as well as Gothic. "Unless modernism can spend itself in an ecstasy of faith like that of mediaevalism or can practice the self-restraint, submit naturally and gracefully to the keen intellectual discipline and attain to the high idealism of the Greek, it is quite apparent how futile it were to seek now to express the un-unified and involved modern conditions by any return in their purity to mediaeval or Greek forms in art."*

He believes that there is no distinctly Christian architecture as such, inasmuch as the history of Christendom has developed many varied styles, but that architectural style is the expression of the temperament and feeling of any age or people as a whole. The spirit of the age will determine the nature of the structures. "Mediaeval Christianity took on its emotionalism because the age was emotional. . . . Without a doubt Christianity was the fullest flower of mediaeval thought and life, and because of that the religious edifices assumed their vast proportions and developed a plan which functioned for Christian uses. The fact that these buildings were mediaeval unsuits them in great measure for Christian expression today, though replicas, trivial and otherwise, are being forced into present-day Christian service. Fully as logically might we employ the pure classic forms in the same service. . . . America has something worthy of expression, some ideal worthy of interpretation in creative architecture. No imitator, only a creator, will discover the ideal and disclose the form."†

Still other artists, in the uncertainties of the hour, the character of the new age being as yet so indeterminate, and imbued with the historic continuity of human life, as it continually revives and re-revives ancient problems and feelings, place less stress upon the matter of style. In a recent letter, Mr. William Orr Ludlow writes: "I have always taken the ground that almost any logical and beautiful style can be used; whether it be Gothic, Colonial, Romanesque, or

* Pond, "The Meaning of Architecture," p. 111.

† *Ibid.*, p. 176.

Architectural Style

Renaissance, and that the question as to which is to be adopted depends on the money and material available, the tradition of the locality,—if there be such,—and the immediate surroundings.”

The Reverend Professor Frederick T. Persons of Bangor, Maine, in a recent address, expresses a similar view as his present wisdom on these mooted questions: “The new church architecture will not be confined to the two styles mentioned—the Colonial and the Gothic. Each of the historic styles at its highest will find a use. In an old eastern town, full of Georgian houses, the Colonial will always be in place. But in the newer towns and cities, some phase of the Gothic will be more appropriate. Even the basilica will occasionally be used. The same may be said of the Romanesque and the Byzantine, while various phases of the Renaissance will meet the needs of certain communities, particularly in the South and West, where the Spanish churches and missions will suggest appropriate models for modern churches. In our use of the great styles, there should be one guiding principle. It is comprehended in the term ‘translation.’ A translation in literature is the carrying over a masterpiece from one language to another, so that its essential qualities are preserved in the new tongue. A translation in architecture is precisely the same thing.”

My own feeling about the question is that we must go into it more deeply than the most of these suggestions. For the time being there is little else to be done than to work with adaptations or “translations” of historic styles, together with experiments in apparently new directions. What will come next after this, no one can very accurately forecast. It depends upon many forces and factors. If there is a continued perpetuation of present-day denominational differences, a like confusion and separatism will characterize the art of building. If there are vital and imaginative movements in the direction of unity of religious thought and feeling and purpose, there will be in architecture equally strong movements expressive of the vital life underneath.

There are two great faults in the current Gothic revival. Both criticisms relate to the comparative provincialism and

Art & Religion

separatism amongst the different sectarian strains of spiritual lineage. On the one hand, the use of Gothic details in the buildings of non-liturgical churches, is for the most part so superficial and so connected with ungothic qualities in structure and in proportion, that one feels the disharmony profoundly. This is further magnified, usually, by the kind of service conducted in the building. This disharmony of the service is still greater if the building is better. I happen to know of one church which in all its proportions and details is singularly rich in genuine Gothic feeling, but where the minister who conducts the service appears to be totally unaware of the sort of building he is in. Certainly no one should attempt to revive the Gothic style unless he wishes to revive also at least some important elements of mediaeval worship.

This objection does not obtain against the other element in the current Gothic revival. This other factor is the natural and proper use of the Gothic style by the Episcopal Church. In this case, of course, the buildings are more true to type because they are designed for the uses of a more nearly mediaeval liturgy. The criticism here, therefore, is not of the buildings themselves, but of the sectarian lineage as being inadequate for the new age, if we are to have a new age. It is not the fault of the gifted artists who have designed these delightful and truly wonderful new Gothic churches in America that they have built something which does not look sufficiently forward to anticipate the feelings of the new age: it is the fault of the church behind the artists. American architecture in general cannot closely follow this lead, for however scholarly and brilliant it may be in its own tradition, it is not a tradition sufficiently comprehensive to gather to itself the complex and commingled strains of our spiritual character. Like others, it is now provincial and separatistic, only one of the elements in the new religion. There are many new hopes and aspirations of the American people which are not adequately expressed by the church building or by the liturgy of the Anglican tradition.

There ought to be added, however, the suggestion that a

Architectural Style

new attention to the art of worship will likely revive many good things from mediaeval liturgics. If this should be the case, as I believe it will, buildings of Gothic derivation will be appropriate where the people understand and desire this meaning.

In many ways it is, in the nature of the case, easier to express new thoughts by the usage of some one of the classic periods as the inspiration for a modern church building. Yet it is not easy to select any one of these as an adequate mode. To go far back to Greece or to Rome is to place too much paganism in the structure and also to come too close, as the Christian Scientists have done, to the forms characteristic of our state houses and post offices. The early basilica is too administrative and too authoritative. Some kinds of Renaissance are too secular, worldly, or elegant. Some of the Romanesque is too crude. Further work in the Colonial strain will be appropriate for some churches. Further "translations" of certain ideas or motives in Byzantine, Romanesque, and early Renaissance structures can be made vital and beautiful.

Can there be a new architecture? In the sense of disconnectedness with the past, no; any more than there can be a new learning disconnected from history. In the sense of freshly saying what we newly experience and feel about life, yes. What will the new architecture be? No one can say until the genius arrives who will know us so well that he can describe us. If you can say when the great American novel will appear, you will also date the advent of the great American church.

It will not be pure Gothic, though it often use the pointed arch, but have something about it of greater breadth, comprehensiveness, and intellectuality. It will express a greater clarity of mind, even about the past. It will teach the youth the glorious history of the church more artistically and symbolically than the bare churches do, but less vaguely and narrowly than by the shadowy figures in a Gothic portal or reredos.

It will not be pure Renaissance, but intimate more aspiration, more faith, more zeal. It will correct the wandering

Art & Religion

eclecticism and futile false freedom that is a passing phase of our life. By greater height, it will lift the emotions, and by greater length fix the will, to definite choice and devotion.

Nor will it be so tentlike and temporary as our common American church, which has neither classic lucidity of mind nor Gothic passion. Yet it will rise out of our best common American morality. With new forms for the new time it will yet be built upon the best in the Classicist's love of truth, the Romanticist's love of nature's beauty, and the Puritan's zeal for goodness.

Chapter XX: Structural Tone

MANY people are aware of being affected by the tones of rooms. They have said to themselves, What a peaceful place! or they have felt restless and uncomfortable without knowing precisely why. It is possible immediately and profoundly to influence people by the tonal character of an interior. Every competent house decorator is not only aware of this but is a student of the physical arrangements of shape and of color, of lights and of shadows, which will produce his desired effects. Every stage manager knows something about this and the best of them know a great deal about it. Designers of churches ought to know a great deal about it. If common people take the trouble to design cheerful playrooms or cheerful bedrooms, quiet reading rooms and stimulating dining rooms, how much more should building committees seek to define the tone they desire in the House of God and seek to understand the physical compositions that produce that tone.

Just precisely what physical arrangements can be counted upon for certain atmospheric effects is hard to say. This is the point at which we must fall back upon the genius of the artist. Partly it depends upon the style of the structure. As already suggested, the definite historic styles in themselves intimate certain emotional attitudes. Buildings which are not constructed in one of the great historic modes are, as would be expected, not very effective in intimating anything. They are neutral and nondescript, negative in their effects because not positive in their structural character.

Probably a good deal more, however, depends upon the treatment of the style than upon the style itself. A Gothic building, active in structural principle, may be so designed as to produce an effect of greater repose than a badly constructed classic building. The problem of a successful church, therefore, is not solved merely by the determination

Art & Religion

of its style; it turns also upon the manner of treatment to the end of producing a definite effect of tone.

I am not attempting to solve the question here, but rather to raise it, and to indicate two or three of the most common faults and two or three of the desirable virtues in this matter. One goes into a church and straightway pronounces it cold, or homelike, or splendid, or elegant, or restless, or warm, or bare, or cheerful. Obviously none of these qualities is sufficient for a House of God and no church is successful if any of these adjectives can be applied to it as its chief characteristic.

Definite tonal effects are easily produced if you know how. Not long since, I went into a moving picture theater that is more than ordinarily popular. The method used in this place was that of a lavish display of color. The orchestral numbers between pictures were accompanied by skilful color settings, changed and modulated, until the rainbow itself was outdone. The color was literally sweet and syrupy. It was cloying and atrocious, but popular, and the artist knew precisely what he was doing with the clientele to which he made his appeal. The tone he developed in his theater is not a fit tone for a church. But the fact of his taking the pains to develop it, while the average church takes no pains to develop an effective tone, is at least one of the reasons why he gets more people than the church does.

The most of church buildings fail, not because they can be at once so easily described, but because they are simply indefinite, Neutral, with no very positive qualities at all. The average church interior is uninteresting. Without necessarily being ugly in detail, there is no commanding excellence. The tinted walls, commonplace woodwork, and inferior windows rouse no surprise or delight in the visitor and become a deadening influence on the regular worshiper. The organ pipes which usually occupy the most noticeable space may not in themselves be offensive, but it is a poverty-stricken imagination which can conceive no more significant treatment of that precious space. Your building will have an effect whether you want it to or not, and this effect of ineffectiveness is one of the most unfortunate.

Structural Tone

Very close to the fault of neutrality is that of Comfortableness. Some churches are so warm and cosy, with curving and well-cushioned pews, that the note of ease or comfort predominates. There is a kind of family-at-home feeling about this atmosphere which is pleasant, but it is not sufficient for a church. Sometimes a parish is so insistent on expressing its character in this way, though perhaps subconsciously, that the air of a building good in other respects is vitiated by this fault.

A very recently built church with several highly successful features of the structure, has been spoiled, in my view, by this tone of treatment. In this case it is so easy to specify the physical factors responsible for the fault as to be worth especial note. The building is the First Methodist Church of Evanston, Illinois. In structure, it is very much more true to the proper feeling of its style than many recent church buildings in that style. It is a beautiful building; in the composition of the exterior façade, in the height of the structural aisles and the proportions of nave arches and aisle windows, in the lift of the walls by a clerestory, in the beamed ceiling and in other features.

But much of the structural effect is thrown away by an interior treatment entirely out of harmony with it. It is merely comfortable. Three things make it so. First, the strongly marked and strongly felt curves of the gallery balustrade, both forward and rear, and of the pews on the floor are alone sufficient to produce this sense of comfort. These, by the way, constitute a great divergence from the tone of the structure itself. Paradoxically, this divergence makes you uncomfortable, the curved lines being set over against the lift of the piers and the vertical lines of the organ case. This gallery, like the running track of a gymnasium, cuts directly across the dominant structural lines. Nevertheless, seated on the first floor one gets chiefly the comfortable feeling of the curved lines. This is enhanced by the second element, the softly modulated color scheme. In the third place, there is nothing in the foreground composition of platform, choir loft, and organ pipes, either in design or color, to break this comfortable monotony.

Art & Religion

There is nothing in the tone of this structure to give you, on the one hand, a certain sense of austerity which ought to characterize a House of God, nor, on the other, anything sharp or brilliant to quicken the emotions and fire the imagination. A church ought to have peace and repose about it, but not the merely physical peace of comfortableness. It only soothes the senses and does not symbolize the peace of a noble faith.

Many people have objected to a stained glass window, or a picture, or candles, or an altar, or a symbolic table as being a sensuous element without place in a spiritual movement. But this church, seemingly designed for people who desired a spiritual experience without these sensuous aids, is in fact far more sensuous in its soporific comfortableness than a little Catholic chapel with bare walls and a single pictured Madonna. The picture appeals to the senses, to be sure, but with some hope of a spiritual effect. This church strongly affects the senses without any further spiritual effect.

As our Protestant churches grow rich and wish to beautify their houses of worship, there is constant danger of this fault of Sensuousness. A building may be devoid of effigies or shrines and yet constitute a lower appeal to the physical senses than do candles and crosses. The attempt to produce a building in which a religious community may enjoy a free spiritual experience sometimes results in something the effect of which is more fleshly and materialistic than the symbolic forms so carefully avoided.

Another common fault is the atmosphere of Coldness. Many church buildings are not merely uninteresting, they are definitely dreary. Some that are excellent in style, proportion, and decorative detail are nevertheless cold. The present interior of the Asylum Hill Church of Hartford, Connecticut, is open to this criticism. The exterior is warm and pleasant; the Gothic piers and arches of the interior are beautiful in scale and design; the new woodwork in the chancel is exquisitely designed; but the total result is somehow too cool. If this effect is produced in a building otherwise so interesting and excellent, how much more is it liable

Structural Tone

to be found where proportions are wrong and decorative details ugly. There are many American churches which repel people because they are chilly and barren in atmosphere.

Recently the fault of Agitation has been developed in some church buildings. It is usually found in a structure consistent in style but badly handled in the matter of scale. The feeling is often due to the attempt to treat a small structure in the same manner as a large one. I have noticed several buildings in the Gothic style, of moderate or small size, with as many structural members as could safely be utilized only in a much larger building. The main lines of the composition are lost in the manifold of detail. The effect is agitated. Such a building lacks quietness. It is in itself disturbing and disagreeable, however successful the details may be, considered by themselves.

To turn from faults to desirable virtues, the first requirement in the tone of a religious structure is *Repose*. The reason for this is a fundamental one, the claim of the sufficiency of religion. No religion is satisfactory unless it is believed to be entirely competent to meet every human need. Men turn to religion and to the House of God to escape the common world of defeat, or shame, or injustice, to find the real world of the eternal goodness.

The church building itself ought to be and can be of such a character as to draw people by its very atmosphere of harmony and of peace. It ought to be so noble and dignified as itself to constitute a strong effect of the sufficiency of the faith to compose the hurt or faulty feelings of all those who come to it in their need. Men are not attracted by an insufficient faith. It is possible for the church to say to people by its very architecture, Here is a place that understands: here is a faith that comprehends all things.

In a general way the chief requirement in a structure which is to have something of this quality is the subordination of every feature to the principal lines of the total design.

The next most important note for a church building is that of *Austerity*. This also is rooted in the necessities of religion itself. A man cannot come to God and keep anything

Art & Religion

back. He must bare himself in sincerity and in truth. The laws of nature are unyielding and religion can never afford to become soft and easy. It is possible for the church building itself to help people to be truthful with themselves. There should be something stern and rigorous about the structure, something restrained and austere. A church cannot be like a theater or a drawing room, it must ever call for the mortification of the flesh and the regnancy of the conscience.


It is difficult for the artist to accomplish this without making the building cold, but it is possible. He can so restrain the application of his decoration, he can so skilfully use a texture of surface or a color of surface as to develop this sense of austerity in the building itself, if he has the desire and the skill to do so.

The qualities already mentioned require two others to counterbalance them, Warmth and Brilliance. By warmth I mean something that will welcome the lonely and the troubled so that the austere aspects of the building will not be forbidding. There are various resources of the artist for the attainment of this note. Every architect knows the meaning of an "inviting entrance," although not every architect succeeds in making one.

The use of color in the narthex, vestibule, or foyer, or in a properly placed window, may succeed in sufficiently expressing this requirement. It is important to beware of gloom. Sometimes an arrangement of sheer form has a strong effect on the tonal character of an interior. Amongst the designs of the more modern achitecture, I have seen one that intimates good cheer at once. It is the use, under a wide pointed arch, of concave rather than convex lines of window tracery. The effect is an almost dancing lightness.

Something brilliant I believe to be needed to make a successful church building. The building should of itself stimulate the imagination and fire resolves. The repose of the structural composition and the austerity of the surface treatment need to be supplemented by a more active principle.

Part of this effect may come from the structure itself, as in the case of a truly characteristic Gothic building, which,



Cram, Goodhue & Ferguson, Architects.

HOUSE OF HOPE · ST. PAUL · MINNESOTA · PRESBYTERIAN

An open and ample Gothic interior. The structural side aisles are high, admitting the major light, there being no clerestory. Interest is added by the triforium gallery. The rich fabric in the clergy stalls constitutes a strong high light.

Structural Tone

although it may have a certain repose of commanding lines, has also a vigorous activity in the spring of high vaults. The historic solution of this requirement is, of course, the altar, which, with the decorations upon it, or those of the reredos back of it, or ciborium over it, constitutes an object intensely stimulating to the imagination. Without this, however, it is still possible for the artist to develop decorative motives, either massed or scattered, which will promote a mental activity. The use of windows, murals, mosaics, statues, or symbolic designs in the focal part of the structure may accomplish what is needed in this direction.

Three other matters have always a powerful effect upon the structural tone of any building, the matters of proportion, scale, and materials. The relation of height, breadth, and length has immediately to do with the feeling one gets from a building. In a general way, as already intimated, breadth of structure is characteristic of the classic heritage and feeling, intimating an intellectual inclusiveness. If the latitude is too great, it suggests a too matter-of-fact view of life. The longer and higher structure is the more emotional and active and perhaps the more mystical. A genuine Gothic building is very long and very high in proportion to its width. It is possible to choose a classic style of detail and build with a spirit almost Gothic, by the increase of length and height. Just so, Gothic details may be applied to a building so wide as to become uncharacteristic in structural tone. In such cases, it is obviously better to use the style which more truly comports with the desired proportions and tone.

In any case, an oblong space is superior to a square one. There are few successful equilateral churches in the world and the most of these are strongly modified as to interior proportion by the addition of an apse or choir, as in San Vitale, Ravenna, or by the extension of semi-domes, as in the ancient Byzantine churches. The square interior makes a focal point of interest almost impossible. It hinders concentration of attention or of action. Even although we may not wish to use the Gothic style, our age probably needs a corrective to its scattering and individualistic effort and

Art & Religion

more of the spirit of concentrated ideals and common devotion, which may be greatly assisted by buildings more nearly Gothic in their proportions.

Other important matters hinge upon the problem of scale. A large building where, also, all the apertures and all the decorative designs are large, will appear to be smaller than it is, as, for instance, St. Peter's in Rome. A small church may be made to appear larger if the doors and windows are minimized and if the furniture of the interior is designed as small as possible in scale. Oftentimes the uncomfortable agitation of a moderate-sized building is due to faulty scale. A change in the scale of all details would yield in many a church a tone of dignity and repose which it now lacks.

Very much can be accomplished for the structural tone of a building by the right choice of materials. My own feeling is that bare stone or bare brick is far superior for the interior of a church to anything else. The desirable austerity of the building cannot be so directly accomplished in any other way. These surfaces, however, will produce a sense of coldness unless the builders are willing to introduce strongly contrasting elements of warmth or brilliance such as have been suggested. Some of the recently built churches with stone interiors, amongst non-liturgical bodies, are decidedly cold because of insufficient color in other ways. They need altars, or murals, or banners, or bright vestments to give them fire and warmth.

A building committee need not be afraid of the cheaper grades of material. It is more important to employ a competent artist who will produce a successful design of the right proportion and scale than it is to spend the money for costly materials. A very beautiful church may be made of the cheapest brick, unplastered outside or inside, if the structure is well designed. I have often seen church buildings overly fine and elaborate, the surface finish running ahead of structural invention and tonal character. Apartment house brick in a building well designed is better than marble badly fashioned. Pine boards, simply stained, if well cut, are better than rosewood, varnished and polished, in shapes inappropriate to a church.

Structural Tone

No one but an artist can solve these questions of structural tone. This does not always mean a professional artist. There are humble parsons who have more artistic feeling than some conspicuous architects. As a general rule, however, only the very best professional architects know enough about all these matters of light and shadow, color, texture, scale, proportion, and design to put together many elements into a simple and successful composition for a church.

A church building casts its influence upon a community for years, sometimes for generations. A noble building seems to have an almost living air and spirit, and may become a benign power in the lives of the people round about it. It is a great blessing to any town to possess such a structure. It is to do one of the most certain of public goods to have a hand in the erection of a beautiful church.

Chapter XXI: The Chancel

THERE is an outstanding fact respecting church building in America which is remarkably significant. It is the fact that numbers of buildings have been erected for the use of so-called non-liturgical churches with the communion table as the center of the interior composition. Although strictly speaking the word chancel refers to the railing which separates the space allotted especially to the clergy, there is no better word to use in describing the separated space that is formed in the apse of the church when the communion table is placed at the head of the building, somewhat elevated, the pulpit upon one side forward, and the lectern on the other side forward.

Such an arrangement, even by historical usage of the term, may properly be called a chancel, though in a larger church this space may incorporate also the choir. This is, of course, the arrangement used in the early Christian basilicas. It has been perpetuated in the West in the Roman Catholic, Anglican, Lutheran, and to some extent in other bodies. Now it is being revived with remarkable rapidity among the free churches. The illustrations of this volume display some of the most successful of those recently constructed.

I am sure that I do not know of all of them, but I do have information of more than fifty of these churches outside of the Roman Catholic, Episcopal, Lutheran, and Reformed Communions. This is a sufficient number to constitute an architectural tendency of note. A few of these are not recent. The First Parish Church and the Central Church, Boston, are older buildings with this arrangement. The latter was built by Upjohn in 1867. The Central Church of Providence, Rhode Island, and the Central Church of Worcester, Massachusetts, also follow the ancient usage. Not all of the Reformed churches have kept the plan, but a large number

The Chancel

of them, especially in Pennsylvania, have not only a chancel but an altar in them. Most of the others are altogether twentieth century buildings.

It is extremely significant that this movement has been developing not merely in one body but in several and in widely scattered communities. And it is altogether too extensive a movement to be laid to the door of any small coterie of artists or of ministers. It is rather a growing expression of dissatisfaction with present forms, of an expanding culture, and of the spirit of experimentation. Presbyterian, Congregational, Unitarian, Baptist, Methodist Episcopal, and Universalist churches are represented in the list.

The reasons for this development are several and in several areas—artistic, ecclesiastical, religious, and practical.

Probably the chief feeling which has prompted the movement is artistic. Every work of art is a composition in harmony. Every artistic composition has some clearly selected method of unity, some plan of bringing together diverse and manifold elements into the single accord of the whole. In painting, there is a point of "high light" upon which the lines of light and shadow converge, and to which the eye turns naturally and easily. Pictures which do not possess excellence of composition are unsatisfying to the physical sense and thus aesthetically weak.

Just so, an architectural interior is satisfactory according as the physical composition is so unified as to assist the composure of the feelings of people in it. It needs a "high light," a point of commanding interest, in precisely the same way as does a painting. The communion table or altar at the head of the apse is artistically a far better center for the composition than a pulpit.

The pulpit is usually an upstanding vertical object set in such a manner as to split up the space and divide the attention rather than center it. You may go into almost any annual exhibition of painters' societies and you will find very few vertical compositions. Portraits are often such, but the peculiar elements of interest in a portrait make it a more successful vertical composition than a pulpit can ever be.

Art & Religion

The pulpit is not especially interesting unless there is someone in it. It is therefore not a successful "high light" during all the parts of the public service other than the sermon and for all other uses of the church building.

Perhaps more profoundly still the artistic advantage of the chancel arrangement is its depth. Attention is not only scattered but blocked and limited by a great unrelieved wall space. By the more remote chancel, and its smaller area, attention is gathered together, led forward, and concentrated. These and other artistic reasons are in themselves sufficient to demand the change which is taking place in the present-day architectural treatment of the church interior.

The religious and ecclesiastical reasons are more important to some than the artistic. The pulpit at the center certainly tends to throw the chief dependence of the service upon the sermon, and in such a manner as greatly to minimize the possibilities and values of other exercises of worship. A successful chancel far better creates an atmosphere of worship before ever the service begins. And after the service has begun, it fosters reverence through all the parts. It tends to minimize the personality of the minister and to merge him into the background as a voice and messenger of the historic church and the communal faith.

Moreover, it differentiates his priestly and prophetic functions, thus enriching and clarifying the aspects of the religious experience. Strangely enough, it accomplishes all this without losing the vitality or function of the pulpit. Leaving the chancel and ascending the pulpit, the minister thus selects it as the appointed station for his own free utterance and whatever prophetic word has been given him to speak. The sermon is not minimized, while other parts of the service may be greatly improved by the greater significance of the objects of visual attention and by the greater variety of movement in the conduct of the service rendered possible by the central chancel plan. It is harder for any man to conduct a loose, flippant, or formless service in such a building.

For special services the arrangement is far superior, freed of the awkward and immovable pulpit platform. The communion service is greatly enhanced in dignity by the phys-

The Chancel

ical aids and evident honor of such a setting. The communion table and all that it represents in the devotional life of the Christian Church is not assigned to a narrow space and passageway below the pulpit platform where it is difficult to conduct the service without the sense of constriction or awkwardness or the feeling of its being after all an incidental affair. Special public exercises involving large numbers of persons are more impressively managed. Organ recitals with no persons at all visible may be made much more effective in a building which itself conveys the Christian message and helps to supply a varied yet pertinent content to the imaginative experience engendered by the music. Such a church building is far superior as a place for silent meditation and prayer, as it is open during all the days of the week.

In addition, the value of retaining excellent traditions is worthy of consideration. It is the traditional plan of the Christian Church, so arranged long before any of the controversies, in the midst of which the arrangement was changed, were developed. One may be eager to be rid of mediaeval ideas that do not comport with modern religion, and zealous to go forward to the free thought of the future, and yet be a lover of excellent and beautiful traditions established by the fathers. This physical setting for the service of Christian worship is one of the traditions of the early church worth reviving. As in the case of the artistic reasons, the religious considerations also strongly favor the tendency already developing in this direction.

Practically, also, the plan has many advantages. It saves space, easily utilizing the corners of a rectangular building for organ, choir room, choir benches, and minister's study, or vestry. The placement of the choir stalls or benches on either side of a chancel in the traditional manner enables at once a more beautiful and a more practical management of the choir. For processional hymns the singers may be more prominent, as they should be; and when not standing to sing, they are desirably less conspicuous. The chancel plan is practically more manageable for wedding ceremonies,


Art & Religion

funeral services, for pageantry of any kind, and for special exercises of children.

These and other considerations have been in the minds of clergymen and architects in their plans. The Rev. Shepherd Knapp of Worcester, Massachusetts, has written: "From a practical point of view the chancel arrangement is especially advantageous for special services, such as The Communion, funerals, weddings, and any festival service when processions and floral decorations come into use. The pulpit in the middle is much in the way for such occasions. The pulpit itself insists upon being the focus instead of some special feature of interest. In effect you have to discard all that lies behind the pulpit in weddings, for instance, and the space in front is usually restricted. The chancel arrangement is beautiful at the Communion Service—the table in the middle on the higher level where all can see it, the minister and deacons occupying the chancel seats."

The Rev. Charles E. Park of the First Church in Boston speaks of the architectural propriety of the plan: "Ours is a pure Gothic church, a dim and very ecclesiastical interior, with steep trussed roof and high narrow stained glass windows. To my mind, such an interior rather predetermines the chancel arrangement. Anything else would be architecturally, or at least traditionally, incongruous, and hence it would not be beautiful."

Concerning the Central Congregational Church of Boston the Rev. Willard L. Sperry suggests its symbolic value: "I like the general arrangement. The value of the whole scheme seems to me to lie in the opportunity given for some symbolic suggestion as to the several functions, priestly and prophetic, in the conduct of public worship. To have a little area in which to move, gives added interest to the general fabric of the service, and seems to me to dignify the various items in the service, giving each a certain distinctiveness of its own. We have a big communion table which I suppose may be called an 'altar.' At the celebration of the Communion it is moved out from the wall and the minister sits behind it. I suppose that is unecclesiastical and would shock any high churchman but in the Communion it preserves something of



Cram, Goodhue & Ferguson, Architects.

SOUTH CHURCH · NEW YORK CITY · REFORMED

Impressive stonework in piers, vaulting, and altar. The light comes through the lofty clerestory windows above low side aisles.

The Chancel

the dignity of the old Congregational idea. The deacons sit in the chancel seats on either side of the table."

In a letter from one of the officials of the Presbyterian Church of Englewood, New Jersey, is the following testimony: "About two years ago our church was remodelled from the stereotyped kind of pulpit and choir arrangement common in many Presbyterian Churches into what every member of our Church now feels is a satisfying result. There was a little question at the outset as to the propriety of the chancel arrangement in a Presbyterian Church but examples of this style of ecclesiastical architecture in Congregational and Presbyterian churches that were submitted by the architect soon overcame any question. The result has more than justified the prediction and our entire congregation is rejoicing in the very beautiful and appropriate result accomplished. I am enclosing under separate cover photographs showing two views of the chancel and a view of the nave. If you could compare these with a photograph of the church in its previous arrangement, you would see what a great improvement has been made from every standpoint."

There yet remain certain difficult problems, both religious and artistic, respecting the ideas and symbols of central prominence in the future church. Artistically, is the communion table itself a sufficiently interesting object of visual attention? Not, I think, unless the setting is very successfully handled. This has been the chief problem of the architects who have used this plan. I have nowhere seen as yet a wholly successful solution.

In the building designed by Cram, Goodhue & Ferguson, for the South Reformed Church, New York, now the Park Avenue Presbyterian, the communion table itself, made of light-colored stone, and faced with a mosaic, is a clear-cut and strongly attractive center of interest, and is particularly well surrounded,—by tessellated flooring, choir benches, the stone arches of the octagonal chevet and exquisite though restrained clergy stall carvings. As a whole, this chancel is one of the most successful solutions of the problem under discussion.

In other instances, as at the First and Second churches of

Art & Religion

Boston and the Church of the Divine Paternity in New York, there are mosaic compositions in the wall immediately behind the communion table, which in these cases is placed against the wall.

In the most of the new buildings with chancels there is not much difference in tone or light value between the table and its background of clergy stalls or minister's chair and deacons' seats. Some have used a strongly colored fabric or dossal for the space behind the table, as at The House of Hope, Presbyterian, St. Paul. Still others have failed to make a "high light" out of the table at all because of the strong character of the chancel windows at the head of the apse and the placement of the table in such a way as to fall within the shadow. The eye is thus constantly lifted away from the center of liturgical and symbolical interest to the place which should be the secondary point of light in the composition. It may be replied that the painted glass figures of the window ought to be the primary "high light." There is much to say for this. I strongly incline, however, to the other view.

Exactly this problem of a sufficiently prominent center of interest led to the development of the ciborium, or pillared canopy over the altar of the early church. Mr. Walter Lowrie has clearly explained this: "With the construction of great basilicas there arose an architectural necessity for this or for some similar device. The altar, no matter what might be the size of the church, retained always the same very limited dimensions. Of itself, therefore, it was ill fitted to constitute the architectural centre of a huge basilica; it needed then as it has always needed, some architectural adjunct which might vary in size with the proportions of the building. . . . The reredos of the Gothic church was another solution under changed conditions. It can hardly be accounted so successful a one."*

The problem is largely solved for an ordinary building if a cross is placed upon the table or candles are used. A white cross against a dark background, or contrariwise, at once constitutes a compelling point of visual interest and

* Lowrie, "Monuments of the Early Church," p. 123.

The Chancel

becomes the artistic as well as the symbolic center of the whole structural composition. This is the reason for its historical development and for its continued usage in all the old churches and this is the reason for its recent revival by some of the free churches.

One of the most simple and beautiful altars I have seen is that of the Second Parish Church of Newton, Massachusetts, an orthodox Congregational Church. In this church there is no question as to where the look of the eye will center. There is very little except sheer prejudice in the way of a more widespread adoption of this solution. Many of the Reformed churches, although meanwhile developing a thoroughly modern theology, have never abandoned the traditional symbol of Christianity.

The fact that the churches most notable in its revival are those of liberal thought is evidence of their view that it is not incompatible with a modern theology. In discussing the question with a friend of mine who is a man of international repute, an orthodox minister, and one of the most typical Puritans of the present day, I was surprised to hear his warm commendation of this procedure. He feels it to be a great assistance to reverence and dignity much needed in these days, to have a definite altar in a Christian church.

There is no essential reason against the placing of a wooden cross in the most prominent place of the church building, unless that reason applies equally against placing the idea of the cross in a prominent place in theology or hymnology, or in decorating other parts of the building with many crosses of wood or of glass. If we are to use symbolism at all, it is better to do it heartily. Assigning the cross to inconspicuous decorative positions looks as though we were half ashamed of it.

There is no great danger of mistaking symbols for realities now. No one regards Dante's great symbolic portrayals as facts. Long ago the great Protestant painter, Albert Dürer, said, "A Christian would no more be led to superstition by a picture or an effigy than an honest man to commit murder because he carries a weapon by his side."*

* Quoted from Crouch, "Puritanism in Art," p. 310.

Art & Religion


If the new religion is to be a composite and the future church a community church in the most inclusive sense, it would be an impropriety to make any such use of the cross. If it is to be definitely Christian, there are many reasons for the central prominence of the cross, even to the liberal thought which does not accept traditional views of atonement. It is a symbol of uttermost love, a symbol of personal salvation, an ever present call for personal acceptance of the law of love even to the extent of self-sacrifice.

It is possible, on the other hand, that the next generation will be moved by a strong sense of the value of the communion service because of its suggestion of brotherhood. The service will be for many not so much a memorial of the sacrifice which historically was the tragic end of a beautiful brotherhood, as a memorial of that brotherhood in its vitality and hope. It will commemorate for them the fellowship of a band of young men under the spirit of an incomparable leader, eager and determined to reform the whole structure of the national faith of his people, and set going new and liberating principles in their moral life.

I hope to live long enough to see some church of noble and brotherly people build a great building for the worship of their community in which a physically large table of communion set in an ample space may be the center of the public exercises which most movingly celebrate and rekindle the ideals of brotherhood.

The use of candle light is one of the historic solutions of the problem of artistic "high light" for an interior composition. Some of the Dutch churches which do not use a cross upon the altar, place candles there. Psychologically, there is much to say for it. The eye, however much it may wander to other beauties in the building or distract the mind with other thoughts, is always brought back to the strongest light. The effect speedily becomes more than physical and tends to empty the mind and make it ready for the message of the service or of the preacher.

This is no more than the logic of the aesthetic experience in general. It is the reason why you go out of doors for a long walk to think over an important matter, despite the



Allen & Collens, Architects.

SECOND CHURCH IN NEWTON • MASSACHUSETTS • CONGREGATIONAL

An orthodox free church that has found religious and artistic value in restoring the altar with its historic symbol.

The Chancel

fact that you may be unable to proceed with the thinking because of the obtrusion of trees or sky or water, the physical charm which these exert and the empty-headedness which at first they seem to induce. But that empty-headedness is the first thing you need, the preliminary condition to the clear-headedness you came for. Just so, the physical beauties of the house of worship should tend to produce this desirable condition of readiness for the positive message of the hour.

Some of the churches which have moved the pulpit from the central position have made an ineffective compromise. They have moved it and not moved it, building a prominent pulpit from which the sermon is delivered, retaining a less prominent desk in the middle of the platform. Such is the plan in the Fourth Presbyterian Church of Chicago. The pulpit proper is very beautiful and placed in a most commanding position on the great pier of the crossing, but the point of the central visual interest is weakly handled. It is an uninteresting mass of chairs, tables, and choir screening. There is nothing religiously appropriate in the prominence of a choir collected in a gallery behind the preacher. In this building especially, the long lines of a majestic nave strongly lead the attention toward the focal point, but when it gets there, there is nothing there. The whole effect is as if you were to look upon the Sistine Madonna after someone had pasted blank paper over the face of the Virgin.

Shall the average church, then, build with a chancel or not? It depends upon what kind of exercise is to be conducted in it, and partly upon what the people go there for. If the building is to be merely an auditorium, that is, a place to hear in, then it makes little difference. But more and more, modern churches are not being considered as meetinghouses or auditoriums.

When the church spends its money to make a more beautiful structure, it does not do so in order to improve it as a place to hear in but as a place to look in. But so soon as you desire to make a successful appeal to the eye, you must follow the canons of looking and not those of hearing.

If the dependence of future church worship is to be chiefly the sermon, the central pulpit is sufficient. But if there is to

Art & Religion

be developed in any kind of genuine sense an art of worship, then there is demanded a more manageable space and a more symbolic differentiation of parts. The possibilities of liturgical and ceremonial improvements are greatly obstructed by high platform and central pulpit; and this entirely apart from any question of reviving any ancient ritual. The traditional chancel plan is just as desirable from the point of view of the invention of new kinds of exercises. It is adaptable in almost unlimited ways. There are no sound objections against it. It dignifies a very small chapel: it is necessary to a great cathedral-like church. It is beautiful, practical, churchly, and positively suggestive to the religious imagination.

Chapter XXII: Practicable Matters

IT is always advisable for persons who wish to build beautifully to be sure that they are also building practically. The parish life of most modern churches includes a greater variety of other concerns than those of worship. These must not be forgotten. And, also, any movement to improve the beauty of church buildings in general should be concerned for the small parish as well as for the larger. The suggestions must be practicable on a small scale.

First of all, educational facilities are required. It is no longer considered important for this purpose that there be an assembly hall. The younger scholars need separate departmental rooms, the older should meet for assembly in the main church. But all the junior, intermediate, and adult classes should be provided with separate classrooms. These rooms may be also utilized as clubrooms. The Church School building should have very much the character of the regular public school building, on a smaller scale. Some of the recent church plants with an elaborate provision for the Church School have more halls and large rooms than they need and not enough small classrooms and clubrooms.

The social life of the modern parish requires at least one large space for church suppers and other large gatherings. It ought also to have, wherever possible, smaller rooms that are particularly attractive in their furnishings, one or more clublike rooms for men, and one or more pleasant parlors for women. If there is a gymnasium, the same space may be arranged for dramatic presentations such as are not suitable for the main church.

The placement of the building, large or small, deserves the greatest consideration. If possible, the floor of the main church should not be too far above the ground. An easy and inviting entrance is very difficult when too many stair steps are necessary. Whether the church be in the city or in the

Art & Religion

country, passers-by should be able at times to get a glimpse of the lighted interior, and to hear the sounds of the organ. All the educational and social rooms should be placed above the ground if possible.

The smaller church and its equipment needs to be given more attention on the part of architects. There is a too common feeling that only the large and rich church can have a beautiful building and adequate parish equipment. It is true that most of the significant illustrations of current usages as to architectural style relate to large and costly buildings. Whatever is done in the large, however, sooner or later affects the style and manner of the small. Precisely the same canons of good artistry apply to the most modest buildings.

It is no more costly to build a very small church beautifully than it is to build an ugly one. On the contrary, my own observation leads me to think that much of the unnecessary expense in many small churches has detracted from the beauty of the buildings rather than added to them. Far too many small churches are not sufficiently plain, direct, and simple. Success in this matter is not a question of materials nor of size but of taste and artistry.

Yet there are especial problems in the small building. It is difficult to design a small church so that it will intimate big ideas. It is hard to secure sufficient dignity in a structure that does not have an amplitude of scale, but it can be done. Mr. Cram's little chapel at Arlington and Mr. Goodhue's little side chapel at St. Bartholomew's in New York are scarce twenty feet wide, but they are more dignified and impressive than some of the biggest churches in the country. They prove conclusively that the small building need not lack dignity. By the right proportions and something to give the interior a religious tone, a very small church may be just as inducive to reverence as a large one. On the whole, no single feature of the plan besides these matters of proportion and tone will so help the small building in dignity as a chancel. The simple arrangement of placing the communion table centrally in the interior composition at once specifies the religious character of the building. Immediately there is



Ralph Adams Cram, Architect.

ST. ANNE'S CHAPEL · ARLINGTON HEIGHTS · MASSACHUSETTS

Unplastered walls are treated with whitewash directly upon the stones. The tone is at once barren and cheerful, a festive note being added by the bent-iron candelabra.

Practicable Matters

conveyed a sense of dignity far superior to that of any structure of the purely auditorium type.

Some of the denominational church building societies are still permitting extremely unfortunate practices in the erection of small church buildings. Others have made great advances and are prepared to offer detailed designs for small churches that are at once practicable and beautiful. The Bureau of Architecture of the Methodist Episcopal Church has published some highly creditable plans and designs. It is no longer necessary for the small church to engage an expensive architect. It is usually desirable to avoid an inexpensive one.

Another very practical question in church building is that of partial construction. Many church committees are enamored of the so-called unit system, and proceed to erect a parish house long before they are prepared to build the church. There are many cases in which this is desirable. In many others it is gravely unfortunate. Particularly is this true now that the Church School assembly hall is not so desirable as it used to be considered. What is the advantage in erecting a Church School house with a large assembly hall and having an ugly building until the main church is built, and thereafter possessing a useless assembly hall?

It is especially unfortunate if the parish house unit is built in such a way as to be later located on the flank of the main church building, arranged to be an addition to the seating capacity of the church. This very procedure is one of the most common and certainly the worst possible plan. The final result in such a church is an ugly interior, whether the doors of the Church School hall be open or closed. And with the growing tendency for the conduct of the Church School worship in the main church the flanking hall is more or less unnecessary in any case.

It is far better to build the principal structure first. The only objection to this is on the part of those who wish to wait until they can afford to build the church more elaborately and beautifully. The only reply is that it need not be more costly than the other plan. To begin with, a building can be given churchly proportions and erected with cheap materials.

Art & Religion

Later it can be beautified by rich furniture, by decorative murals or windows, by the addition of a tower or spire, by covering the outside with plaster or better faced brick. Meanwhile, the outlines of the structure tell their own story and make a churchly appeal in a way that is impossible for a nondescript-looking building at the back of a lot.

One of the most simple plans for such a structure is that of a plain rectangle about twice as long as broad. The social room may be in the basement. At the front of the church may be a chancel with two small rooms in the two corners, one for the minister's study or Church School classroom, the other for stair hall and choir. At the other end of the building may be two crosswise rooms one above the other, for primary scholars and for classroom space, or for small meetings. When the time for improvement comes, the lower of these rooms becomes a foyer, yielding also some space for more pews. The upper room becomes the gallery of the church. Further Church School classrooms and social rooms will be built as an additional parish house equipment. Some such procedure as this is scarcely more expensive and far superior, artistically, to the plan of erecting a parish house first. It provides very creditably for the Church School, while the public worship of the church is far better encouraged than when conducted in a temporary and ill-proportioned hall.

More important than anything else suggested in this chapter is the practicable character of structural beauty. No building can be artistically satisfactory if a preconceived design or style is foisted upon the structure to the detriment of its practicable character. The sense of the appropriateness of the structure with respect to its materials, location, and uses is essential to the aesthetic enjoyment of it. The artistic forms, both structural and decorative, must be fashioned, at least in part, out of the utilitarian demands of the situation. The use of concrete developed in modern times, and still more the use of steel, adds to the structural methods of modern buildings. As time goes on, there will be increasing skill in the mastery of the aesthetic possibilities of these materials.

Practicable Matters

To recognize the aesthetic worth of that which is also practicable is not to admit that every practicable building is beautiful. The elements of scale, proportion, decorative design, and other factors must constantly be remembered, particularly in the attempt to build beautiful churches for the worship of God. Nevertheless, these elements may be in every other way satisfactory without yielding the shy secret of beauty, unless also the structure be evidently recognized as practicable.


Chapter XXIII: Religious Ideas for the Architect

ON the whole, the architects are less to blame than the churches for failing to make of church buildings successful symbols of religion. They have been quite as zealous as the churches in the reëstablishment of a nobler conception of the church building. In a recent letter, Mr. William Orr Ludlow has discussed this point. "There has been a very distinct tendency on the part of some of the Protestant denominations to consider the church building an auditorium and to make comfort, acoustical qualities and clever arrangement of plan the criterion of excellence. These things are all essential but after all are merely the good body and unless the spirit is conserved, the best part is wanting.

"A building is an expression of purpose and the church building is something more than a comfortable and convenient place for the worship of God. It may be unfashionable in these days to speak of the 'House of God,' but that very fact indicates the lack of appreciation of the real purpose and real ownership of the building.

"If then it really is God's House and not merely a convenient place in which to worship Him, any true architectural expression must recognize the qualities and character of the real owner. If someone builds a house for me and builds it without recognizing anything of my character and tastes, to say the least, he is an unfaithful steward of my funds. To build the House of God and make beauty, dignity and spirituality, as expressed in architecture, entirely secondary to good heating and acoustics is to build God's House without God."

The first religious idea, therefore, for the architect to bear in mind, in planning his church, is that it is to be a House of God. The building as viewed from without or from within should be definitely recognizable as standing for



Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue, Architect.

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH · MONTCLAIR · NEW JERSEY

A chancel of exquisite detail. It displays the difficulty of centering attention upon the communion table without making it a definite altar.

Religious Ideas for the Architect

religion, an ever present reminder of God. There should never be any question as to whether it might possibly be a post office or any other secular structure. Forms, styles, proportions which have been commonly in use amongst the people for other public purposes, though perhaps in themselves appropriate, should not be used for a church.

For the clear representation of religion, probably no structural feature is so important in the exterior aspect of the church as a tower or spire. Some churches in the Gothic style have been so designed as to produce the aspiring effect without a tower. By the lofty and narrow proportions of the façade, and the prominence of tall, pointed windows, they give an impression of lift and upward reach. But it is difficult to do and not often successful. The typical church should have a spire or tower.

Just what interior elements can be utilized to convey the feeling of religion is for each artist to decide for himself. On the whole, probably nothing is so tangibly effective at this point as the planning of some kind of chancel, as already suggested. But the desire and the spirit of the builder is more important than the forms he chooses for his expression. It is in the nature of the case difficult for an ungodly man to build a House of God. Whatever the style the first demand of the building is that it somehow convey a sense of God. In such a church, sometimes at least, men who have come to admire will remain to pray.

In this connection it is worth suggesting that the conception of a church building as a House of God relates itself to two important religious faiths, one ancient and one modern. The Eastern Church has always emphasized the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation. Present-day religious faith emphasizes the conception of the Immanence of God. These are only different forms for solving the same religious problems. The architect should understand something of the present vitality of this present thought of the immanence of God, in its two most important aspects. First, it means that present religion conceives of God as at work creating and recreating the world, especially as actually an energy and influence in the spirits of men. The second aspect is the

Art & Religion

thought of God as ever revealing the truth. A House of God should in some sense be a record of the historic triumphs of religion, a statement of old faiths which are more and more confidently held to be true, together with a genuine expectancy of larger light and nobler success yet to come.

A church should have Man in it as well as God in it. It should be a strong and manly structure—honest, dependable, vigorous in all its structural character. It should not be overly decorated nor too delicate. If possible, the structural principle of the building should be clear and evident, rather than obscured or covered up. It is, for instance, to me a very great regret that the heavy masonry arch over the crossing in the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York, cannot be seen. It has been covered with lesser slabs and stones. In an age which has developed so little of such structural stability, I would like to see the very stones that hold the great building up. Let the architect reveal the structure wherever it is possible.

In its symbolism, also, it should have something to glorify the achievements of man and express confidence and hope in the development of man. Without worshiping the saints, we can enlarge and brighten life by vivid recollections of the leaders of the human race. It is not possible or desirable to make of any church a Pantheon or a Hall of Fame. It is possible to put in every church something to connect the religious experience of the present with the spiritual achievements of the great and good in the history of the human conquests of mind and heart.

Tablets, windows, portraits, statues, may be utilized, many or few, according to the scale of the building and the interests of the community, to memorialize those spiritual achievements considered to be especially inspiring by the particular church. The brilliant new reredos of St. Thomas's Church, New York, contains figures of the early political heroes of American life as well as saints of the church. This is one definite way of putting Man into the church.

It is perhaps more difficult to express the other great present conception of man, the ideal of brotherhood. But it must be included in some way. If the theological analogy of

Religious Ideas for the Architect

God as a father means anything practical, it means that all human beings are in some sense children of God, and should learn to practice the brotherly life. Everything autocratic must come out of the church. It is for the artist to put his imagination at work to design something expressive of this vigorous, modern conception of the human person.

As the Eastern Church has stood for the Incarnation, the Western Church has stood for Salvation. The church must still be a place of refuge, forgiveness, cleansing, healing, and joy. It must ever be a place where there is experienced the joy of release from failure, shame, injury, and trouble of every sort, and the joy of the abundant and creative life.

In seeking to symbolize these things the architect needs to remember some important changes in theology. If it is still true that the cross is the great symbol of salvation, it is also true that its interpretation is very different from that of mediaeval or Reformation faith. The cross is still a symbol of the uttermost character of the Divine Love, which may become the inspiration and the power of its human imitation. It is no longer a symbol of something accomplished for the believer entirely outside himself, to be appropriated by a formal act of faith: but rather of that which must be accomplished inside himself and appropriated by imitation in the actual life of the practical world. Nowadays it is seen that men are saved according as they become saviors.

Also the life of the world and the character of human nature is not now conceived as formerly. We are not saved by withdrawal from the world, but by living the divine life in it. We are not saved in spite of the flesh, but by understanding and developing the gifts of the bodily powers. Salvation, in other words, is positive and not negative. It is the developing transformation of human nature. It is the living of an abundant life. It is living the productive and creative life, and receiving the immediate rewards of such a life. It is a life freed from sin and failure by the positive spirit of Christ-like good will.

I do not just now see how the architect can say these things in his building. I do believe that as we acquire more and more mastery of our new view of life and more and more

Art & Religion

facility of expression there will be discovered appropriate forms for celebrating the beauty of nature and of human nature, for assuring people of the goodness of life and of God, and for assisting the process of their own participation in this life. These new forms will not exclude some of the old forms. Perhaps they may be only modified manners of setting forth the old solution. It is for clergyman and artist alike to consider and develop how the church building may best serve to help people to the Joy of Salvation.

These things we have been discussing may be perhaps more clearly specified to the artist as Truth, Goodness, and Beauty. Modern religion desires to make earnest with all these three. It desires to have ever fresh discovery, practice, and enjoyment of all these three. It desires constantly to minister these to all men. Let the architect do his best to build a House of God which men will feel to be open to All the Truth, where men may be led to live according to the Highest and most Brotherly Goodness, and enabled to enjoy the Beauty of the Whole of Life, and he will have been most highly successful.

Chapter XXIV: The Future Church

THE Reformation age has been marked, amongst other things, by the extensive delimitation of the functions of the church and widespread specialization of social agencies. There was a day when the church school was the only school. There was a day when the church charity was the only organized charity. There was a day when the only drama was the church drama, when the only public art museum was the church, when the noblest musical productions were those of the church. The Reformation age has witnessed the severance of the arts as well as many community services from the ecclesiastical institution.

The new age will be characterized by new integrations. The discursive temper of the old age will be greatly modified by new popularities and new commonalities. The analytical temper of today will give place to the synthetic efforts of tomorrow. It is not necessary, economical, or efficient to develop too many institutions for the functioning of life. Moreover, and vastly more important, it is not good psychology to divide up the human person and his interests into too many categorical expressions.

I like to think that it may be possible to reunite in the church some of its dissevered members, especially in the region of the arts. I am definitely hopeful that in some great community there can be formed a company of men, some of them artists, some of them sociologists, some of them laborites, some of them patrons of the arts, some of them priests, and most of them plain people, who will unite to establish a great Community Church—a Church that will in itself be a great museum of art, a great music hall, a great scene and theater for the pageantry of new representations of life, a great school of morals, a great forum of new thought, a great expression of brotherhood, a great temple of worship.

I do not mean to say that any great variety of community

Art & Religion

organizations ought to be reunited in the church. Yet organized religion must ever be one of the chief centers of thought, must ever perform certain vital community services, and constitutes the only opportunity for the joint expression of all the arts. There are some who would set too narrow limits to the functioning of the ecclesiastical institution. Perhaps there are many who would fear the compressing effect of anything placed under the governance of religion. But the true religious life is the all-comprehending life. True religion never compresses but rather enlarges everything it touches. It gathers to itself and fuses in the fires of its own supreme experience all discoveries, all purposes, all apprehensions, and then upon all quests and aims and joys it throws the illumination of its own great light.

This play and interplay between historic religion and fresh, natural, human experience, just intimated, is precisely the thing that will create the church of the new age and describe its character. The future religion will not be a vague eclecticism. It will be specific, historic Christianity. But it will be a Christianity ever freshly tested and ever newly enriched by a conscious relation to the categories of truth, goodness, and beauty.

A pagan standard as a test of revealed religion? Partly, yet the only standard comports with a spiritual conception of revelation. We are at last face to face with a revived demand and possibly with a revived opportunity to do what they did in the earliest days of the Christian faith and to do it better.

Into the pagan world went forth the gospel of the Hebrew prophet and Christ. But the forms through which the gospel was passed on to the later generations were the forms of Greek thought and Roman polity. Historic Christianity was fashioned by the mergence of Hebraic and pagan elements. Retaining great moral and spiritual ideals from their own religious heritage, the early Jewish Christians left off their allegiance to the Jewish Law. But their disciples were not supplied with an adequate intellectual furniture nor an adequate practical organization until they met with the pagan world. Christian theology very early began to be

The Future Church

formed to the moulds of Greek thought, and almost as early Christian polity was cast into the mould of the Roman imperial administration.

A similar mergence is now required. It is for Catholics and also for Protestants to abandon their legalistic character. Both are in bondage to the Law, the one to the legalistic conception of the Church, the other to a legalistic conception of the Bible. Retaining the spiritual authority of the historic Jesus, the root of specific Christianity must be grafted afresh with the new growths of rational, ethical, and artistic faith.

And this great process ought to be better achieved than ever before. What in the former time was accomplished largely out of the pressures of practical life, could now be done self-consciously and deliberately. We have behind us the modern scientific and analytical studies of religion. It is now time to transform the academic survey of the psychology of religion into applied psychology of religion. Only a great priest can perform the marriage of naïve popular religion with critical and rationalized experience. Only a great artist can weld the components of historic faith with seething, aspiring, naturalistic humanism.

It has been done before, it can be better done again. The materials for a great comprehensive reconstruction are at hand, and those who do the work will discover all but inexhaustible resources for the task in the world of the Arts as well as in the worlds of Science and Reform. This has been impossible under the old dualistic view of human nature, which afforded no legitimate basis for the fleshly appeal of art. The new studies of experience and the newer views of nature and of human nature not only constitute a sound basis for artistic progress but, vice versa, open the gates that the rivers of faith may be freshened from the springs of art.

What is needed, therefore, is not so much a Reformation as a new Formation, comparable in comprehensiveness with the early formulations of Christianity. The reformers thought they could do without forms: we know that we must create forms for realizing and propagating our faiths. We have been thinking of the new age in contrast with the


Art & Religion

Reformation age. If human life is to be successful, possibly the next hundred years will rather be of such a character as properly to be called the time of the great Formation.

The Church of the Future will be the Church of the Open Mind. We are here interested in this only as it relates to the arts and to worship. We have already endeavored to see that the artist is not only not inimical to new truth, but that his own perennial tendency is to break away from outworn ideas. The artist, always seeking new modes of utterance, thereby ever transforms the thing that is uttered. And we have already sought to appreciate also the aids of art to the rationalizing process. Arriving at an apprehension of the truth is not wholly a matter of science and philosophy, but in part a mystical process. A great art of worship would foster a great theology.

The Future Church will be the Brotherly Church. It will not only teach advancing ideals of human relations, but practice them. It will not only discuss the problems of right and wrong, but call men to definite and sacramental dedication to the right. It will resolve the tragedy of culture by carrying it forward out of the realm of the mind by a culture of the will. A great modern art of worship will not merely display a tangible brotherhood realized in the communion of the saints, but it will fire the resolution of friendship until the whole community is absorbed in that fellowship.

The Church of the Future will be the Church Beautiful. It will value and enjoy beauty, any beauty, the beauty of anything, the beauty of the whole of life. Most of the artistry used by religion is symbolic in character and classic in method. It begins with definite religious concepts and seeks to express these ideas in forms of beauty—musical, liturgical, architectural, decorative, or ritualistic. The Church of the Future will utilize also the romantic method. It will value forms of beauty in painting, music, and dramatic action not specifically symbolical, but realistic, poetical, or lyrical productions. That is to say, it will set forth the oneness of life not only theologically and ethically but also aesthetically.



Cram & Ferguson, Architects.

SECOND CHURCH IN BOSTON · MASSACHUSETTS · UNITARIAN

The barrel-vaulted side aisles and elevated nave are more reminiscent of Italian than of English Renaissance work. A building of intellectual type, yet designed for a rich art of worship.

The Future Church

What does all this mean practically? Briefly, it means for the average church or the small church that it will be furnished with a beautiful building and supplied with far superior materials for all its work and worship. It will be assisted to the development of a noble liturgy. It will from time to time be visited by superior preachers connected with preaching orders. Freed from the burden of much unprofitable sermonizing, the minister will be enabled to improve the religious education of the young and of the old and more richly perform his priestly and pastoral functions.

For the extraordinary church in the city, it means a more elaborate cathedral organization, where a dean and his canons constitute a chapter of specialized clergy. The staff will include teachers, preachers, dramatists, musicians, visitors, directors, and evangelists. The intellectual life will be developed from the pulpit as freely as in the past age, much more freely in the church school, and more democratically in the open forum. Practical service to the community will develop according to the needs of differing situations. The heart and core of this community service, however, will be the pastoral work of good cheer in the homes of people, and the personal, priestly ministry of consultation. The public worship will be founded upon the normal great ritual drama of the spiritual life. Other public exercises will be more varied, including great evangelistic appeals, free and informal discussions, noble musical presentations, and I think also pageants and morality plays in the choir of the church.

We cannot have this Future Church, we cannot have church union, we cannot have a new age until we acquire a new psychology about practical religion. Nothing is more important in this attempt than to reëxamine the categorical relations of the religious organization in its ordinary constitution. The background of our consciousness in these matters is unnecessarily divided. The mediaeval church, thinking of the minister under the category of the priesthood, has never genuinely admitted the prophetic category. The Protestant body, thinking of the minister as a prophet, has hindered his usefulness in his ordinary capacities by assign-

Art & Religion

ing him a rôle which in the nature of the case is extraordinary. So also in less sharp contrasts we have spoken of public services as "going to meeting," "going to Mass," "going to hear Dr. So and So." None of these things is primary.

The way out of this confused background is the plain recognition of the primacy of religion. The religious experience is the human experience of the living God. Art is not religion, but only the stepping-stone to it. Theology is not religion, but only the description of it. Morality is not religion, but the resultant issue of it. The culture of the religious experience itself is therefore the primary function of the practical religious institution.

If the primary category of religion is the religious experience, the primary category in describing the function of the church is the *Cultus*. The public worship of God is the reason for the being of the organized church. It does not attempt chiefly to provide a cult of ideas as do scientists and philosophers; nor a cult of ethics as do sociologists; nor a cult of beauty as do aesthetes; but the culture of religion, the all-embracing life. It is for this primary function that the church is chiefly valued, even by the outsider. Entirely typical of this estimate is the word of a modern artist and philanthropist, Mr. Allen Bartlett Pond. "The pulpit as a doctrinaire platform may pass away; creeds may come and go; but the church as a house of worship must remain, its liturgies and its rituals, purified and refined, voicing for men their deepest feelings, their loftiest aspirations, their noblest ideals."*

The Future Church will maintain a great cult of religion itself, personal and social, the stabilizing background of change in theology and in morals, the great ordinary over against which the extraordinary has significance, the underlying being out of which there always flows that which is becoming.

The corporeal character of this great cult, the nature and method of its apparatus, will not be that of creedalism, nor the personal rousing of hedonistic emotions for their own sake, but that of great symbolic acts and objects of beauty.

* Quoted from the *Brick Builder*, vol. 8, p. 174.

The Future Church

This great cult will be administered by priestly officers who will organize a scientific school of moral and religious education; keep themselves in readiness for personal consultation; devise exercises in public worship, simple and quiet at times, at other times brilliant and majestic; and keep open welcome to the prophetic voices of the day, whether of scientist, reformer, or artist.

This great cult will be the record and consummation of the national ideals, the pictured description of the national life, the supreme and harmonized utterance of the voice of the age.

This great cult will be rooted firmly in the primary sensational approach to human nature, but it will flower in the spiritual and sacramental realization of the divine nature of persons.

This great cult will be housed in a building made with hands but which by its very style and tone will intimate both the near and far presence of Divinity.

The time draws near when it should be possible to construct such a great Cultus, on the one hand freed of authoritative and legalistic formularies; and on the other free, by competent technique and the mastery of its joyous forms, to spread the influence of the noblest ideals in the social life.

The Church of the Future will heal the breach between religion and the ancient categories of truth, goodness, and beauty. Yet the worship of the new age will be not less but more religious in spirit, not less but more Christian in essential character. If the spur of the scientist is the love of truth, the joy of the Christian is the Truth of Love. If the zeal of the moralist strives to achieve some association or brotherhood of goodness, the joy of the Christian is the Goodness of Brotherhood. If the satisfaction of the artist is the life of beauty, the joy of the Christian is the Beauty of Life, all life, man's life, the Life of God.

Appendix

IT would require a volume properly to collate and criticise in detail the various orders of worship amongst the free churches. I am appending therefore only the simple orders used in our own church, the regular Ordinary, and the order for the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

The usual Sunday morning order, as will be readily observed, is very simple. It is designed to follow the course of experience as outlined in chapters fifteen and sixteen.

The Organ Prelude and Processional Hymn are, as suggested, introductory in character.

The burden of Presentation is entirely carried by the Introit, which for every service has about the character of those printed in chapter seventeen.

The second principal liturgical division, the Prayer of Penitence, is the Prayer of Confession taken from the Fifty-first Psalm.

The third element, that of Praise, is chiefly expressed by the Anthem. Sometimes a hymn of praise takes its place. This note of Praise, that is, the upward swing of the pendulum of attention, in the swift alternations which so typically characterize the mystic experience, is further impressed and sustained a little later by the Doxology and the Gloria Patri.

The definite mental and moral content to be realized and readjusted in the experience of Illumination, is suggested in the Scripture Readings and pastoral Prayer. The illumined outlook is then led to congregational expression in a Confession of Faith. Our present material is taken from I John and from Romans.

A definite suggestion of personal Dedication is made in connection with the Offertory by a Scripture verse, freshly chosen for each service, and by a consecration prayer as the offering is received.

The emotional course is then more or less neutralized by

Appendix

the hymn preceding the sermon, which thus prepares the way for fresh attention to the explicit thought of the day. This thought has already been prepared for or intimated by the Introit, Scriptures, and Prayers.

Two other items should be mentioned, which indeed are extremely important. The little responsive benedictions and ejaculations after the prayer of confession, serve to graduate the mood between penitence and praise. A brief gradual of organ playing leads from the mental interest of the Scripture lessons to the reiterated praise of the Doxology.

The Communion Order is in part about the same. In the one herewith published the traditional words were sung in the Gloria in Excelsis, Benedictus, Te Deum, Sanctus, Agnus Dei and Nunc Dimittis.

Although most of the prayers are free and extemporaneous, usually the ancient Communion Collect is used at some place. Sometimes a traditional prayer is said at the Offertory. The Communion Admonition commonly includes the suggestions contained in the Orate Fratres and Sursum Corda. The Prayer of Thanksgiving opens and closes with the words of the traditional Preface.

Order of Worship

ORGAN PRELUDE
PROCESSIONAL HYMN
INTROIT
PRAYER OF CONFESSION

Have mercy upon us, O God, according to thy lovingkindness. According to the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out our transgressions.

Wash us thoroughly from our iniquity, and cleanse us from our sin. Against thee have we sinned and done evil in thy sight.

Create in us clean hearts, O God; and renew a right spirit within us. Cast us not away from thy presence; And take not thy holy spirit from us.

Restore unto us the joy of thy salvation; And uphold us with thy free spirit.—Amen.

MINISTER—The Lord be with you.

PEOPLE—And with thy spirit.

MINISTER—Praise ye the Lord.

PEOPLE—The Lord's name be praised.

ANTHEM
PRAYER
SCRIPTURE READING
THE DOXOLOGY
CONFESSION OF FAITH

God is love; and every one that loveth, is born of God, and knoweth God. We have beheld and bear witness that the Father hath sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world. And this commandment have we from him, that he who loveth God love his brother also. The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified with him.

THE GLORIA PATRI
OFFERTORY
HYMN
SERMON
THE BENEDICTION—The Congregation Seated.
RECESSIONAL HYMN
ORGAN POSTLUDE

Order of Worship for Holy Communion

ORGAN PRELUDE

PROCESSIONAL HYMN

INTROIT

PRAYER OF CONFESSION

Have mercy upon us, O God, according to thy lovingkindness. According to the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out our transgressions.

Wash us thoroughly from our iniquity, and cleanse us from our sin. Against thee have we sinned and done evil in thy sight.

Create in us clean hearts, O God; and renew a right spirit within us. Cast us not away from thy presence; And take not thy holy spirit from us.

Restore unto us the joy of thy salvation; And uphold us with thy free spirit.—Amen.

MINISTER—The Lord be with you.

PEOPLE—And with thy spirit.

MINISTER—Praise ye the Lord.

PEOPLE—The Lord's name be praised.

ANTHEM—Gloria in Excelsis.

PRAYER

EPISTLE

GRADUAL—Benedictus.

GOSPEL

THE DOXOLOGY

CONFESSION OF FAITH

God is love; and every one that loveth, is born of God, and knoweth God. We have beheld and bear witness that the Father hath sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world. And this commandment have we from him, that he who loveth God love his brother also. The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified with him.

THE GLORIA PATRI

RECEPTION OF MEMBERS

ANTHEM—Te Deum.

SERMON

OFFERTORY

COMMUNION ADMONITION

PRAYER OF THANKSGIVING and SANCTUS

THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION

PRAYER OF CONSECRATION and the LORD'S PRAYER

THE HOLY COMMUNION—Agnus Dei.

—Nunc Dimittis.

THE BENEDICTION—The Congregation Seated.

CHORAL AMEN—Silent Meditation.

Index

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>AARON, 99
 Abbaye aux Hommes, 186
 Abydos, 92
 Acropolis, 180, 182
 Adams, Herbert, 11
 Advent, 175
 Adventism, 61
 "Aesthetic," 25, 29, 33
 Agnus Dei, 253
 Aix-la-Chapelle, 185
 Allen, Alexander V. G., 121
 Allen & Collens, 123, 192, 225
 Alps, 186, 190
 Amaziah, 82, 84
 America, 14, 17, 38, 52, 122, 128, 135, 189, 198
 American, 3, 12, 15, 40, 42, 45, 66, 73, 114, 120, 127, 128, 200, 202
 American Academy of Design, 11
 <i>American Architect</i>, The, 186
 <i>American Journal of Theology</i>, The, 118
 Ammon Ra, 100
 Amos, 58, 82, 84
 Andover Seminary, 192
 Angelo, Michel, 12, 25
 Anglican, 34, 90, 120, 130, 200
 Anglican Church, 38, 109, 214
 Apocalypse, 61
 "Approaches toward Church Unity," 131
 Aquinas, Thomas, 196
 <i>Architectural Record</i>, The, 7, 190, 196
 Arizona, 9
 Arles, 186
 Arlington, Mass., 230, 231</p> | | <p>"Art and Environment," 12, 54, 182
 "Art and Ritual," 18
 "Art of Worship, The," 137
 Assyrian, 19
 Asylum Hill Church, Hartford, 206
 Athens, 13, 180
 Augsburg Confession, 59
 Auvergne, 186</p> |
| <p>BALDWIN, Simeon, 34
 Balfour, Arthur, 27
 Baltimore, Md., 79, 192
 Bangkok, 10
 Baptism, 102
 Baptist, 14, 41, 102, 125
 Baptist Churches, 130, 215
 Baptistery, Florence, 93
 Basilican, 191
 Bellini, 94
 Benedictus, 253
 Bennett, C. A., 30, 117
 Bethel, 57, 82, 84
 Bethlehem, 183
 Bible, 81, 90, 133, 157, 245
 Bohemian, 130
 "Book of Common Prayer," 38, 81, 122, 125, 137, 138
 "Book of Worship of the Church School," 109
 Bosanquet, Bernard, 26
 Boston, Mass., 45, 125, 193, 214, 218, 222, 247
 Bragdon, Claude, 7
 Bramante, 190
 Breton, 97
 <i>Brick Builder</i>, The, 250</p> | | |

Index

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>Brick Presbyterian Church,
 New York, 167
 British, 39
 Brittany, 7
 Brooklyn, N. Y., 195
 Browning, 98
 Brunelleschi, 190
 Bryn Athyn, Pa., 192
 Bucer, 130
 Buddha, 65
 Buddhist, 19, 65
 Bureau of Architecture, 233
 "Burghers of Calais," 97
 Byzantine, 183, 184, 185, 189,
 195
 Byzantium, 13, 184, 196, 199,
 201, 211</p> <p>C AEN, 186
 Calvary Church, Pitts-
 burgh, 192
 Calvinist, 59
 Cambridge, 14
 "Can the Church Survive?" 7
 Canaanitish, 57
 Carthage, 160
 Catholic, 9, 57, 59, 86, 131, 206,
 245
 Central Church, Boston, 214, 218
 Central Church, Providence,
 197, 214
 Central Church, Worcester, 214
 Chaldean, 19
 Chapel of the Intercession,
 New York, 192
 Charlemagne, 7
 Cheshire, Conn., 43
 Chicago, Ill., 195, 227
 Chinese, 19
 Christ, 74, 100, 105, 129, 132,
 244
 Christ Church, New Haven, 192
 Christendom, 116, 118, 130
 Christian, 37, 42, 60, 105, 117,
 127, 153, 198, 217, 224
 "Christian Institutions," 121</p> | <p>Christian Science, 61, 201
 <i>Christian World, The,</i> 120
 Christianity, 35, 39, 69, 114, 127,
 128, 198, 244, 245
 Christmas, 78, 175
 "Christmas in Heaven," 95
 Chrysostom, 62
 "Church at the Cross Roads,
 The," 119
 "Church in the Furnace,
 The," 39
 Church of the Apostles, Sa-
 lonica, 185
 Church of the Chora, Con-
 stantinople, 185
 Church of the Divine Pater-
 nity, New York, 222
 Church of England, 140
 Church of the Holy Apostles,
 Cologne, 186
 Church School, 109, 110, 229,
 233, 234
 Cicero, 160
 Cistercian, 188
 Civil War, 85
 Classic, 9, 40, 106
 "Classical Heritage of the
 Middle Ages, The," 12
 Classicism, 97, 202
 Cleveland, Ohio, 20, 192, 195
 "Cloud," The, 25
 Coe, George Albert, 109
 Coit, Stanton, 54, 166
 Cologne, 186
 Colonial, 45, 191, 195, 199, 201
 "Community Church, The," 128
 Confiteor, 152, 164
 Congregational, 14, 41, 125, 140
 Congregational Churches, 215,
 221, 223
 Congregational Union of
 Great Britain, 119
 <i>Congregationalist, The,</i> 65
 Constantine, 184
 Constantinople, 184
 Coptic, 37
 Corinthians, 56</p> |
|--|--|

Index

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Cram, Ralph Adams, 7, 191, 195,
196, 230, 237</p> <p>Cram & Ferguson, 193, 247</p> <p>Cram, Goodhue & Ferguson,
193, 209, 219, 221</p> <p>Croce, Benedetto, 25, 29, 33, 51</p> <p>Cross, George E., 115</p> <p>Crouch, 223</p> <p>"Crucifixion," 91</p> <p>DAN, 57</p> <p> Dante, 11, 19, 223</p> <p>Davies, J. W. F., 110</p> <p>Day of Atonement, 57, 77</p> <p>Dearmer, Percy, 137, 138</p> <p>Declaration of Independence, 101</p> <p>della Seta, Alessandro, 19</p> <p>Demeter, 97</p> <p>Des Cartes, 180</p> <p>Detroit, Mich., 192</p> <p>Deuteronomy, 58</p> <p>de Wulf, Maurice, 186</p> <p>Dexter, Henry Martyn, 140</p> <p>Dickenson, Clarence, 167</p> <p>Dionysius the Areopagite, 163</p> <p>Doric, 182</p> <p>Doxology, 156, 160, 176, 252</p> <p>"Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde," 24</p> <p>Dürer, Albert, 223</p> <p>Durham Cathedral, 186</p> <p>Dutch, 224</p> <p>"Dying Gaul," 97</p> <p>EASTER, 78, 175</p> <p> Eastern Church, 239</p> <p>Eckel & Boschen, 195</p> <p>Edward VI, 38</p> <p>Egyptian, 19, 92</p> <p>Elijah, 81</p> <p>Elizabeth, Queen, 12, 38</p> <p>Elizabethans, 38, 40</p> <p>Emerson, 28</p> <p>Emmanuel Church, Balti-
more, 79</p> <p>England, 12, 38, 66, 130, 186,
187, 190</p> <p>Englewood, N. J., 221</p> | <p>English, 9, 38, 65, 130</p> <p>Ephraim, 10</p> <p>Episcopal, 14, 39, 125, 130, 154,
192</p> <p>Episcopal Church, 38, 122, 137,
200, 214</p> <p>Erasmus, 190</p> <p>Erectheum, 182</p> <p>Ethical Culture Society, 68</p> <p>Eucharist, 103, 162</p> <p>Euclid Avenue Presbyterian
Church, Cleveland, 192</p> <p>Europe, 9, 188</p> <p>Evanston, Ill., 205</p> <p>FIJIS, 10</p> <p> First Baptist Church,
Pittsburgh, 21, 23, 192,
193</p> <p> First Church, Boston, 214, 218,
221</p> <p> First Church, Cheshire, 43</p> <p> First Congregational Church,
Montclair, 192, 237</p> <p> First Congregational Church,
Riverside, 195</p> <p> First Congregational Church,
St. Louis, 137</p> <p> First Methodist Episcopal
Church, Evanston, 205</p> <p> First Presbyterian Church,
Englewood, 221</p> <p> First Presbyterian Church,
Oakland, 192</p> <p> First Presbyterian Church,
St. Joseph, 195</p> <p>Fitch, Rev. Albert Parker, 7</p> <p>Flanders, 12</p> <p>Flemish, 20</p> <p>Florence, 12, 93, 190, 195</p> <p>Florentine, 11</p> <p>"Folkways," 108</p> <p>Fortesque, Adrian, 37</p> <p>Fourth Presbyterian Church,
Chicago, 227</p> <p>Fra Lippo Lippi, 98</p> <p>France, 12, 185, 186, 187, 190</p> |
|---|--|

Index

- "Freedom of the Faith, The," 66
 Freemantle, Archdeacon, 27
 French, 9, 130
 Frothingham, 189

GALLICAN, 37
 Galton, 108
 Garrett Biblical Institute, 14
 Gelasian, 37
 General Confession, 153
 Georgian, 37, 199
 Germany, 186, 190
 "Gleaner," The, 97
 "Gleaners," 97
 Gloria in Excelsis, 164, 253
 Gloria Patri, 156, 160, 252
 God, 24, 27, 70, 74, 87, 99, 100,
 101, 102, 103, 117, 129, 144,
 146, 148, 149, 150, 157, 177,
 235, 236, 239
 "Gold, Frankincense and
 Myrrh," 7
 "Golden Calf," 100
 Goodhue, Bertram Grosvenor,
 21, 191, 230, 237
 Gothic, 9, 19, 37, 45, 186, 187,
 188, 191, 192, 196, 197, 199,
 200, 201, 211
 Grand Rapids, Mich., 191
 Graeco-Roman, 196
 Greece, 12, 180, 185, 189, 201
 Greek, 19, 24, 182, 183, 185,
 188, 191, 197, 198, 244
 Greek Church, 34
 Greek Rite, 120
 Greeks, 9, 93, 180, 182
 Gregorian, 37
 Groton School, 192

HADLEY, Arthur T., 84
 Hall of Fame, 240
 Hamlin, A. D. F., 189, 190, 196
 "Hand of God," The, 51
 "Handbook of Congregation-
 alism," 140
 Harrison, Jane, 18, 30, 77, 103
 Hartford, Conn., 206

 Hartshorne, Hugh, 109
 Hastings, Thomas, 190, 196, 197
 Hebrew, 57, 64, 76, 127, 244
 Heidelberg Catechism, 59, 94
 Hellenic, 182, 184
 Henderson, Charles R., 7
 "Hermes," 93
 "History of Architecture, A," 189
 Hocking, William E., 11, 29, 104
 Holmes, John Haynes, 128
 Holyoke, Mass., 123, 192
 Hopis, 9
 Hosea, 58
 Hospital of the Innocents, 190
 Hotel des Invalides, 190
 House of Hope Presbyterian
 Church, St. Paul, 192, 209, 222
 "Human Nature and Its Re-
 making," 11, 29
 Humanists, 190
 Huss, John, 84

IFFLEY Church, 186
*International Journal of
 Ethics, The,* 30, 117
International Studio, The, 28
 Introit, 5, 37, 155, 157, 166, 252
 Irving, Sir Henry, 145
 Isaiah, 5, 58, 145, 148
 Ile de France, 13
 Israel, 77
 Italian, 12, 19, 93
 Italians, 190
 Italy, 9, 189

JACKSON, 128
 Jacobean, 190
 Jacobite, 37
 Japan, 16
 Japanese, 64
 Jehovah, 57
 Jeremiah, 84, 127
 Jeroboam, 57, 82
 Jerusalem, 57, 84
 Jesus, 60, 64, 83, 99, 127, 129
 133, 245
 Jewish, 57, 133, 244

Index

Jews, 126
 Jones, Inigo, 190
 Judea, 13
 Jumieges, 186
 Justinian, 184

KINGDOM of God, 35
 King's Weigh House
 Chapel, London, 118, 122,
 137
 Kioto, 10
 Kirchmayer, I., 79, 95
 Knapp, Rev. Shepherd, 218
 Kyrie Eleison, 153, 155

“**L**AST and First,” 93
 Latin, 12, 37, 39
 Lenten, 78
 Leonine, 37
 Lloyd, Alfred H., 7
 Lombard, 195
 Lombardy, 186
 London, 20, 190, 195
 Lord's Prayer, 156
 Lorenzo de' Medici, 12
 Lowell Institute, 186
 Lowrie, Walter, 185, 222
 Ludlow, William Orr, 198, 236
 Luther, 58, 83, 127
 Lutheran, 40, 45, 125, 214

MACBETH, 51, 147
 Macedonia, 182
 Maclaren, Ian, 119
 Mainz, 186
 Mansart, 45
 “Manual for Training in
 Worship,” 109
 Mars, 86
 Mass, The, 37, 41, 58, 70, 120,
 155, 162
 Massachusetts, 11
 McAfee, Joseph E., 129
 McClure, Sir John, 119, 120
 “Meaning of Architecture,
 The,” 10, 12, 13, 30, 198

Medinet Habu, 77
 Mens Creatrix, 27
 Messianism, 74
 Methodist, 14, 78, 125
 Methodist Episcopal Church,
 125, 215, 233
 Mexican, 19
 Micah, 58
 Michel Angelo, 12, 25
 Middle Ages, 7
 Milan, 185
 Military Chapel, West Point,
 192
 Millet, 97
 Milner-White, Rev. E., 39
 Milton, 19
 Missionary Education Move-
 ment, 46
 “Modern Architecture,” 190, 197
 Mohammedanism, 108
 Montclair, N. J., 192, 237
 “Monuments of the Early
 Church,” 185, 222
 Moody, Rev. Dwight L., 62
 Moore, Rev. Edward C., 197
 Moorish, 12
 Mosaic, 60
 Mozarabic, 37
 Munger, Rev. Theodore T., 65
 Mycenaean, 19
 “Mystic Way, The,” 158, 162,
 163, 164

NEW England, 65, 134, 195
 New Haven, Conn., 78, 91,
 192
 New Testament, 84
 Newton, Mass., 125, 223, 225
 New York, N. Y., 14, 23, 192,
 219, 222, 230, 240
 Nicene Creed, 94
 Nike Apteros, 182
 Nippon, 13
 Norman, 186, 187
 North Church, New Haven, 191
 Norwegian, 130
 Nunc Dimittis, 253

Index

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>OAKLAND, Cal., 192</p> <p>Oath of the Tennis Court, 101</p> <p>Oberammergau, 10</p> <p>Old Testament, 75, 84</p> <p>Olympia, 93</p> <p>Omar Khayyam, 61</p> <p>Orate Fratres, 253</p> <p>Orchard, Rev. W. E., 118, 122, 136, 138</p> <p>"Order for Divine Service, The," 136, 137</p> <p>Ordinary, 120</p> <p><i>Outlook</i>, The, 53</p> <p>"Outlook for Religion, The," 118</p> <p>Oxford, 10</p>
<p>PALADIO, 190</p> <p>Palm Sunday, 64, 178</p> <p>Panathenaic, 77</p> <p>Pantheon, 181</p> <p>Paris, 190</p> <p>Park, Rev. Charles E., 218</p> <p>Park Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, 221</p> <p>Park Street Church, Boston, 191</p> <p>Parthenon, 9, 240</p> <p>Passover, 100</p> <p>Patmore, Coventry, 182, 188</p> <p>Patton, Rev. Cornelius H., 65</p> <p>Paul, 149, 180</p> <p>Pericles, 11, 182</p> <p>Perigneux, 185</p> <p>Persons, Rev. Frederick T., 199</p> <p>Peruvian, 19</p> <p>Pharasaic, 59</p> <p>Phidian, 182</p> <p>Phillipps, Lisle March, 12, 24, 182, 189</p> <p>Phillips, Wendell, 83</p> <p>Pisa, 93</p> <p>Pisano, Nicola, 93</p> <p>Piti Palace, 190</p> <p>Pittsburgh, Pa., 21, 23, 192, 193</p> <p>Plato, 180</p> <p>Plotinus, 149, 180</p> <p>Poitou, 186</p> | <p>Pond, Allen Bartlett, 250</p> <p>Pond, Irving K., 10, 12, 13, 30, 182, 197</p> <p>Porter, Mrs. Frank E., 78</p> <p>Portland, Me., 126</p> <p>Praxiteles, 93</p> <p>Prayer Book, 9, 39, 42, 120, 130, 137</p> <p>"Prayers, Ancient and Modern," 81</p> <p>Presbyterian, 41, 125</p> <p>"Presbyterian Book of Worship," 137</p> <p>Presbyterian Church, 215</p> <p>"Principle in Art," 188</p> <p>Propylaea, 182</p> <p>Protestant, 3, 14, 34, 38, 41, 45, 71, 103, 117, 119, 130, 131, 197, 206, 223, 236</p> <p>Protestant Episcopal Church, 38, 122</p> <p>Protestantism, 3, 4, 5, 36, 40, 54, 62, 67, 75, 86, 107, 114, 126, 132, 197</p> <p>Providence, R. I., 197, 214</p> <p>Psalms, 53, 58, 136, 153</p> <p>Puritan, 40, 64, 134, 202</p> <p>Puritans, 40, 223</p> <p>"Puritanism in Art," 223</p> <p>Puvis de Chavannes, 97</p>
<p>QUAKERS, 69</p>
<p>RAVENNA, 183, 185</p> <p>Reformation, 1, 3, 36, 59, 62, 121, 126, 135, 190, 197, 241, 243, 245</p> <p>Reformed, 41, 45, 125, 130</p> <p>Reformed Church, 130, 137, 214, 223</p> <p>Reformed Episcopal Church, 140</p> <p>"Religion and Art," 19</p> <p>Renaissance, 9, 20, 93, 189, 190, 191, 195, 196, 197, 199, 201</p> <p>"Revolutionary Function of the Church, The," 128</p> |
|--|---|

Index

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Rheims, 11</p> <p>Richardson, 45</p> <p>Ritter, Waldemar H., 79</p> <p>Riverside, Cal., 195</p> <p>Rochester Seminary, 117</p> <p>Rodin, 51</p> <p>Roman, 182, 183, 184, 186, 189, 190, 191, 195, 244</p> <p>Romanist, 37, 101</p> <p>Romans, 184</p> <p>Roman Catholic, 37, 120, 122, 126, 129</p> <p>Roman Catholic Church, 34, 37, 38, 130, 195, 197, 214</p> <p>Roman Empire, 7, 184</p> <p>Romanesque, 185, 186, 191, 195, 196, 197, 199, 201</p> <p>Romantic, 106, 182</p> <p>Romanticism, 97, 202</p> <p>Rome, 38, 183, 189, 212</p> <p>Royden, Maude, 140</p> <p>Russell, Bertrand, 92</p>
<p>SACRAMENTALISM, 97</p> <p>St. Agnes's, Cleveland, 20, 195</p> <p>St. Ambrose, Milan, 185</p> <p>St. Anne's Chapel, Arlington, 231</p> <p>St. Augustine, 146, 149</p> <p>St. Bartholomew's, New York, 230</p> <p>St. Bernard, 149</p> <p>St. Bride's, London, 191</p> <p>St. Catherine's, Somerville, 195</p> <p>St. Clement's, Chicago, 195</p> <p>St. Front, Perigueux, 185</p> <p>St. Gregory's, Brooklyn, 195</p> <p>St. Irene, Constantinople, 185</p> <p>St. James, 37</p> <p>St. John the Divine, New York, 240</p> <p>St. Joseph, Mo., 195</p> <p>St. Mark, 37</p> <p>St. Mark's, Venice, 185</p> <p>St. Mary le Bow, London, 191</p> | <p>St. Mary's of the Lake, Chicago, 195</p> <p>St. Paul, Minn., 192, 209, 222</p> <p>St. Paul's, London, 190</p> <p>St. Paul's Without the Walls, Rome, 183</p> <p>"St. Peter," 95</p> <p>St. Peter's, Rome, 190, 212</p> <p>St. Sulpice, Paris, 190</p> <p>St. Theresa, 149</p> <p>St. Thomas's, New York, 23, 192, 240</p> <p>St. Trophime, Arles, 186</p> <p>Sakkara, Egypt, 92</p> <p>Salem, Mass., 11</p> <p>Salonica, 185</p> <p>San Apollinare in Classe, Ravenna, 183</p> <p>San Apollinare Nuovo, Ravenna, 183</p> <p>San Clemente, Rome, 183</p> <p>San Lorenzo, Florence, 25, 190, 195</p> <p>San Pietro, Toscanella, 185</p> <p>San Spirito, Florence, 190</p> <p>San Vitale, Ravenna, 185, 211</p> <p>Sanctus, 253</p> <p>Santa Barbara, 9</p> <p>Santa Maria Maggiore, Rome, 183</p> <p>Santa Sophia, Constantinople, 99, 184</p> <p>Saracenic, 9</p> <p>Sarum, 37</p> <p>Savonarola, 62</p> <p>Scopas, 97</p> <p>Second Church, Boston, 125, 137, 193, 195, 221, 247</p> <p>Second Church, Newton, 125, 192, 223, 225</p> <p>Seti, 92</p> <p>Shakespeare, 9, 20</p> <p>Shakespeare, Rev. J. H., 119</p> <p>Shelley, 25</p> <p>Shintoist, 65</p> <p>Siam, 16</p> <p>Sistine Madonna, 227</p> |
|---|--|

Index

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------|
| Skinner Memorial Chapel, | |
| Holyoke, | 123, 192 |
| Smyth, Rev. Newman, | 130, 131 |
| "Social Theory of Education," | 109 |
| "Social Worship," | 55, 166 |
| Society of Friends, | 69 |
| Socrates, | 84 |
| Solomon, | 57 |
| Somerville, Mass., | 195 |
| South Reformed Church, | |
| New York, | 192, 219, 221 |
| Southwark Cathedral, | 39 |
| Sowerby, Leo, | 168 |
| Spain, | 12 |
| Spanish, | 20, 195, 199 |
| Sperry, Rev. Willard E., | 218 |
| Speyer, | 186, 218 |
| "Spoon River Anthology," | 97 |
| "Star-Spangled Banner, The," | 98 |
| Stoicism, | 191 |
| Stone, Arthur J., | 141 |
| Strassburgh, | 130 |
| Sturgis & Frothingham, | 189 |
| Sumner, William Graham, | 108 |
| Sunday School, | 107 |
| "Supper at Emmaus," | 79 |
| Sursum Corda, | 253 |
| Swedenborgian, | 192 |
| Swiss, | 130 |
| Symbolism, | 97 |
| Symonds, J. A., | 93, 189 |
| Syria, | 183, 185 |
|
 | |
| T ANNHÄUSER, | 24 |
| Tauler, | 149 |
| Taylor, Henry Osborne, | 12, 182 |
| Te Deum, | 253 |
| Temple, William, | 26 |
| Thanksgiving, | 175 |
| Thirty-nine Articles, | 59 |
| Thomae, Charles, | 95 |
| "Three Lectures on Aesthetic," | 26 |
| Tileston, Mary, | 81 |
|
 | |
| Torcello, | 185 |
| Toscanello, | 185 |
| Trier, | 186 |
| Troccoli, G., | 141 |
| Turner, | 24 |
| Tuscan, | 195 |
| Tuscany, | 186 |
| Trinity Church, Boston, | 45 |
|
 | |
| U NDERHILL, Evelyn, | |
| 156, 162, 163, 164 | |
| Union Church, Winnetka, | 125 |
| Union Seminary, | 14, 192 |
| Unitarian Church, | 215 |
| Unitarian Hymnal, | 137 |
| United States, | 38, 41 |
| Universalist Church, | 215 |
| University of Chicago, | 14, 114 |
| Upjohn, | 214 |
| Uzziah, | 148, 149 |
|
 | |
| V ALENTINIAN, | 183 |
| Vaughn, Henry, | 192 |
| Venice, | 185 |
| Versailles, | 11, 190 |
| Virgil, | 12 |
| Virgin, | 59, 227 |
|
 | |
| W ALKER, Williston, | 131 |
| Washington, D. C., | 192 |
| Wellington Avenue Church, | |
| Chicago, | 168 |
| Wesley, John, | 59, 60 |
| Wesleyan, | 40 |
| Western Church, | 241 |
| Western Reserve University, | 192 |
| Westminster Cathedral, London, | 195 |
| Westminster Confession, | 59 |
| West Newton, Mass., | 192 |
| West Point, N. Y., | 192 |
| Whitfield, | 62 |
| Whitsuntide, | 175 |
| Williams College Chapel, | 192 |

Index

Winnetka, Ill.,	110, 125	Y ALE University,	14
Woodward, Rev. C.	Salisbury,	Yewdale, Merton Stark,	28
Worcester, Mass.,	214, 218	Z WINGLI, Ulrich,	58, 190
Wren, Christopher,	190		

Date Due

DEC 8 '48			
MAY 11 '55	JUL 08 2004		
MAY 23 '55			
JUN 23 '55			
FEB 21 '59			
JAN 23 '60			
JUN 10 '61			
DEC 7 '69			
NOV 1 '71			
NOV 10 '72			
DEC 21 '73			
NOV 21 '74			

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137



BV 150 .V6 1921

Vogt, Von Ogden, 1879-1964.

Art & religion

