

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF
CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY

✓
CHRIST AND THE CHURCH

ESSAYS CONCERNING THE CHURCH AND
THE UNIFICATION OF CHRISTENDOM

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY THE
REV. AMORY H. BRADFORD, D. D.



FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY
NEW YORK CHICAGO TORONTO
Publishers of Evangelical Literature

Copyright, 1895,
by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY.

TO THE MEMORY OF

CHARLES F. DEEMS, D.D., LL.D.,

PASTOR OF THE CHURCH OF THE STRANGERS, NEW YORK;
FIRST PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CHRISTIAN
PHILOSOPHY; A MAN WHO ILLUSTRATED IN HIS OWN
PERSON AND MINISTRY THE UNITY OF THE
CHURCH OF CHRIST,

THIS VOLUME IS LOVINGLY DEDICATED.

INTRODUCTION

THE papers composing this volume were delivered as lectures before the American Institute of Christian Philosophy, at Chautauqua, July 5-12, 1894. The subjects were selected because of the great and growing interest in the unification of Christendom both in this country and in England. In many ways this interest had found expression. The Disciples of Christ had issued a series of articles which they proposed as the sufficient basis of a universal church. They were: "The Primitive Faith," "The Primitive Sacraments," "The Primitive Life." Somewhat later the Chicago-Lambeth Articles appeared. They constitute what is called "A Quadrilateral," and propose, briefly, union on the basis of the Holy Scriptures, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the Historic Episcopate. In Great Britain the last of these propositions blocks the way to their serious consideration; in this country, however, there is a greater willingness to begin the consideration of the subject with the Chicago-Lambeth Declaration. In April, 1894, the Congregational Association of New Jersey adopted a minute concerning the subject which has attracted wide attention. This has also been adopted by many other State Associations, and will come before the National Council of Congregational Churches in 1895. The New Jersey prop-

ositions are as follows: (1) The Holy Scriptures . . . the rule and ultimate standard of Christian Faith; (2) Jesus Christ the divine Saviour and Teacher of the world; (3) The Church of Christ ordained by him to preach his Gospel; (4) Liberty of Conscience in interpreting the Scriptures and administering the Church.

The doctrine of the church, which has heretofore been regarded as of secondary importance, as the result of recent interest in this subject has come to occupy a far larger place in the thinking of American ministers and laymen. Probably no single utterance has done so much to stimulate interest in the subject as the remarkable address on "The Historic Episcopate," by the Rev. Charles A. Shields, D.D., professor in Princeton University. The publication of this address was followed by a symposium in the American edition of the *Review of the Churches*, to which many eminent ministers of various denominations contributed, and which is perhaps as valuable a collection of utterances on this subject as has yet appeared. It was issued in book form by the Christian Literature Company under the title of "Many Voices Concerning the Historic Episcopate." About the same time another symposium appeared in the *Independent*, to which most of the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States contributed, and in which most of them practically took the ground that the question of unification otherwise than on the basis of the Historic Episcopate and Apostolic Succession is not even to be entertained.

During this discussion, and while the subject of the unification of Christendom was in the air, the course of lectures in this volume was delivered. From the reception first accorded them, as well as from the importance and timeliness of the subjects considered, it is believed that they will be recognized as an important contribution to this discus-

sion. The first lecture is somewhat introductory, and is on the general theme, "The Church and the Kingdom." Those which follow are divided into three groups: first, "The Incarnation;" second, "The Church," or the "Continu. l Incarnation;" and third, "The Unification of Christendom." There has been no attempt to make these chapters appear other than a series of lectures. They were prepared without consultation between the writers, and are published substantially as originally delivered. That they may contribute at least a little toward bringing together in one holy fellowship all who are truly Christians, but many of whom are now widely separated, and thus help to hasten the coming of that kingdom of truth and love which the church exists to promote, is the earnest prayer of those to whom was committed the responsibility of planning this course of lectures, and by whom it is now offered to the public.

It remains for me to add that these lectures were delivered during my term of service as President of the American Institute of Christian Philosophy. Since that time I have been compelled by other duties to resign that office, and the Rev. Henry M. MacCracken, D.D., LL.D., Chancellor of the University of the City of New York, has succeeded to the presidency.

AMORY H. BRADFORD.

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,
MONTCLAIR, N. J.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION. <i>Rev. Amory H. Bradford, D.D.</i>	5
LECTURE	
I. THE KINGDOM AND THE CHURCH. <i>Rev. Amory H. Bradford, D.D., Pastor of the First Congregational Church of Montclair, N. J.</i>	11
II. THE INCARNATION PHILOSOPHICALLY CONSIDERED; OR, AVAILABLE LIVING EVIDENCE, AS DISTINGUISHED FROM THE EVIDENCE OF THE GOSPELS OR THE EVIDENCE OF FAITH, FOR THE HISTORIC AND DIVINE CHRIST. <i>Rev. Lewis Lampman, D.D., Pastor of the High Street Presbyterian Church of Newark, N. J.</i>	33
III. THE INCARNATION BIBLICALLY CONSIDERED. <i>Rev. George T. Purves, D.D., Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary</i>	51
IV. THE INCARNATION HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED. <i>Rev. Chester D. Hartranft, D.D., President of Hartford Theological Seminary</i>	87
V. THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH. <i>Rev. George Dana Boardman, D.D., LL.D., Honorary Pastor of the First Baptist Church of Philadelphia</i>	135
VI. THE CHURCH AND THE PROBLEMS OF SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY. <i>Rev. Henry M. MacCracken, D.D., Chancellor of the University of the City of New York.</i>	165

LECTURE	PAGE
VII. THE CHURCH AND THE CITY PROBLEM. <i>Rev. John B. Devins, Pastor of Hope Chapel, New York, and President of the Federation of East Side Workers.</i>	187
VIII. THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM AS IT APPEARS TO AN EPISCOPALIAN. <i>Rev. George Hodges, D.D., Dean of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.</i>	217
IX. THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM AS IT APPEARS TO A CONGREGATIONALIST. <i>Rev. William G. Ballantine, D.D., President of Oberlin College</i>	233
X. THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM AS IT APPEARS TO A PRESBYTERIAN. <i>Rev. Henry M. Booth, D.D., President of Auburn Theological Seminary</i>	249
XI. THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM AS IT APPEARS TO A DISCIPLE. <i>Rev. Benjamin B. Tyler, D.D., Pastor of the Church of the Disciples of Christ, of New York.</i>	267
XII. THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM AS IT APPEARS TO A FOREIGN MISSIONARY. <i>Rev. Gilbert Reid, Missionary to the Higher Classes of China</i>	295

I

THE KINGDOM AND THE CHURCH

AMORY H. BRADFORD, D.D.,

First Congregational Church, Montclair, N. J.

I

THE KINGDOM AND THE CHURCH

THE most striking characteristic of the religious life of our time is what, in the felicitous phrase of Principal Fairbairn, has been called "the return to Christ." There is no more general agreement concerning the mystery of his gracious person than formerly; indeed, few thinkers are now trying to give definite answer to the old inquiry as to the divinity of our Lord. The importance of the subject is not denied, but men are occupied with other, and to them more vital, themes. The era of controversy over that subject has passed. Now and then its echoes are repeated, but they are fast dying away. But while most thinkers are not speculating much about the mystery of Christ's person, they are, with a unanimity hitherto unknown, acknowledging the spell of his teaching, and gathering around him as the only one who offers any light worth having on the fundamental questions of man's origin, duty, and destiny. Never before was Jesus so truly the great Teacher—all men's Teacher, the world's Teacher. In the department of theology the attempt to interpret the Godhead in the terms of "the consciousness of Christ" is rapidly becoming universal. In other words, "the consciousness of Christ" is recognized as the only place where the Godhead is clearly revealed. If we turn to man's relations with his brethren, we find that almost all the social ferment of the closing years of the nineteenth century may be traced directly to

the influence of Jesus. In his recent book on "Social Evolution," Mr. Benjamin Kidd has shown that the growth of the altruistic sentiment which is swiftly transforming society owes its existence to religion, and its supreme power to Jesus Christ. Mr. Kidd represents the culture of the time. There is another aspect of the same fact: the common people in many lands may be in rebellion against the church as they know it, but they feel that all their hopes someway are bound up with that Man of Nazareth, whose person they do not understand, but whom their social instincts proclaim to be their true leader. English "dockers" and German Social Democrats alike recognize Jesus as Master. This is one of the most striking features of modern religious progress. Thus many eyes turn toward the Christ as the one from whom a solution of our social problems may be expected.

Among the questions which are vexing modern thinkers, few occupy a more conspicuous place, or are more vital and far-reaching, than that which may be called the Relation of the Kingdom of God to the Church. In other days the appeal was to councils, assemblies, conventions, to the fathers; but most thinking men are now asking, Why not go straight to Christ? What did he mean by the church and the kingdom? And so it has come to pass that not only creeds, confessions, social ideals, laws and customs, methods of work, and rules governing men in their relations one with another, but also all ecclesiastical systems, all assumptions of authority, all ministers, popes, bishops, priests, and ecclesiastics of every name, are being commanded to render an account to the Master himself.

What is the Christian interpretation of the phrases "kingdom of God" and "kingdom of heaven," and what relation have they to the "reunion of Christendom"? In our discussions concerning the organic unity of the church, or the

reunion of Christendom, or the unification of Christendom, we have reached a point where definitions are of the utmost importance, and where great misunderstanding may result without them. There can be no clear idea of unification without also a clear idea of what is to be unified. Do we mean the bringing into unity of individual Christians, or do we mean that the various branches of the Christian church are to be incorporated into one organization, so that they may work under a common head toward a common end? We mean the organic unity of the church, so that instead of a divided church, composed of Romanists, Greeks, Protestants; instead of a hundred sects among both Romanists and Protestants, there shall be unity and coöperation. But why should there be such unity? Is it possible, and is it desirable? These questions cannot be answered without a definite understanding of what the church is. Is it an end in itself, or is it a means or instrument for the accomplishment of an end? If it is an end it has in it the elements of universality and endurance; if it is a means it will be constantly changing, adapting itself to new conditions, and manifesting itself under perhaps a thousand different forms. When we ask what the church is, and whether it is synonymous with the kingdom of God, we are surprised by the frequent answer that the church and the kingdom are the same. That answer is possible only when there is a very exalted definition of the church. Are we ready to say that our distracted and warring Christendom, with its popes and prelates, its pageantry and display, with its offices, its bishops with great titles and munificent endowments, its splendid cathedrals and magnificent sanctuaries, constitutes the real kingdom of God on the earth, when our Master said, "Who-soever would be first among you shall be servant of all" (Mark x. 44), and when he asked that terribly searching question, "How can ye believe, which receive honor one of

another?" Is there not a radical antagonism between the prevalent ideals of the church and the ideals of the kingdom as they are set forth in the New Testament? Are we ready to acknowledge that societies of the rich and well-to-do, in which pews are sold to the highest bidder, in which social distinctions and forms of etiquette are carefully observed, in which there is no place for the poor man with soiled raiment or black skin, but ample place for the rich man with the soiled character and gold ring, truly represent the kingdom of God? Are we ready to say that those who bear the title of "Lord Bishop," move about in splendid state, and dwell in ceiled houses, are the real successors of those apostles who followed closely after Him who had not where to lay his head, and who found his life by losing it? Are we ready to say that our systems of theology, our creeds carefully formulated and welded into propositions which require philosophers to understand, our preaching—modeled as it is after the rhetorical schools of Greece and Rome, rather than after the brave directness of the Hebrew prophets, and often more in the form of heathen orations than of personal appeals to dying men—that these truly represent Him whose greatest utterance, perhaps, was, "I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly?" (John x. 10.) No, not any denomination, not any form of the church as it now exists, and not all forms combined constitute the kingdom of God. The unity which we desire is something different from the agglomeration of such antagonistic elements. In the ideal church—that which exists within all the denominations, and yet is independent of all—there are the signs of the kingdom, but they are few in our so-called churches, which are all equally sects, however little some may like to acknowledge it. The community of elect souls who have the life of the Lord Jesus Christ form the ideal church, and they constitute the kingdom of God. Well,

then, what is it that we are seeking to realize: the unity of elect spirits who are in Christ, and who day by day are showing forth his life, or the unity of those organizations which often misrepresent him? Are we appealing for the unity of Christians, or are we appealing for the unity of societies which only by courtesy can be said to continue the incarnation of Jesus Christ? We all believe in the real church—the church of the elect, the church of the Good Samaritan, of the Golden Rule, of the law of love, the church of Galilee and Calvary—and there can be no question whatever but what there is already more than a formal unity in that. But many Christians are not willing to identify that with the sects which are known by various names, and which most who advocate unification really have in mind. Is the unity of the church, as it is, possible? Is there any basis on which Roman and Greek, Protestant, Anglican, Quaker, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregationalist, can all be brought into one great army, under the command of one who shall truly represent the Master on the earth? We confess that as things now are we do not think such unity is possible or desirable; and yet we do most firmly believe in the Holy Catholic Church, and pray for its prosperity; but we want something other than the welding together of sects. There must first be a return to Christ. The company of the elect must be enlarged until the ideal church and the actual church are identical; then there will be little need of efforts toward unity, because it will already be realized. The divisions—*note I do not say diversity*—are all external. They are in most cases the result of disloyalty to Christ rather than of loyalty to him. They are the remnants of barbarism in the society that bears the name of Christ; they are the results of the paganism which conquered the church when it was supposed to have conquered Rome. These facts will be clearer when we

have studied the biblical teaching concerning the kingdom of God.

It is noticeable that our Master seldom used the term "church"—twice only, in his reported words—but "kingdom," with substantially the same significance, was often on his lips. It is used in the Gospels one hundred and twelve times to denote his society. Plainly with him the idea in the word "kingdom" was more important than that in the word "church," for we cannot think he ever used language carelessly. If he chose "kingdom" rather than "church" it was because of a preference. The two cannot be identical, or he would have identified them. At the beginning of our study of the kingdom we are met by the text, "Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand."* Here is a reference to something which was familiar to his hearers. Where did that ideal come from? It was foreshadowed in the kingdom of God in Israel. There we have what has been called the national type of the kingdom of God—"the kingdom of Jehovah, including all Israel and many other nations, centered in Jerusalem, and ruled by a King of the house of David, who is Jehovah's Anointed, or the Lord's Christ."†

In the earliest time the ideal of the kingdom as held by the Hebrews was that of a *nation* directly responsible to Jehovah, who was their tribal Deity, and who, it was believed, sooner or later would conquer all the gods of the surrounding people. The prophetic ideal is an advance upon the ancient Davidic ideal. According to the latter, Jehovah ruled for the sake of his own people, while through all the prophets there runs the greater note that Jehovah would in and through his people realize his "royal rule"

* Mark i. 14, 15.

† "The Kingdom of God," F. Herbert Stead, p. 20.

on the earth. The kingdom when realized, according to the prophetic teaching, would have the following features: "Peace: war unknown; the wealth once wasted in war now used to increase wealth. Plenty: starvation and poverty abolished; exceeding fruitfulness of soil; abundance of corn and wine and oil and flocks and herds and of all rural growths. To these were added later: Great material magnificence: a profusion of the most highly prized products of civilization. Health: long life; life beyond death; annihilation of death. Populousness: extraordinary multiplication of life; countless hosts of human beings. Liberty: intelligence. Eternal security and stability. Righteousness universal: public justice, private rectitude, faithfulness. Kindness, gentleness, helpfulness. Joy exultant, musical, festal. Worship of God, public, regular, universal, led by an unceasing line of priests. Knowledge of God: loving personal intimacy between him and every soul in his kingdom. Glory: an overspreading, pervading splendor; a brilliance above that of sun or moon; an irradiation of the divine life and glory. God everywhere glorified."*

Gradually the teaching concerning the kingdom in the Old Testament expanded. From being the rare possession of a few select spirits it became the heritage of the multitude. Amos emphasized its universality and eternity. Its transcendent character, its accomplishment by means of a sudden interposition from above, through a single, supernaturally endowed, superhuman preëxistent Man, becomes very clear after the apocalypse of Daniel. It has permanent and temporary elements. All the sacerdotalism and the legalism, all the priestly codes and the sacrificial systems, were temporary. Its universal elements were its teaching concerning righteousness and the divine law. All that was thus predicted by the prophets, the Master an-

* "The Kingdom of God," F. Herbert Stead, pp. 51, 52.

nounced had come. In order to understand, however, what is implied in that we must remember that formerly the "kingdom" embraced the whole life of man in the family and in the state. The ideal then was vastly larger than is possible in an age when the church and the state are separated. In our Lord's time the early Davidic ideal had given place to that of later prophecy, in which both the state and the church as human institutions were subordinated to the rule of righteousness in the life of all the people, under the sovereignty of Jehovah, who was no longer a tribal Deity, but who was making ready to bring all men under his sway. When we turn from the Old Testament to the New we note that the Master came to fulfil, not to destroy. The Davidic ideal had been merged in the prophetic, and what the prophets predicted he came to establish.

Let us now observe a few *characteristics* of this kingdom as taught by our Lord. It has a vital relation with the Creator. From him it receives its life. The King is the Father. It is a royal household. When our Master prayed, "Thy kingdom come," he began his prayer with, "Our Father." The kingdom, then, is the household of the Father of the universe, who cares for his children as he clothes the grass and feeds the raven; who knows their wants, who hears their prayers.

The teaching of Christ concerning the *subjects* of the kingdom is also clear. In the first place, the word "kingdom" means literally "the royal rule of God," and it is sometimes used "of the eternal sovereignty of God, his government throughout all time of every part of his creation; but chiefly, both in the Old and New Testaments, in a narrower and richer sense. The preparation in Israel has shown us that the kingdom of God is not merely a divine reign or government or order or spiritual condition, but also

the royal rule of God realized, at least to some extent, in the responsive attitude of subjects; a commonwealth, therefore, or society or fellowship of souls. As such it contains citizens or subjects, who have a certain status or character, and stand in certain relations to God, to one another, and to the Christ.* In the teaching of the Master, what are the conditions of entrance into this kingdom? They all refer to character. "Repent and believe"; "Exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees"; "Do the will of God"; "Become as a little child"; "Receive the kingdom"; "Deny thyself"; "Follow Christ"; "Lose your own life." He then says that the kingdom is already possessed by those who are childlike; by those who have been persecuted for righteousness' sake; that it is meant to include all nations; that whosoever shall do the will of God is of Christ's kindred. All these are significantly spiritual conditions. Whenever he refers to the expansion of the kingdom it is always along vital lines. It is to grow, but not with observation. It is mysterious. It is like the leaven, pervasive and assimilative. Its sacraments are the simplest possible—the application of pure water and the use of the common meal. It is the life of God in heaven realized among men on earth. It excludes the wicked; it receives the righteous. It is made up of those who do the will of God. It is the central theme of Christ's teaching. It is a fellowship of souls, divine and human, the human realizing that they are to follow Christ and have but one law, and that, love. The kingdom has two characteristics—fatherhood and brotherhood. It is the community of those who acknowledge Jesus to be the Christ, and who seek to do his will. It dwells not in temples made with hands. It cannot be articulated in creeds.

* "The Kingdom of God," Stead, p. 20.

The kingdom must embrace all life—it is the fellowship of all men in the love of God and of one another. Those who are righteous cannot be righteous in one sphere alone. The scribes and Pharisees were formalists in religion, but Christ's righteousness exceeds theirs.

I do not at this time enter into a consideration of the relation of our Master and his work to the kingdom. I am trying to bring out the nature of the kingdom. The Davidic ideal was of a state, narrow and exclusive. The prophetic teaching pointed toward a universal sway in which righteousness would prevail. The teaching of Christ goes still farther, and shows a community of righteous spirits recognizing fatherhood and brotherhood, living the life of love—a community which is to grow by contact, as all life grows; something which is independent of forms and ceremonies and states; something which is itself the divine life, and which creates all the means which it will use for its own advancement. "Such was the contribution of Jesus toward the shaping of the future character of his church. He provided for it no ecclesiastical constitution, issued no authoritative instructions concerning forms of church government, clerical offices and orders, or even worship. These he left to be determined by the self-organizing life of the society. He concerned himself with the spirit, believing that if that was right all would be right. He taught the apostles humility, brotherly equality, charity, patience, concord, and for the rest left them to their discretion. Neither of the three forms which ecclesiastical organization has assumed is either justified or condemned by his instructions. Prelacy is possible under Presbytery, humility is compatible with Episcopal dignity, and catholicity is not irreconcilable with Congregationalism."*

When we come to the teaching of the apostles concern-

* "The Kingdom of God," Bruce, p. 270.

ing the kingdom, we find that they put more emphasis upon the church. "The word 'church' occurs in the Acts and the Epistles, including the Apocalypse, exactly the same number of times as 'kingdom' in the Gospels—one hundred and twelve; while 'kingdom' appears in only twenty-nine cases."* That is probably because they were men, and it is always easier to emphasize the institution than that which the institution represents. But there is never any contradiction of the teachings of the Master, and with the apostles "kingdom" is always the larger and more inclusive word. In the Acts and the Epistles the church is always the local society of believers to whom the apostles are writing or of whom they are speaking. There is no evidence of any interrelation between those widely scattered Christian communities. They were companies of those who had common interests, and who were seeking to know the truth as it was in Jesus. The other idea which we find in the Epistles is of a future kingdom which shall appear at the second advent of the Christ. "The idea of the kingdom as a thing already existing on earth is not wholly absent, but is only seldom expressly cited." Gradually in the teachings of Paul there is developed a new idea, or at least there is a decided change in the phraseology. With him Christ was everything. He said of himself that he had been crucified with Christ and that he lived in him, and that to be a subject of the kingdom was to be in Christ. Surely by that he meant something different from membership in a local society. According to Paul the subjects of the kingdom were in some way included in the personality of Christ, and the extension of that personality to believers was the extension of his kingdom. Again, consider the great text, "The kingdom of God is . . . righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." That surely is

* "The Place of Christ in Modern Theology," p. 519.

not synonymous with any external and visible society; and cannot be translated into these words: the kingdom of God is an organization with a bishop and elders and deacons, whose condition is baptism, and whose highest act of worship is the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Again, Paul says, "Our citizenship is in heaven." And so the thought moves on, and his teaching may perhaps be condensed as follows: "What Jesus meant by the kingdom of God reappears substantially (1) under the same name, and also under the figures of (2) the Human Organism (the Body which is Christ); (3) the Home of the Adopted; (4) the Realm of the Justified; (5) the Reign of Grace; (6) the Heavenly Citizenship."*

From these considerations it is clear that "church" and "kingdom" are not synonymous words. The church was the *ecclesia*—was to Christians what the synagogue was to Jews. We do not mean that that was all that it was ever intended to be, but that is all it was at first, and there are no hints in the New Testament of its future development. The kingdom of God is the grand and glorious ideal. It is "the royal rule" of God; it is sometime to fill the earth, to embrace all spheres of life; its characteristics are fatherhood, brotherhood, love, and "the realization of righteousness in the life of humanity."† This was the good news which the prophets predicted, the Master proclaimed, and the apostles preached. The church, on the other hand, so far as it may be traced, is an evolution of one phase of the kingdom. The kingdom was preached; the message was accepted; the Christ was obeyed; and those who were of one heart and one mind naturally came together. So far as they had the common life they were one, but it was inevitable that the

* "The Kingdom of God," Stead, p. 37.

† "The Republic of God," Mulford.

kingdom should attract some because it pleased their intellects. Many gave to it intellectual adherence who would not yield their wills to its sway. From the first, therefore, there were those in the church who were not in the kingdom—the apostle reprovèd the Corinthians because of their unseemly conduct at the celebration of the Supper. The church grew faster than the kingdom. From the beginning some were in the kingdom who were not in the church, as there were those in the church who were not in the kingdom. “Kingdom” is the larger word. The church is one of many instruments by which the kingdom is to be advanced. If the inquiry now arises as to whether the church is on a level with other instruments, we reply that the ideal church is the kingdom in the phase of “its corporate self-consciousness”; that it is composed of those, and those only, who are in the kingdom, who are conscious of the fact, and who are seeking to make the kingdom prevail. As Principal Fairbairn has expressed it, “The church is the kingdom seen from below, and the kingdom is the church seen from above.”* “Polity is not of its essence; saints and souls are.”†

This study has brought us to the following conclusions:

1. The kingdom is not an institution; it is an organism. It is not like any existing state. It is not like the old Jewish Church, and surely as little resembles the Roman Church, with its imperial pretensions and bewildering forms. It has nothing corresponding to the sacrifices, the priesthood, the temple. It concerns character and the inner life of man, and the world only as that inner life articulates itself in righteousness, faith, and love. Here we must be careful to make our meaning plain. Form is essential. The kingdom required embodiment. It was more than a

* “The Place of Christ in Modern Theology,” p. 528.

† *Ibid.*, p. 510.

dream. What we contend is that it is embodied in a truly spiritual church, not in our ecclesiastical societies. Life always tends to form, and it always manifests itself through form. The life is in all the denominations, working to shape its own form, and sometime it will do so; but it is not correct to call the denominations the church. In the kingdom there must be unity; there is little in the denominations. When the form is the true expression of the life, the kingdom and the church will be coördinate. Institutions are necessary, but to be enduring they must be vital—the outgrowth of the divine life, and not mechanisms built around it. The kingdom is not an institution, and yet it uses institutions; it grows into them as the life in nature grows into flowers and forests. “The identity of church and kingdom is not absolute, but relative only. The two categories do not entirely coincide, even when the church as a visible society is all it ought to be—its members all truly Christian in faith and life. The kingdom is the larger category. It embraces all who by the key of a true knowledge of the historical Christ are admitted within its portals; but also many more: the children of the Father in every land who have unconsciously loved the Christ in the person of his representatives—the poor, the suffering, the sorrowful. For such no apostle or church officer opens the door; the Son of man himself admits them into the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world.”*

2. The church as now existing and clearly visible is an institution, or a series of institutions, and not an organism. At first it was composed of those who accepted the teaching of Christ and his apostles concerning the kingdom. At present what is *called* the church shows many signs of degeneration. To acknowledge this is to exalt the church, since we maintain that when the visible society is once more

* “The Kingdom of God,” Bruce, p. 265.

composed of those, and those only, who have the mind of Christ, "the kingdom will be the church seen from above, and the church the kingdom seen from below."

3. As the number of Christians increased, organization began. The simplicity of the earlier Christian life was quickly invaded by two forces: one came from the old Jewish faith, and tended to introduce Jewish forms and ceremonies; the other culminated in the practical absorption of Christianity by the Roman empire, and flooded the infant church with the theories and ideals of pagan civilization. From that time the spiritual conception of the kingdom was lost. The identification of the kingdom and the church with the visible society bearing Christ's name is a pagan conception. The growth of ritual and of ecclesiasticism has not been so much from the divine life as from the Jewish and pagan life, which intruded themselves into the place which belonged to Christ. The church within the church during all these Christian centuries has been trying to slough off its heathen skin. But the divine life has been slowly and surely asserting itself, and in our time, more than in any since the apostles, Christians recognize that the kingdom is the ideal; that the church is the means by which the kingdom is to be advanced; that the real church cannot be defined in the terms of any religious society now existing; and that, before it can be thus defined, what is commonly called the church must become more Christian, more truly the real church, which is ever the kingdom in manifestation.

4. If what has been said is true, it follows that the church is divine only as the state and the family are divine. The state and the family are not eternal, nor destined to be universal in their sway. The ideal state is one form of the manifestation of the kingdom of God; the ideal family is another form; and the ideal church is still another form.

The state may manifest the kingdom of God without the element of self-consciousness, and so may the family; but the church is the self-conscious manifestation of the kingdom. The kingdom may be advanced by science and by art as well as by the church; but science and art do not exist primarily for the sake of the kingdom, while the church does.

5. Only as the church is devoted to the advancement of the kingdom does it fulfil its function; when it seeks anything for itself it is false to the kingdom. It is as true of the church as of individuals that "he that would save his life must lose it." Denominational selfishness is as pernicious as individual selfishness. In so far as liturgies and politics are manifestations of the divine life they are of value, and helps to the kingdom; but in so far as they are simply the expression of esthetic sense, or desire for power, they are worldly, and hindrances to the kingdom. The kingdom, which is the divine life in humanity, can never develop into anything which is in antagonism with itself. The visible church is composed of sects. No one sect has any more right than another to call itself *the* church. The Roman and the Anglican are as truly sects as the Primitive Methodist and the Plymouth Brethren. Historic continuity is not necessarily divine development. It is a serious question how much of the machinery and how many of the forms of worship of our time have any relation to the life of God as it was in Christ Jesus. That life is spirit; it is manifested only by holiness; it cannot be communicated through material channels; it is not dependent on physical touch. Whatever gives that life freer passage is of God; whatever attracts attention to itself and away from that life is of man.

6. It follows from what has been said that the organization of the church must change with the expansion of the

kingdom. In the nature of things, as time advances and localities are different, the means by which men may be induced to accept the royal sway of God must of themselves be different. Character is not the same in India as in Greenland: zones have much to do with conduct. Mountaineers differ physically, mentally, and spiritually from those who live in valleys. Fertility of soil breeds one class of men; hard and barren fields another class. Cities present conditions of existence unknown in country districts. One century is not like another. The nineteenth century is to the first as a youth to a child. The year 3000 will be to the year 2000 as a full-grown man to a growing youth. Conditions constantly change, and the divine life always adjusts itself to its environment. Consequently it cannot be supposed that there is any one divine order of church polity, or any one element of polity which can very long endure. The episcopate may be best for to-day, but who can tell whether it will be best for to-morrow? Independency may be best for one class of people, but he would be presumptuous who would assert that it is best for all classes. That is always nearest the divine ecclesiastical order which best allows the divine life to manifest itself and do its work.

7. We have a hint of what will be realized when the kingdom of God is fully come. Then all who are Christ's will be "kings and priests unto God"; then all will have entered into the meaning of the great text of St. John, "Ye have an anointing from the Holy One, and ye know all things." I confess the more I study this subject the more I am led to believe that all our forms of polity are ephemeral. They are like the scaffolding around a cathedral; they are not the real church. The first time I visited Cologne the scaffolding was more conspicuous than the spires, but the last time I was there the scaffolds had disappeared,

and the spires, magnificent and splendid, lifted themselves toward the heavens. So it seems to me are what we call our churches. When individuals are dominated by the Christ there will be no need of churches or creeds or sacraments or ministry. Did not the Apostle have something like this in his mind when in the vision of the New Jerusalem he saw no temple therein? And yet I would speak carefully here, for I do not mean to liken the church—but only the denominations—to scaffolding, for surely the Master founded the church and gave to it his life. It is divine. It manifests God. Its lines are not coördinate with those of the kingdom, because it is the kingdom in one phase of its manifestation. The real church is the kingdom as it is manifest, and the glorified church the kingdom triumphant; but the denominations are all of them scaffolds built by man. When they disappear the glory of the kingdom will be distinctly, if not completely, visible in the church.

Finally, the Lambeth Articles, like those which have been put forth by the Disciples of Christ, may suggest temporary expedients by which the kingdom for a little while may be more swiftly advanced. If so, it is the duty of all Christians to give to them earnest and serious consideration, and so far as they may be made to help the advancement of the kingdom to adopt them, recognizing the scandal of the present divided state of Christendom, but never expecting that any expedient—which in the nature of the case is only transitory—can be a substitute for the life of God in man and in society.

We conclude, then, that the church, in so far as it is composed of those in the kingdom, is divine. In that church there is already of necessity perfect unity. Those who have Christ see face to face and work hand in hand. Division and discord are sure signs of the absence of the divine life. We may best promote the kingdom, and the

only real and enduring unity, by opening our hearts to the life of God as it is in Jesus Christ, and helping others to do so. Some things can be made one by welding; others only by growing. Christian union must be a growth. Church union without Christian union will make more scandals than it will cure. Only vital unity is desirable, and only that will be enduring. The kingdom of God is the "goal of history," the

"One far-off divine event
To which the whole creation moves."

It was among men when the God-man walked in the flesh; it is in all men in whom he dwells. His prayer will be answered, and his kingdom will come, when, not one man only, nor many men, but when humanity has reached the stature of the fullness of Christ.

II

THE INCARNATION PHILOSOPHICALLY CON-
SIDERED ; OR,

AVAILABLE LIVING EVIDENCE, AS DISTINGUISHED FROM THE
EVIDENCE OF THE GOSPELS OR THE EVIDENCE OF FAITH,
FOR THE HISTORIC AND DIVINE CHRIST.

LEWIS LAMPMAN, D.D.,
High Street Presbyterian Church, Newark, N. J.

II

THE INCARNATION PHILOSOPHICALLY CONSIDERED

I PROPOSE to try to formulate an argument for the person of Christ that does not depend mainly on gospel history or the evidence of faith.*

The age is skeptical of so-called historical evidence, and the evidence of faith is not available for the man who does not believe. Discarding these, what is left on which one can build an argument for both the human and the divine Christ? What is the present living evidence that does not depend on Scripture history and the evidence of faith for the life and claims of Jesus Christ?

Cæsar and Napoleon lived and attracted the attention of their times. Socrates and Savonarola lived, so history says. But what is left over of these lives? What is the actual amount of survival on which we can put our finger—which we can count as an actual, available material or moral asset? Now, is Jesus of Galilee like those who preceded him and like most who have followed him—simply a memory, an historical shadow? What, if anything, is left that creates obligations now and here?

* This line of argument was begun by Clement of Alexandria, and has been extended by Horace Bushnell, Dr. John Young, Lyman Abbott, and Newman Smyth. There is no claim to any originality—not even in its particular application. I have simply put together what others have formulated.—L. L.

To the question, What survives? I answer:

1. His *life* survives. It survives as the life of no other person that has ever lived survives. It is recognized now as an example of exalted and perfect manhood; it is both power and inspiration. The Gospels, indeed, drew its outline, and without them this new evidence could never have been developed; but into it has been breathed the breath of life, and it has become a living soul, with a power independent of the Gospels, and with a life of its own that would survive the loss of the Gospels.

The fact is that Jesus of Galilee lived a life so extraordinary that men have not forgotten it. It was a *universal* life. It was not simply fitted to the age in which he lived; it is as much a pattern in the nineteenth century as it was in the first. It was not simply adapted to the race from which he sprang; it is as much a pattern for the Gentile as for the Jew; for the dreamy Oriental as for the bustling, feverish life of the Occident; for a woman as for a man. No bounds of race or country or time limited it. It was a *universal* life, fitted to every age, to every people, and to every clime.

This life, then, as a pattern and inspiration, survives. It is not a memory; it is an actual existing thing which a man can see and feel. "In his name" is the motto of the Christian world. By the power of it Livingstone gave his life for Africa, and under its inspiration men are pressing forward to take the place left vacant by Mackay of Uganda; and in Christian lands men are consecrating time and labor and goods to establish the influence of the name over all the earth; it is the sweetest lullaby that mothers sing to their babes. It is the sign by which dying men conquer; and through it sobs are hushed and hearts are kept from breaking. The old song we sing is literally true:

“There is no name so sweet on earth,
No name so sweet in heaven—
The name before his wondrous birth
To Christ the Saviour given.”

Says Lyman Abbott: “The influence of most men dies with them; if in some few instances it survives, it grows less and less as the years pass on—first a power, then an influence, then only a memory. Of whom is not this true, if we except Jesus of Nazareth? In this case the reverse is true.” Says Newman Smyth: “The influence of Jesus is a perpetual influence; in his name is named whatever is most worthy our consecration of power, our devotion of heart, our endless endeavor of life.” He is not a mere memory; he is a magnificent force at present. He lived a life so extraordinary that men cannot forget it, and new centuries only bring new wonder and catch new inspiration from it.

What Jesus is as an existing personal force is easily illustrated. We can forget Alexander and Socrates and Antoninus; we can forget them, and lose little by our forgetting. But suppose this world should forget Jesus of Galilee? Suppose it should keep all of his philosophy and teaching, and should forget the man Jesus, so that his life would not survive—what then? Why, it would blot out the Christian church. It would break up all distinctively Christian organizations, end missions at home and abroad, and turn the whole world backward. I affirm that it is the *person* of Jesus of Galilee—the actual living personality—that is the power that underlies every Christian thing, and not simply his teaching. The inspiration of the world, the civilization of this nineteenth century, are not so much from the words of Christ as from the person of Christ. Neither in Egypt, nor in Persia, nor in India, nor in China, is either religion or philosophy wanting. Some of the hymns of the Vedas

sound like our penitential psalms. The lack of these nations is, that they have not the knowledge of and the inspiration from the person of Jesus Christ.

His life has changed and is changing the world. A simple lesson in geography will illustrate it. In the words of James Russell Lowell, "There isn't a decent place on God's earth that hasn't been made decent by Jesus of Nazareth."

Explain it as you will, you cannot explain away the fact that this son of a carpenter, this untaught Galilean, this man who was crucified outside of the wall of Jerusalem, has revolutionized the world, and that after nineteen centuries he continues his leadership unimpaired. His life is making men patient under wrong; developing self-restraint and making liberty possible; tempering justice; and changing equality and fraternity from a dream into a reality. For Jesus of Nazareth is not only the author of the doctrine of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, but he is the *power* by which that doctrine is being transmuted into life.

And the present power of the life of Jesus is recognized by unbelievers as well as by those who accept him. Says John Stuart Mill: "Whatever else may be taken from us by rational criticism, Christ is still left; a unique figure, not more unlike all his precursors than all his followers." Says Lyman Abbott from the Christian side: "He still marches at the head of humanity; and the world after eighteen centuries has much to learn before it has learned him, and much to do before it becomes like him. . . . He died in darkness and amid scorn and contumely. The religion of Judea, the culture of Greece, the power of Rome, knew him not. The few faithful friends who still clung to his memory were not too many to be contained in one upper chamber. To-day his name fills the world. . . . And the last eighty years sees a greater accession to his followers

than the total growth of all the eighteen hundred years which preceded. The scoffs and sneers of infidelity are silenced not by the arguments of Christian scholars, but by the character of Christ himself. And Renan, Hooykaas, and John Stuart Mill join in ascriptions of honor to his name, and in expressions of gratitude for his influence."

You ask, then, What survives of Jesus of Galilee? and I answer, his life survives. He lived a life so extraordinary that men cannot forget it. And it is not a memory. It has become a vital, a living thing; a force in this world that has to be estimated. His life survives—a pattern and an inspiration to the world.

2. In the second place, his *authority as a teacher* survives.

We may be indebted to history, and to gospel history especially, for the fact that Christ won his way to the position of a recognized leader and teacher, and that he has held it for nineteen hundred years; but we are indebted to no history for the tremendous fact that he holds the place of the recognized leader and teacher of the civilized world to-day, and that, too, with no signs of any impairment of his authority, but, on the contrary, with *increasing* authority. That fact neither depends on the Gospels nor on faith. It is one of the noisy, living, and demonstrative facts of the present. And is there any question as to the fact? Where is the court of last appeal in any question of religion or morals? If in any controversy on these matters there can be found a clear and undoubted statement of Christ, or a deciding act of Christ, is not the matter settled? Not only is there no dissent among the actual followers of Christ, but four hundred millions of nominal Christendom accept it as final.

Who turns to Socrates or Plato to settle the moral or spiritual controversies of the age? Such an appeal would be laughed out of court. And yet only five hundred years

later than these—nineteen hundred years ago—a man comes out of a humble shop in Nazareth and declares to the wondering crowd, “I am the light of the world,” and proclaims the doctrines which men were to believe and teach.

The centuries have come and gone since then. The little country that was his home, and once the center of the world, is far one side, and with no place or rank among the nations; the intellect of man has broadened more than his territory; each age has accumulated greater treasures of knowledge than of wealth; and still in spite of changed position, in spite of passing centuries, in spite of gathered wisdom, this Galilean, reared in the meanest town in all the province, untutored, and dying while but a youth—this Galilean still remains as the leader and teacher of the world; and in every controversy with reference to morals or religion, he is the court of last appeal.

And if this is true, how do you account for it? The last word on any other branch of knowledge has not been spoken. In this age we outgrow books and theories and men in a generation. Everything is in flux. New light is breaking out from every quarter, and no man, however profound his knowledge, is able to keep the ear of the people and to teach them beyond a brief stretch of years. But here this son of a carpenter stands yet. No one questions his authority or wisdom—not even the men who do not believe in him. It is accepted that up to this date he has spoken the last, highest, and best word with reference to the most intricate questions of the soul.

You ask, What actually survives of Jesus Christ? and I answer, his authority as a teacher survives. The study of nineteen hundred years has not yet emptied his words of their meaning. He is easily Master and Lord in the domain of spiritual knowledge, and men of the profoundest insight and wisdom are glad to call themselves his disciples. And

there never was a time in the history of the world when so many men were listening to his words, and when they were so impressed by them; as in this year of our Lord 1894. Says Dr. John Young: "It may be affirmed that, of all the spiritual truth existing in the world at this moment, not only is there not a single important idea which is not found in the words of Christ, but all the *most important* ideas can be found nowhere else, and they have their sole foundation in his mind. From his mind there shone a light which no age before his day ever saw, and none since, except in him alone, has ever seen."

3. Not only does the authority of Christ as a teacher survive, so that it is a present fact on which you can put your finger, but also his *power* survives. He is the King of the civilized world to-day. One of the courtiers in the palace turned to Scotland's king one day, and, plucking his sleeve, said, "Sire, there is a greater king in Scotland than thou." "Who is it?" said the ruler. "King People," answered the courtier. To-day it needs no daring courtier to say to the czar of all the Russias, to the German emperor, or to the empress of India and queen of all England, "There is a greater ruler in thy dominions than thou. It is Jesus of Nazareth." If any ruler of Europe should attempt deliberately to dishonor Christ's name or prohibit his service, I think it would be perfectly safe to say that rebellion would be begun within an hour. Not one of them would dare, either on account of his life or of his kingdom, to put himself or herself in open hostility to the rule of Christ. Nearly nineteen hundred years ago the Roman procurator asked in scorn of a pale-faced Galilean who had been arraigned before him, "Art thou a king then?" and this last century gives the answer, rising louder and more triumphant as nation after nation adds its testimony, "Yea, thou art a king."

You ask again, What did he actually accomplish? I answer, he established a kingdom whose bounds each year approach nearer the bounds of the habitable earth. You ask, What survives? I answer, his power survives, growing larger and more extended every year. He is King of this world. Any government of Europe or America that should attempt deliberately to run counter to what is recognized as the clear teaching of Christ would be overturned. He is the undoubted power behind every civilized throne.

Who is this man? Born in Nazareth, yet a citizen of the world; born a Jew, yet akin to every race; untaught, yet the teacher of the world; scourged by the brutal Roman soldiers, and dying a death of shame on the cross amid the taunts of Jerusalem's mob, yet living, and drawing knight and banneret to the same city to struggle for his tomb; crowned with thorns, yet seated to-day on every throne of every civilized nation, ruling the world as the King over all kings and kingdoms.

Men in his day asked after some sign. They ask it now. Here is his sign to-day: the living, constant miracle of his endless, deathless life and power; the witness that he came from beyond the stars and that he wields the power that moves the world.

4. In the fourth place, his *religion* survives. It is known distinctively as the Christian religion. It is an existing fact to be accounted for. And it is a new religion, new in its conception and actual knowledge of God, and new in its conception of the destiny of man—that large and luminous ideal known now as “the kingdom of God.”

The philosophers of the Old World had tried by searching to find out God. Worshipers built their altars, offered their sacrifices, sang their penitential psalms, and turned away wearied with unavailing search and sacrifice, and sought their heaven in a personal annihilation. Judea

came, but the God of Judah was enthroned upon a mountain; clouds were about him, and lightning darted from the darkness, and the hearts of his people trembled while his thunders rolled. "But Jesus of Galilee revealed God metaphysically, intellectually, and morally as he never was known before. This untutored Galilean proclaims God as Spirit, and clears away in a single sentence the crude notions of the ages. 'God is Spirit,' unlimited and unconditioned." " 'God is light,' and he centers all knowledge and wisdom in the eternal." "God is love." Hear him again as he dispels the fears of the trembling company at the foot of Sinai, and wipes away the tears of a troubled world. God is love. And ye "are not come unto the mount that . . . burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest: . . . but ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, . . . and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel."

(1) He gave the world a new conception of God, so that we can think of him as Father. "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me." He has taken the sting out of the sweep of the storm, and fear out of the thunder. He has revealed to us the supreme Power of the universe, filled with love for his creatures, and striving to bless them. So that we need no Mary to personify tenderness and compassion; we have it all in God. He is our Father, and our Mother too.

(2) And he gave the world a new conception of the destiny of man. It was Jesus Christ who drew the lines of that marvelous picture of the kingdom of God—a kingdom full of light and beauty, whose atmosphere is peace and righteousness, unto which all the world is called; a kingdom that grows larger and more luminous as time goes

on. Man never had such a dream of destiny until Jesus of Galilee suggested it. He had dreamed of terrestrial gardens, of summer lands with sensuous delights, of triumph over enemies, of material rewards and honors; but of a kingdom built on righteousness, of a peace, not conquered, but unfolded, of intimate union and fellowship with God, he had not the power to dream until Christ inspired the dream. "Neither in the philosophies of the Old World, nor in the Jewish religion, nor in *any* religion, can be found the conceptions of God and of the destiny of the human race revealed by this Nazarene. His positions were bold and startling, and his doctrines were denounced by the religious teachers of his country as blasphemous." But the point is that this conception of God and human destiny survives. That is not a matter of tradition, or even of history. It is a living fact to be accounted for. The religion of the civilized world to-day is the *Christian* religion.

Centuries have come and gone since he died. What has become of the doctrines of this Nazarene? Are they forgotten? Why, what else is remembered in the world to-day? What else is talked about and taught and written about as the teaching of Jesus? His religion has become an organized thing, until it represents more and better machinery, more men, and more money than any other movement on the face of the globe. The sound of the church bells girdles the world.

Do you ask, What survives? I answer, his religion survives. Mothers teach it to their children. Strong men go out to fight their battles taking it as their armor; and when men come to die they wrap it as the drapery of their couch about them, and lie down to pleasant dreams. Every assault upon it has been idle. The infidels of the first century are dead and forgotten. The infidels of the eighteenth boasted that they would wipe it from the face of the earth.

The infidels of the nineteenth century continue their activity. But what does it all matter? It moves on with mysterious power, resistless, so that whosoever falls upon it is broken, and on whomsoever it falls it grinds him to powder.

It survives, this religion of Jesus. At no period of the world were there so many devotees as now, and at no period of the world did it ever have the same look of mastery. Says Abbott, "To-day his name fills the world; the cross, emblem of ignominy, on which he seemed to perish, is worn as the outward symbol of the heart's adoration on many a gentle woman's breast; and the last eighty years of the church's life sees a greater accession to his followers than the total growth of all the eighteen hundred years which had preceded."

Now, who is this Nazarene who walks out of his humble shop, out from the narrow streets of this inconsequent town, and lifts his hands and proclaims, "I am the light of the world," and men for two thousand years continue to exclaim, "Surely no man ever spake as this man"? Who is this man to whom costly structures are reared in every land; for whom strong men grow tender, and tender women grow brave; for whose sake trouble is borne without a murmur, and in whose strength death is met without fear? Who is this man who calls to praise and service, and all the world responds? Answer for yourselves. This world has not gone mad; it never was so clear and strong of brain as now; and this world answers with an emphasis that grows stronger every year, this man is none other than the Son of God. The life that prolongs itself is eternal life; the power that thus grips the world is divine power; the religion that has lifted, inspired, comforted, and is saving this world is the Word of God spoken to us in these last days by Jesus Christ his Son. Jesus of Nazareth orig-

inated a movement that has changed the world; a movement that *survives*, that gathers power with the ages.

5. To the question, What survives? I answer finally, *Jesus Christ in all his miraculous and transforming power survives.*

The evidence for miracles is as good, if not better, in the nineteenth century than it was in the first. There is a power in this world by which men can exorcise devils now; by which miracles are wrought in this present age; by which the blind receive their sight, and the dead are brought to life; by which men can face disaster and death itself with heroic courage, and even with joy.

Men say, "Oh well, your Jesus of Nazareth lived a good many years ago, if he ever lived at all, and the proofs of his wonderful works are confined to the first century. Show me something tangible *now*, something on which I can put my finger, some sign of divine power that I can witness, and then I will consider his claims." That is a challenge that can be met. The age of miracles is not past. They are being performed almost every day.

Last winter, at my mission, a locomotive engineer arose one night and said: "My friends, a few years ago I was a swearing, drinking man, going to the devil as fast as a man could go; careless of mother, wife, and children; careless of my own life and soul. But Jesus Christ came to me and convicted me and saved me. He drove out the devils of profanity and drink, and made me hate the things I once loved, and love the things I once hated." That statement was made by a strong-brained, clear-eyed fellow, in a tone that carried conviction. Was he mistaken? About what? Not about the transformation; that was perfectly plain. A whole ward of the city of Newark could be brought in as witnesses. This once drinking and profane engineer is now an active worker for Jesus of Galilee; has Christ's

mottoes hanging in his cab, and preaches the gospel whenever he has a chance. The transformation is evident and marvelous. Is he mistaken about the means of the transformation? That is a matter that I cannot make out. Kinan and Cary say that they have been changed by the power of Christ. The change is acknowledged, but the power by which the change was wrought is denied. Now, who ought to know best how they were healed and who healed them—the men out of whom the devils have been cast, or the men who come to inspect them after they have been restored? These healed men say that Jesus Christ did it; and, more than that, they say that it is this same Jesus who is keeping the room against the return of the evil spirits. And this argument does not turn on one or more isolated cases. There is no dearth of evidence. Kinan had no sooner taken his seat than another arose and made the same statement. And I know of him and of his transformation. He is at the head of the Rescue Mission in the city of Newark at this present time.

In my home is hanging a picture of a mother and a son. The face of the mother shines with almost a celestial light. It is St. Monica and her son Augustine. They are at Ostia waiting for the ship, and the mother has heard the full story of the transformation which Christ has wrought. Was the strong-brained and learned Augustine mistaken? He said that it was Christ that had wrought the transformation. Who ought to know better than he how he was healed? Was John Bunyan the drunken tinker transformed into John Bunyan the seer mistaken? He said that it was Jesus Christ who transformed him.

Last winter, one Saturday night, I stood in Water Street Mission, New York. There were three hundred men floated in from the sewers of that great city, covered with the very slime and ooze of life; outcasts every one of them, with-

out God and without any hope in this world. On the platform were twenty men with every mark of the world's prosperity and comfort about them. When the service was thrown open, one after another of these men arose and told the same story. A few years ago they, too, were outcasts, and dying in the gutter, without homes, without friends, without any good and without any God in this world; and there came to them this same Jesus of Nazareth, and kindled dead affections and hopes—recreated them, made them new men. Were these men mistaken—one and all of them? Who ought to know the power by which they had been transformed?

Here, then, is something tangible, something on which a man can put his finger—a sign of divine power that a man can witness. We need not ask men to believe in Christ for his works' sake—works only that were wrought two thousand years ago, and transmitted to us by history—but on account of the works wrought *now*—the casting out of devils and the bringing of the dead to life. Jesus of Galilee is still in this world with all of his miraculous and transforming power.

To sum up, What survives? I answer:

1. His life survives, the pattern and the inspiration of the world. The power of this nineteenth century is not in philosophy or in material development; it is in the possession by the world of Jesus of Galilee.

2. His teaching and leadership survive. Never in the history of the world had he the same authority as now. He is the court of last appeal in every moral and spiritual issue, and a clear "Thus saith the Lord" ends the controversy.

3. And his power survives. He is molding states and controlling kings and people, and the one resistless force

that subdues rebellion and prevents revolution is the power of this uncrowned King of Galilee.

4. His conceptions of God and of human relations and human destiny survive. The religion of the civilized nations of the earth is Christ's religion. Men are willing to live and die for him in increasing numbers, and there has been a greater accession to his following in the last eighty years than in the eighteen hundred years preceding.

5. And finally, Jesus Christ in all his miraculous and transforming power survives. He is here working miracles in the redemption of men in this last century as he was in the first.

Who *is* he? The old question comes again, Who *is* he? This strange, mysterious figure that enters the world but never quits it, whose power is broken by neither time nor death, who has in himself the power of an endless life—who *is* he? This startling figure, unlike any other the world has ever seen, with a conception of a mission that was fitted to the thought of Almighty God, speaking as man never spake before, and with power to perpetuate his life, so that the increasing years but increase his sway, working miracles in this nineteenth century as he worked them in the first—who *is* he? There is but one answer, the old answer of the centurion, "Truly this man was the Son of God."

Friends, men in his day asked for some sign of his divine commission, and he gave it. He gives it still. Here is his sign to-day: the living, constant miracle, viz., *his endless, deathless life and power*, the witness that he came from beyond the stars and wields the power that moves the worlds.

III

THE INCARNATION BIBLICALLY CONSIDERED

GEORGE T. PURVES, D.D.,

Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton
Theological Seminary.

III

THE INCARNATION BIBLICALLY CONSIDERED

THE purpose of this paper is to set forth the way in which the fact and the doctrine of the incarnation are presented in the Bible. In attempting to do this in the limited space at my command, I shall relieve myself entirely from the consideration of two matters which it would be necessary to introduce if it were my task to prove the incarnation to be an original Christian doctrine, but which the title of my paper justifies me in regarding as assumed.

On the one hand, I am to take the Bible as a whole, and as it has been received by the church, without entering upon the discussion of any critical questions concerning the genesis or authenticity of its parts. "The Incarnation Biblically Considered" can mean nothing but a discussion of the topic as it lies in the existing volume which we know as the Bible. It is not a question, therefore, whether the Bible rightly represents the history of this idea in Jewish or apostolic times. I have no doubt that it does; but I am relieved from the necessity of proving it by the terms of my subject. Our question simply is, How does the Bible present this truth? though I may remark, in passing, that this seems to me the true question for biblical theology to answer. Biblical theology is the theology of the Bible. It has no right to attempt to go by critical processes behind the Bible in order to present what is supposed to have been the history of religious ideas among the Hebrews or in the

apostolic church, and yet call itself biblical theology. Such critical reconstructions, supposing them to be historically true, belong to the department of historical religion. A biblical theology must ground itself entirely upon the Bible, and must have for its purpose to set forth the progressive unfolding of religious truth in that volume. It must proceed upon the assumption of the organic unity of the book, and use exegesis alone as its instrument. This is the method upon which I shall proceed in the following paper, and therefore all questions of critical introduction will be neglected.

On the other hand, I may assume that the Bible teaches that Jesus Christ was and is the incarnate Son of God. On this there is general consent among those who are interested in the present discussion. Commentators differ about the precise force of particular proof-texts and about particular phases of the doctrine, but few deny that the Bible teaches our Lord to be a real divine incarnation. Those who dispute the doctrine are generally content to deny the authority of the Bible. As, however, it is not my object to prove the authority of Scripture, so I may fairly assume that the Scriptures teach the fact and the doctrine of the incarnation. By that I mean that they teach the absolute deity of our Lord; his personal and eternal preëxistence as the divine Son or Word or Image or Effulgence; his real and complete humanity, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost in the Virgin's womb; and, consequently, the union in him of divinity and humanity, effected by his mysteriously making this human nature his personal organ and particular dwelling-place, in order that he might be truly man as well as truly God. It is sufficient for me to quote the words of Paul to the Romans (i. 3, 4): "Concerning [God's] Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with

power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead," together with the words of John's prologue to his Gospel: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father), full of grace and truth." It lies, however, beyond the scope of this article to prove the incarnation to be a biblical idea. I shall assume this in order to devote attention to the incarnation from a biblical point of view. I propose to inquire concerning the way in which the incarnation is presented and attested in the Bible, the relations in which it is placed to other biblical ideas, and finally to attempt a more precise statement of the nature of the incarnation as biblically described. It appears to me that thus we shall be led to deal with those aspects of the theme which are of most interest and importance in current discussions.

1. I call attention, in the first place, to the fact that the incarnation appears, when biblically considered, as a doctrine based on historical facts and produced by the need of elucidating them. The truth is not first declared as a dogma and then substantiated by evidence from facts; but the historical advent, career, and teaching of our Lord are first historically attested, and only as explanatory of the history is the profound truth of the incarnation explicitly declared. It thus appears as a fact before it appears as a doctrine. We have in the New Testament first the historical Christ of the Gospels, then the theological Christ of the Epistles. This is in obvious accord with the actual movement of the apostles' minds in setting forth, in response to the church's needs, the great mystery of which they were the witnesses. It is in accordance, too, with the general character of the Bible, which is not only, when com-

pleted, a revelation itself, but is also the professed record of an historical process of revelation, since the truths given by God were adapted to the movement of his providence and to the external events which marked his interposition in behalf of his church.

The consequence of this is that in the Old Testament the incarnation is but dimly and fragmentarily presented, though in the light of the New Testament we can see it adumbrated. In the Old Testament the Agent by whom salvation was to be accomplished is represented in various aspects, all of which appear to the New Testament student as partial presentations of the Great Deliverer. It begins with the promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. Later follows the promise to Abram that in his seed should all nations be blessed. Still later we read of Messiah as the last of the prophets; again, as the Son of David with an everlasting throne; then, as the prophets enriched by their successive revelations the hope of Israel, we read of the lowly Branch from the root of Jesse, of the humble but glorious King of Israel, and of the suffering Servant of Jehovah, in whose personal and vicarious passion the mission of Israel itself is represented as being achieved. In this line of promise the human, Abrahamic, Israelitish character of the Agent of salvation is made prominent. But we also find in the Old Testament foreshadowings of his divine character. The Angel of Jehovah, who often appears identified with Jehovah himself, is in the earlier history represented as the guide and deliverer of the church. In the Psalms appellations are given to Messiah which go far beyond the possibilities of merely human dignity. It is sufficient to refer to the instance which Christ himself cited, where David's Son is called by the psalmist David's Lord. Similar titles are ascribed to him by the prophets, and the era of future deliver-

ance is frequently described as the day of Jehovah or as his coming to earth. In the Old Testament, however, these predictions and descriptions are not brought together into a completed exhibition of Messiah as God incarnate, save in a few rapt utterances of the prophets, such as Isaiah ix. 6 and Micah v. 2. At the same time, all the Old Testament representations of the Agent of salvation were at once harmonized by the fact of the incarnation when that was historically revealed, and it in turn appears as so organically related to the previous promises as to be the only fact by which they can all be unified and fulfilled. Perhaps in no respect does the Christian gospel more plainly appear as the intended accomplishment of the earlier promises of God than in its presentation of the divine-human personality of its Founder; and likewise the earlier promises contained in the Old Testament plainly appear as revelations and as parts of one divine plan by the fact that when the incarnation is accepted the key to all of them is found. As Oehler says (quoted by Riehm, "Messianic Prophecy," p. 297): "It belongs to the character of prophecy to present in its envisaging forms *disjecta membra*, which are harmoniously blended only in the course of the fulfilling history. The presuppositions of all the essential determinations of New Testament Christology are to be found in the Old Testament, but the revealing word which unites them organically and gives them their ultimate form is given only along with the accomplished revealing fact."

It is, however, in the New Testament, as we should expect, that the relation of the incarnation to the history of the Incarnate One most plainly appears. There the doctrine is distinctly presented as growing out of and as necessitated by external events.

The only apparent exception to this mode of presentation is the prologue to the Fourth Gospel, where we find

theological reflection preceding the historical narrative. Yet it is to be observed that John's narrative approves itself as historically accurate, and as forming the basis of his theology, by the fact that the most distinctive term of the latter—the Logos—is nowhere attributed by him to Jesus himself. Even in this instance, therefore, we see the doctrine resting on the facts.

In the Synoptic Gospels, although they, too, were composed from special points of view, and therefore not without some theological reflection, the narrative reveals very plainly that the understanding by the disciples of the truth concerning Christ was gradually forced upon them by the events which took place, so that their apprehension of the truth was conditioned by the facts, and expanded as new facts occurred or became known. Thus, for example, we find the miraculous conception of our Lord recorded, but in the announcements of it to Mary and Joseph the deeper mystery of the incarnation was not explicitly disclosed. Mary was indeed told, "He shall be called the Son of the Most High: . . . and he shall reign over the house of Israel forever;" also, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God;" but all these expressions could have been, and doubtless were, interpreted by her without rising to the thought of an incarnation of God, while the second of the two declarations just cited turned her mind directly to the miraculous conception as the reason why the title "Son of God" would belong to her offspring. This, of course, was not to exclude other and higher reasons for the title; but the expression was evidently designed to accord with the facts as she knew them, and to go no farther. The narrative thus indicates the dependence of the first disciples, even of the Virgin herself,

on facts for their belief about Christ; and the precise relation of the annunciation as thus narrated to the facts as then known, rather than to the full truth as known later, is a strong guaranty of the truthfulness of the evangelist.

Again, the gospel narratives make clear the progress of the disciples in the belief concerning the real nature of Christ during his ministry among them. It lies beyond my present purpose to present Christ's testimony to himself, but it may be remarked, in passing, that it was, as reported in the Gospels, as explicit as the character of the work which, according to the Bible, he had come to do permitted. That work involved his appearance on earth as man, and the veiling for the most part of the splendors of both his divinity and Messiahship, save as these were manifested to those with eyes to see them through his humanity and lowliness, his teaching, character, actions, and sufferings. The Gospels, however, record enough to prove that he asserted the consciousness of being divine. Even the Synoptics testify to his claim. They represent the demons as silenced, but not rebuked, for their witness to him as Son of God. They record the divine testimony at the baptism and the transfiguration, as well as the confession of Peter for which Christ pronounced him blessed and taught of the Father. They record these words of our Lord, only paralleled in the Fourth Gospel: "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him." The Fourth Gospel provides much more explicit testimony. I will refer to this hereafter. It is sufficient now to refer to the fifth, sixth, seventh, tenth, and seventeenth chapters. If these reports of Christ's language be accurate, certainly Christ claimed to be consciously divine. But the very character of Christ's self-

revelation necessitated that the disciples should penetrate gradually into its mystery, and so they are represented in the Gospels. We may observe them, unlike the populace and the rulers, advancing slowly and unequally into the understanding of Him whom they had learned to trust and love. We should indeed be careful not to attribute to their earlier expressions the full significance which at a later time they would undoubtedly themselves have attributed to the same words. The title "Son of God," as used by Nathanael, or even as used by Peter at Cæsarea Philippi, probably did not express to the speaker the developed theological conception of the Epistles. But it seems impossible to read the Gospels sympathetically without perceiving that the divine mystery in Christ took shape in the apostles' minds in a firm belief in his divinity as they received and pondered upon his words and deeds and character. They differed among themselves, doubtless, in the degree to which this belief had as yet taken distinct shape. Philip merited Christ's reproachful question, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father." But soon they could all say, "Now are we sure that thou knowest all things: . . . by this we believe that thou camest forth from God;" and after the resurrection Thomas may be well thought to have uttered the conviction of the rest as well as of himself: "My Lord and my God." Again, therefore, the biblical narrative depicts the apprehension of this truth proceeding in accordance with the progress of external events.

If, once more, we examine the Acts and the Epistles, the same method of revelation appears. The disciples' apprehension of their Lord's real nature was verified by the transcendent facts of his resurrection and ascension. To the natural power of these facts there was also added, according to the biblical narrative, the illuminating power of the

Spirit, whose specific function it was to take of the things of Christ and show them unto his disciples. What they had formerly perceived dimly was now made clear, and as the true character of Christ's work was more and more definitely unveiled to them the true nature of Christ himself was also more explicitly apprehended. The course of their thought, so far as it can be traced, appears to have been backward from the divine dignity of Christ as manifested in his resurrection and ascension to the essential divinity of his nature and the clearer recollection of his divine claims. Yet the process is represented as still gradual and as conditioned by the progress of events. Peter's speeches in the early chapters of the Acts show that his thought mainly rested as yet on the external proofs of the Messiahship of Jesus, and do not give expression to any definite conception of the Lord's essential divinity. Neither did the course of events during the earliest period in the apostolic age evoke developed teaching upon this point. The Judaistic controversy dealt with another aspect of Christianity, so that in the first and second cycle of Paul's Epistles we find the incarnation assumed and stated, but not argued or elaborated. It was at a later period, when apostolic teaching was forced to meet the attack of theological errorists, that the truth of the incarnation was both explicitly asserted and defended. Then we are elaborately told of the dignity of Christ's person both before he came to earth and after he assumed humanity; his sublime self-humiliation is made to be an example for our imitation; his infinite superiority to all other messengers from God is used to set forth the sufficiency and finality of his priestly work of salvation; and the last surviving apostle completes the testimony of his colleagues by exhibiting in Jesus the eternal, personal, divine Word, who, by manifesting in the flesh, through word and deed, the character and will of God,

had completed revelation, and had performed the work by which the salvation of his people is made secure.

In thus hastily outlining the way in which the incarnation is progressively presented in the Bible, I have not thought it necessary to cite passages in proof. My object is simply to direct attention to the fact that the doctrine is brought out in dependence upon the history. When this is considered, the testimony of the Bible on this subject appears doubly valuable. It does not present the truth after the manner of a theoretical treatise, but as first a revelation of facts through which the truth was almost forced upon the minds of the disciples, and into the full purport of which they penetrated gradually. A mythical explanation is impossible, since the doctrine arose under the pressure of attested and external events. It is equally impossible to regard it as the offspring of dogmatic speculation. The incarnation, when biblically considered, seeks no confirmation from philosophy. It is made so exclusively dependent on historical facts that, as we have seen, the expectation of an incarnation only fragmentarily appears in the Old Testament, and in the New its unfolding is the result of external evidence which to the apostles was convincing and irresistible. The Bible, therefore, presents the incarnation not as a speculation, and not primarily even as a dogma, but as an historical fact. This feature of its teaching should surely weigh heavily in our estimate of its testimony.

2. Closely connected with this relation of the doctrine to history is the next fact to which I call attention, that the incarnation, when biblically considered, appears most prominently as a stupendous moral truth, and again secondarily as a theological dogma. This, too, is an example of the characteristic method of the Bible. It usually advances from the concrete to the general; from example to principle; from life to its analysis and explanation. To it

truth is not abstract, but embodied ; God is not absolute Being, but Creator, King, Benefactor, and Father. In large part the Bible is like nature, where truth lies in actual operation, to be discovered, analyzed, and systematized by the student. In part, however, the Bible is like science, by which existing truth is pointed out and reduced to statement. But in the Bible the living truth in concrete form usually appears first and the doctrinal statement follows, so that both aspects appear in their proper relation and proportion.

The incarnation, then, biblically considered, appears preëminently a living, moral fact in human history. Take, for example, our Lord's testimony to his divine nature as recorded in the Gospels, and observe the practical purposes for which it is always made. If he sublimely declared that none knoweth the Son, save the Father, or the Father, save the Son, it was that he might immediately add, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." So when he called himself the Son of man—a phrase used, doubtless, with reference to his representative assumption of humanity—it was that he might indicate the spirit which, after his example, should animate his followers, or the character of his mission upon earth, or some other practical inference. In the Fourth Gospel the moral significance of the incarnation appears no less than in the Synoptics, though it was written more in a theological interest than they were. In the fifth chapter Christ's equality with the Father is represented as a state of uninterrupted communion, and this in order that the Son may bring forth life out of death (vs. 17-29). In the seventh (ver. 57) his obedience to and loving dependence on the Father are made the type of the relation of the believer to himself. Again, his testimony to his perfect knowledge of the Father (vii. 29) and to his

superiority to the limitations of time (viii. 58) is given for the purpose of defending his authority to teach. In the phrase, "I and my Father are one" (x. 30), the moral unity of the Father and the Son is shown by the context to be quite as prominent a thought as the unity of being which in the light of other passages we must also see included in it; and hence the force of the following argument by which he met the Jews' charge of blasphemy: "If he called them gods, unto whom the Word of God came, . . . say ye of him, whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" In his last prayer, likewise (ch. xvii.), the union and communion of the Father and the Son are again and with great emphasis represented as the spiritual basis and type of the union and communion of believers with one another and in Christ with God. Not, therefore, as a separate, unrelated doctrine is the incarnation set forth by our Lord, but as a moral phenomenon, revealing God to man and man to himself, forming the foundation upon which the renewed life of his people rests, and the spiritual image to which they are to be conformed.

Nor do the Epistles lose this apprehension of the moral and practical aspect of the truth before us, even when they express a dogmatic conception of it. Thus Paul saw in it the means by which a truly representative Redeemer was provided for men, when he wrote, "But when the fullness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that he might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption." (Gal. iv. 4, 5.) Again, he appeals to it as a reason for Christian generosity, reminding the Corinthians of him who, "though he was rich, yet for your sakes became poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich." To the Colossians he would make the fact that in Christ "dwelleth

all the fullness of Deity bodily " the assurance that they were complete in him ; while the Philippians are urged by the Apostle to let the same self-forgetfulness and self-sacrifice which Christ exhibited in becoming man be their mind also. So when we turn to the Epistle to the Hebrews the incarnation appears as the bond of union between Christ and his people, and the assurance to them of their high priest's sympathy and effectual intercession. Finally, to St. John the incarnation of the divine Word meant the revelation of light and life to those who received him, and the entrance by them into a divine fellowship. According to both Paul and John, union with Christ is the condition of becoming the sons of God, since he is the incarnate Son of God ; but the latter apostle most emphatically sets forth the mystery of Christ's person as the fundamental fact on the basis of which grace and truth have been brought to man in the knowledge of God, and whereby, through faith in Jesus as the Word of God, man's joy may be full.

Thus the biblical writers never lose the perception of the moral and practical significance of the incarnation. To them it was not in the least an abstract or philosophic dogma, but a sunlike truth, shedding beauty and fertility on human life. It was the actual revelation of God in his most gracious aspect ; the dawn of light, the birth of life, to a darkened and dead world.

While, however, it is of the utmost importance to preserve, as the Bible does, this moral or dynamic view of the incarnation, it would be unjust to conclude that the biblical writers did not also penetrate to or intend to teach a really dogmatic view of it. Such a conclusion is contradicted by the obviously dogmatic thought and statement of many of the New Testament Epistles, especially those of Paul and John. It is idle to deny to these writers the intellectual articulation of Christian truth, as well as sharp and clear

distinctions between truth and error and the careful choice of words to define the doctrines of the faith. It is a favorite idea with some theologians that this dogmatic process was Hellenistic and post-apostolic, and that it introduced an alien, intellectual element into the creed of Catholic Christendom. But in fact this process is not peculiarly Hellenic, but universally human; and since the biblical writers were thinking men, and since the belief of the early church was confronted from the beginning by intellectual opponents, there soon appeared in the apostolic Epistles clearly cut and well-articulated statements of the dogmatic content of the new religion. It is true that this process is not carried so far in the Bible as to include the whole system of religious truth in a single and formal series of statements, or to preclude the formulation of such by the later church. But it is also true that the biblical writers are not content with the moral apprehension of the truths of Christianity. While that is prominent, as we have seen, it leads back with them, as it must do with all intelligent believers, to an intellectually constructed dogma.

In respect to the incarnation the dogmatic statements of Scripture cannot be questioned. Thus we have Paul's most carefully chosen language in the Epistle to the Colossians. Writing against the theosophical errorists of Asia, he used words to describe the incarnation which were evidently intended to combat incipient Gnosticism: "God was pleased that in Christ all the pleroma [i.e., the entire manifestation of the graces and attributes of Deity] should dwell." Again, and still more definitely, "In him dwelleth all the pleroma of the Deity in a bodily form." Here we have the direct statement that Christ is the absolute Deity and no inferior being; the statement that he is the manifestation of the entire plenitude of divine attributes; the statement that his is a continuous embodiment of this manifestation of Deity;

and the statement that this manifestation of Deity in Christ is "in bodily form," *σωβατικῶς*—a word intended to describe the real, corporeal nature of Christ's physical frame, and selected, doubtless, to combat expressly the notion that matter is evil.

Again, the classical passage in the Epistle to the Philipians is perhaps even more clearly a dogmatic construction of the doctrine, and that, too, in closest connection with a practical exhortation; for the Bible never conceives of doctrine as unrelated to life, or of spiritual life as capable of continuance and growth without the nourishment of doctrine. In this passage we note the careful use of *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ* to describe the condition of Christ's preëxistent activity, involving "equality with God," and of *μορφῇ δούλου* to describe his condition upon earth. *Μορφή* is "form"; the intrinsic, distinguishing peculiarity of an object; that by virtue of which it is what it is; unlike *σχῆμα*, which describes the external appearance. Hence the Apostle asserts the possession and exercise by the preincarnate Christ of the divine attributes, and the possession and exercise of real humanity after his incarnation. He also represents our Lord's self-humiliation as his voluntary act, and traces it as the work of one person from its beginning in heaven to its consummation on the cross. I shall have occasion to recur to this passage again. What I have said is sufficient to show that to this biblical writer the moral power of the incarnation rested on its dogmatic *idea*, and that, as the moral aspect led to the dogmatic, so the latter was necessary for the continuance and power of the former.

I might present other Christological passages, particularly those in the Johannean writings; but what I have adduced must suffice. They make very clear the relation of the moral and dogmatic aspects of the incarnation as it is presented in the Bible. The consequence is that this truth,

biblically considered, appears neither an abstract proposition nor a vague, unreasoned impression. It is powerful through its reality. It is presented as a living fact, supreme in its revelation of true deity and true humanity; appealing to our gratitude, our aspirations, our wondering love and hope; bringing heaven to earth and God to revealed Fatherhood, and thus truth to man. Yet it is also set forth in dogmatic form, and the dogmatic truth is authoritatively proclaimed. This, however, is only to say that it is a real truth, capable of exact statement. Being such, it is then depicted for us in the living colors of the Bible's sublime portrait of the living Christ.

3. I pass on to observe, in the third place, that the incarnation, biblically considered, stands in definitely assigned relation to other parts of God's revealed activity with respect to this world. The Bible presents this truth in its relation to other truths, and the correct observance of these relations is essential to a complete biblical view of the doctrine.

(1) Thus the incarnation, biblically considered, is related fundamentally to the biblical representation of God as a Trinity. It was the eternal Son, the divine Word, who became incarnate—not the Father, nor the Holy Spirit. At the same time the Bible teaches an harmonious action of all three Persons of the Trinity in respect to this as to other external acts. The Son became incarnate in accordance with the will of the Father, so that he spake constantly of having been sent by the Father, and of doing the work which had been given him to do. The incarnation is represented also as performed through the agency of the Spirit, the latter producing and endowing the humanity which the Son assumed, so that when incarnate he was filled with the Spirit. All this is in strict accordance with the biblical doctrine of the Trinity, in which the Son is ever represented

as the personal Agent of the Father in the accomplishment of his will *ad extra*, while both Father and Son are represented as operating by the Spirit. In such operations the Son ever manifests the subordination of office and the loving obedience toward the Father which the name "Son" implies, and in harmony with which he is represented as assuming the work of human salvation.

Now the effect of this fundamental relation, in the biblical view, between the incarnation and the Trinity is to represent the former as having been accomplished in profoundest harmony with the nature of God—a harmony so profound that the fact of the incarnation results immediately in the revelation of the triune nature of Deity. From this it further follows that the Bible does not present the incarnation as a mechanical or necessary process of evolution, but as effected upon the basis of the personal and free, though most certain, relations which it represents as existing between Father, Son, and Spirit. The Father sent and gave the Son. The Son agreed to come. The Spirit produced and endowed the human organ. These are free acts, not necessary processes. In fact, by resting its view of the incarnation on the fundamental conception of God as a Trinity, the Bible at once removes its teaching from the two extremes into which the idea of incarnation has elsewhere been carried. It appears neither as a necessary process of the self-manifestation of God, such as pantheism has taught; nor as the pagan notion of an isolated or partial appearance of deity on the part of one of the gods. Its relation to the Trinity causes the biblical view of the incarnation to present us with the idea of a real manifestation of the absolute Deity, which is yet the result of a freely devised and adopted plan on God's part, performed in strictest harmony with his revealed intrinsic nature.

This relation to the Trinity is the fundamental relation

in which the incarnation is placed by the biblical writers ; but we should next note the relation in which our doctrine is placed to the several phases of God's activity with reference to the world.

(2) Thus it is placed in relation to the work of creation. The incarnate Son is always represented as having been the Creator of the entire universe, or, more strictly, as having been the Agent through whom creation was accomplished. He is represented also as the One in whom the universe consists, "upholding all things by the word of his power." He is set forth as being, in his relation to the universe, the image of the invisible God, "the effulgence of his glory and the very impress of his nature," by whom and for whom all things in heaven and earth, both material and rational, were made. He is thus represented as sustaining to creation the position of revealed Deity, creation's Author and Lord.

Now the effect of this upon the incarnation, biblically considered, is not only to give the highest dignity to the person of our Lord, but to represent his incarnation as in harmony with, and as the culmination of, God's relation to the universe, even as we have seen it to be in harmony with the biblical representation of the nature of God himself. Thus the biblical view implies that the incarnation is not an act to which the divine Son is compelled by any force outside of himself ; but, as he is the sovereign Author of the universe, so he freely exercised his power in becoming man. Again, it is implied that he no more limited his intrinsic nature or subjected himself to unforeseen contingencies by becoming incarnate than he did by creating the universe. In both cases, indeed, he determined to work out the divine will by means of instruments created for the purpose, and to be used in accordance with the qualities bestowed upon them. Hence both the creation and the

incarnation were the beginnings of historical processes. But in neither case did the Son's transcendence over the instrument cease. As by creation he did not cease to be God, so by incarnation he did not become merely man. And then, still further, it is implied that, since the Incarnate One was the Creator, the work which he undertook in becoming incarnate is in some sense the highest operation of his creative activity. Creation is here carried to its highest point. As man is the goal of the creation of this world, so the God-man is the highest realization of that goal; and as, according to the Bible, the history of man is to be the means of supremely revealing God's glory to the entire universe, the God-man becomes not only the end of this world's formation, but the climax of the entire universe itself. Such, for example, is the teaching of the first and second chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Beginning with the Son as Creator, the writer explains his incarnation by showing that in him the promised dominion of man had been already accomplished, and would be shared by those who are in him. In the fact that Christ was the Creator the early church found a ready answer to the dualistic philosophy of Gnosticism, and by the same fact the biblical doctrine of the incarnation appears not as an isolated, unrelated fact in the scheme of nature, not even as merely exalted by the dignity of the Incarnate One, but as itself a part of the crowning work of the Creator. This is not to say that, if man had not fallen, the incarnation would still have taken place. That hypothesis lies wholly beyond the scope of the biblical survey, since the Bible looks on the introduction of sin as included in the divine plan. The hypothesis in question, therefore, is a purely unverifiable speculation. But by linking the incarnation with creation, by teaching that it was specifically the Creator who became incarnate, the Bible seems to intend

to represent the incarnation as the climax of the works of God, and in profoundest harmony, as I have said, with his relation to the world, as well as with his own internal nature.

(3) Further, the Bible places the incarnation in close relation with God's self-revelation before and elsewhere. In its view God is emphatically a self-revealing God. He may, and does, judicially give men over to blindness and hardness of soul, so that they do not see or worship him; but he is none the less self-revealing, and the revelations given through chosen men have an analogy in his wider self-manifestation in providence and nature.

I have already shown in part that the incarnation stands in organic relation in the Bible to the earlier teaching of the Old Testament concerning God and salvation. We should now add that it is set forth as giving to the church the final and complete revelation of God, so that it unites the earlier foregleams in one clear light. "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son." It could be shown that every revelation of God in the Old Testament, as holy, just, good, true, almighty, omniscient, etc., is included in the revelation of God in Christ, each quality and attribute being blended in true proportion. In fact, according to the Bible, Jesus is Jehovah. The revelation has only become more explicit with the explicit disclosure of the Trinity. "He that hath seen me," said Christ, "hath seen the Father."

But the biblical view goes farther, and represents the divine Logos not only as the Agent of creation, but also as the Agent of the moral and rational illumination of all intelligent beings. John brings this out most plainly. He says of the Logos that "in him was life, and the life was

the light of men." Of Christ he could say, "There was the true [original] light, which lighteth every man, coming into the world." In our Lord's declaration that he was the light of the world, the way, the truth, and the life—a declaration which referred, undoubtedly, to his incarnate activity—the apostle saw the historical and supreme culmination of his wider activity as the unincarnate Logos. Hence he writes in his first Epistle: "The life was *manifested*, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal [life], which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." We should observe the care and caution with which this truth is stated. There is no identification of the Logos with the reason or conscience of man. But the statement is that he is the life of the universe, i.e., its organizing, controlling, guiding principle, since, as Paul says, "in him all things consist," and that to intelligent beings this manifestation in the universe of an intelligent and ethical principle is the light which falls on their intelligences, and so provides for them a rational and ethical interpretation of existence. The thought appears to be essentially that of the Apostle Paul when he wrote to show man's accountability under the light of nature: "The invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived by the things that are made, even his eternal power and divinity." John, however, represents the Logos as the Mediator of this divine revelation, and then adds: "The Logos became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father), full of grace and truth. . . . No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son [or 'God'], which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

Thus the incarnation is set forth as the climax of the self-revelation of God. It did not occur to the biblical writers to discuss its possibility. They testify to it as a fact,

and then they show that it is the most adorable instance of that determination of God to reveal himself to his creatures to which Israel's prophets had borne repeated witness, and of which the universe itself is, in their view, but an instrument.

(4) Once more, the incarnation is related most closely of all, by the biblical writers, to the work of redemption. It is impossible for me here to discuss this most important matter completely. I can only observe that, biblically considered, the incarnation was *in order to* redemption. The biblical idea of the mode of redemption is that the Son of God, by becoming man, was enabled to, and actually did, meet the claims upon men of divine justice and law; did in his life on earth perfectly obey for them the divine will which they ought to, but cannot, perform, and did suffer and die in their place, being made a curse for them, being made sin for them; so that on the ground of his faultless righteousness those who by the Spirit are united to him are literally redeemed, soul and body, from the guilt of transgression, and will be delivered from the power of sin. It is beyond the scope of my article to prove this, but it is necessary to remark that this redemption is plainly represented, not only as the work of Christ, but as only possible through his having become incarnate, and as the immediate end of the incarnation. (Cf. Col. ii. 9-15; Phil. ii. 5-11; Heb. ii. 9-18.) The mission of the divine Son is not represented as culminating in his becoming incarnate, but in his obedience to the Father's will even unto death. He was made a little lower than the angels that he should taste death for every man. It behooved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest. The Son of man came to minister, and to lay down his life a ransom for many. The song of the saved is not an exultation over the humanity of the

Son of God, but a thanksgiving that he redeemed them unto God and washed them from their sins in his own blood.

The point to be noted is that according to this view the incarnation is not an end in itself, but the means to an end. The Bible does not teach that we are saved *by* the incarnation, but *through* the incarnation, and by the cross. As we now look back upon its relation to the Trinity, to creation, and to the self-revelation of God, we must partly correct our impressions. Not by itself is it related in the Bible to these truths, but as the first moment, the fundamental condition, of redemption. The biblical climax in Christ's life is not at Bethlehem, but at Calvary, and the incarnation appears the important biblical truth which it is because in the biblical view it is the astonishing condition of the yet more astonishing redemption of men by the sacrifice of the Son of God.

When, then, we observe the way in which the incarnation is related in the Bible to other truths, a fair idea may be formed of the way in which it was intended to be practically conceived. It appears as a free act of sovereign power and grace. It appears, more particularly, as part of a moral scheme deliberately devised by God for sufficient reasons. It is so sublime an act of wisdom, power, love, and of desire on God's part to bestow the highest life on guilty man, as to be the point where all his previous activities converge, and where his whole nature is disclosed. And yet it is not the ultimate end of the divine purposes. It provided rather the condition on which the attainment of the ultimate end depended. It is presented in the Bible as an essential part in a scheme of grace which began with the eternal counsels of the Godhead and is to end in a redeemed multitude of sons of God, who are joint heirs with the Incarnate One, and conformed unto his image, because

they have been redeemed by no less* a ransom than his precious blood.

4. Having thus endeavored to exhibit the way in which the incarnation appears to me to lie in the Bible in its relations to historical fact, to moral life, and to theological truths, I venture in conclusion to inquire briefly how, in the light of biblical statements, we are to conceive of the incarnation itself. I do so with especial reference to those aspects of the subject which have been most discussed in recent years. The greatest possible fidelity to the statements of the Bible is here required. The nature of the incarnation so entirely transcends our experience and understanding that purely philosophical constructions of it must be quite untrustworthy. The biblical student must faithfully follow the record, and not allow speculative theories to surreptitiously intrude themselves.

Assuming, then, the real and personal divinity of our Lord, we may with equal confidence affirm that the Bible attributes to him an equally real and complete humanity, both corporeal and rational. The reality of his corporeal nature I may assume to be biblical without proof. No one is now disposed to revive the early Docetic view. But the reality and completeness of his rational human nature must be equally held on exegetical grounds. He is called "the man Christ Jesus." "In all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren;" and the context of this latter statement shows that the writer had in mind both the likeness of nature and of sorrow which exists between Christ and men. Again, he is said to have become flesh, to have been born of the seed of David according to the flesh; and the usage of the term "flesh" proves that it included in such passages the mental and moral as well as the physical nature of man. Again, we read in the Philippians that he took the "*form* of a servant," where, as already

observed, "form" (*μορφήν*) means not the appearance, but the essential and distinguishing qualities. Appeal may also be made to the evidence afforded by Christ's life. He called himself the Son of man. He exhibited the features of man's mental and moral life, such as affection, sorrow, ignorance, and growth, sin alone being excluded. Certainly the biblical portrait is that of one really divine and really human, "born of the seed of David according to the flesh, declared [or defined] to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead."*

But while there is little need for me to show that the Bible presents Christ as equally and completely God and man, the question may be raised how we are, in conformity with biblical teaching, to apprehend this mysterious union. The church has replied by declaring Christ to possess two natures, including two wills and intelligences. Many modern theologians reject this dogmatic construction, and maintain that the divinity and humanity of our Lord may be regarded as two aspects of one nature, or, at least, as two sides of one consciousness, which must be considered a human consciousness, whatever may be said of the substance in which it inhered. With the philosophical basis of either view I have here nothing to do. But my article would be incomplete if I did not attempt to state the biblical evidence upon this phase of our subject.

I find myself, then, confronted with several facts which appear inconsistent with the modern theory.

* Whether "the spirit of holiness" (Rom. i. 4) describe Christ's divine nature, after the analogy of Hebrews ix. 14, or whether it describe his human spirit, in either case the Apostle teaches the reality and completeness of both the divinity and humanity of our Lord, for even on the latter view his "spirit" is represented as the organ of his divinity.

(1) First, the humiliation of our Lord, including his incarnation, is represented as a continuously voluntary act. His determination to become incarnate, and the act of becoming so, are certainly represented as voluntary. Its whole moral value is described as consisting in the freeness with which it was done. It thus became the act of self-sacrifice and self-humiliation that it was. "He who was rich became poor." "He thought not equality with God a matter for grasping, but made himself of no account, and took the form of a servant." The point, however, to which I call attention is that, after the act of incarnation had been accomplished, the incarnate life of humiliation on earth is represented as still a continuous act of voluntary lowliness. Thus, in Philippians, he not only took the form of a servant and became in the likeness of men, but, being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death. His subjugation to law is here described as a continuously voluntary act and as the continuation of the same purpose and personal determination by which he became man. So in the Epistle to the Hebrews we read: "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, himself also in *like manner* [παρομοιωσίως, "in every respect"] partook of the same." Both the act of incarnation and all his experimental identity with man were parts of one plan of voluntary self-humiliation. The same fact must appear, I think, constantly to the careful student of the Gospels, for in these Christ appears as possessing from the beginning a perfectly clear knowledge of the real work he was to do and the means by which it would be done, but as letting it appear to others gradually, and as freely choosing to hide his real glory in the somber life of popular disappointment, suffering, shame, and death. In the biblical view the self-humiliation of Christ does not appear as the resignation of a pious

man to strange providences, nor even as the vigorous and willing acceptance of shame and death by one who in the ordinary human way found such to be required of him. It appears as a continuous act of free self-abasement, beginning in the preincarnate state, and carrying out on earth the purpose for which the coming to earth had been determined. This implies, however, the continuance of his divine consciousness.

(2) Again, the incarnation is represented as not interrupting the conscious relations of the Father and the Son in the Trinity. In fact, those relations are principally revealed to us through the declarations made by or about the incarnate Son. Note, for example, the present tenses in Christ's language: "No one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal him." Observe that Christ replied to the charge that he made himself equal to God by declaring that both in view of the conscious relations between the Father and him, and in view of the office assigned him by the Father, he had a right to advance such a claim (John v. 19, etc.): "Verily, verily, I say to you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father *doing*. . . . For the Father loveth the Son, and showeth him all things that himself doeth." These words are perhaps unfathomable. They indicate the essential relationship of Father and Son as at once necessary and yet ethical. They lead us into the very mystery of the Trinity. But they also disclose this relation as continuous in the incarnation, so that, whatever addition the latter made in the consciousness of the divine Son, it did not interrupt his conscious relation to the Father. To the same effect are many other passages in the Fourth Gospel. Hence the apostle could prefix to it his summary in this language: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten

Son [or God], who *is* in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." The divine consciousness thus appears in the biblical representation along with the truly human and, therefore, limited mind of Christ, and both must be preserved in our conception of him. The divine Son did not lay aside the *μορφήν θεοῦ* when he took the *μορφήν δούλου*. It was "the being equal with God" which he did not consider a matter for grasping, and by that we are apparently to understand an external manifestation of the equality—"the glory which he had with the Father before the world was," of which he spake in the presence of his disciples as something which he had relinquished. But he could still say, "I am in the Father, and the Father in me;" "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

(3) Still again, the Sonship of Christ, as we should expect from the foregoing, is represented as absolutely unique, and the sonship of believers as something different from it. To him belongs the title "God's only begotten Son." His Sonship is eternal, though manifested in time. The Word was God, and always had been God, though he became flesh. The sonship of believers, on the other hand, is dependent on their legal and moral union with the incarnate Son of God. To them he *gave* the right to become sons of God. They are *joint* heirs with him. They have received the *adoption*. They have been born *again* after his likeness. When the two sonships are viewed purely in their moral aspects, they are, indeed, evidently alike. This illustrates the fact already stated, that in the Bible the incarnation is presented preëminently in its moral aspects. The character of the sons of God consists in conformity to the ethical relationship of the divine Son to the Father. Looking forward to the final consummation, John could write, "Beloved, now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if it shall be mani-

fested, we shall be like him ; for we shall see him even as he is." But, though ethically alike, the two sonships are represented as metaphysically different, the one being the manifestation in a man of the same personal Sonship which exists eternally in Deity ; the other being the reproduction in men, who are the creatures of God, of the divine Son's ethical relationship to the Father, that they, too, may have fellowship with him. Believers are not represented as being or becoming divine. The sole phrase which seems to imply such—viz., "that by these ye may become partakers of the divine nature"—is to be interpreted ethically, unless it is to be regarded as opposed to the rest of Scripture. Believers obtain sonship in dependence entirely upon Christ, being sons in him. Hence the two cannot be biblically considered as differing only in degree, but must be held to differ also, and most fundamentally, in kind.

(4) Once more, it appears to me that we shall most consistently apprehend the nature of the incarnation as presented in Scripture by taking as our key-word the one habitually used for the purpose by St. John. This is the word "manifested." "The life was manifested," he says, "and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;" "He was manifested to take away sins;" "He was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil." Similar language is found in other apostolic writers. Thus Peter writes of "Christ, the Lamb without blemish, foreknown before the foundation of the world, but *manifested* in these last times on your account." The term, however, is in exact accord with the point of view of the Fourth Gospel, where the life of Christ is set forth as the manifestation in the flesh of the spiritual life and light which the eternal Word mediated from the beginning of creation, but which was finally revealed for

men's salvation, in accordance with the loving will of the Father, by the redeeming work of his incarnate Son.

In modern times, however, the word which has been most widely taken as the key-word to the incarnation has been ἐκένωσεν. (Phil. ii. 7.) This has also been pressed to its literal and etymological meaning, so that the incarnation is represented as the Son's emptying himself of his divine attributes or consciousness. The incarnation is thus conceived of as the self-depotentiation of God, and the Incarnate One as consciously man alone, though, according to some writers, gradually returning again to the remembrance and finally to the exercise of what he had been, and to the full enjoyment of perfect communion with the Father. The "kenosis" has almost become equivalent, in modern theology, to this particular theory. But I am compelled to criticize this interpretation of the Apostle's language. In no other instance in the New Testament is κενόω to be pressed to its bare etymological meaning, but always signifies "to make of no account," "to esteem as nothing." (See Rom. iv. 14; 1 Cor. i. 17; ix. 15; 2 Cor. ix. 3.) Why should it be thought to denote in this case a metaphysical process of self-limitation, especially when the very object of the passage is to represent Christ as the ethical example which his people are to imitate? Moreover, the language of the Apostle is simply ἑαυτοῦ ἐκένωσεν, making the action of the verb terminate simply and emphatically on the person of the divine Son, and without expressly stating what he relinquished in becoming man. We may, indeed, infer the latter from the preceding verse, but the emphasis of the Apostle's thought is not on it, but simply on the entire absence of self-seeking and self-glorification on the part of the pre-incarnate Christ. Still further, the modern interpretation appears plainly inconsistent with the evidence which I have

already offered for the undiminished divine consciousness of Christ when doing his work on earth.

The incarnation, therefore, when biblically considered, should be described as a manifestation rather than an occultation. It is represented as a particular mode of the revelation of God. As God reveals himself in nature by acting through the agency of second causes, without destroying their reality and without contracting himself to their measure, but by using them in accordance with their nature, dwelling in and working through the physical universe, though transcending it in his own life, so we may believe that the divine Son, who is the image of the invisible God, and the Creator of the universe, united to himself a complete human nature, and manifested himself through it, in accordance with its constitution, but preserving intact his transcendence over it. This union was more intimate than that between nature and God, for it is represented as personal, so that the humanity of Christ was the immediate organ of his divinity. The result, also, was a higher manifestation of God than nature could mediate, since human nature is spiritual, and could therefore directly embody spiritual qualities. Viewed in contrast with those glories which are the natural manifestation of God's supreme excellence, the "form of a servant" was utter self-humiliation for the Son of God, while the life of obedience and the death of atonement were even more so. But viewed in relation to man's ignorance and need, and in relation, also, to the ruin in which mankind lay, it was the highest manifestation of God, disclosing in perfection his nature and his will; and it was so, according to the biblical idea, just because it was a continuously voluntary and gracious act of divine manifestation through a real human life. Such seems to me to be the biblical way of conceiving of the incarnation itself. If so, then

we cannot suppose that Christ's divine Sonship differs from ours only in degree, nor that he was possessed of but a single conscious intelligence, nor that he laid aside his divine activity when he became man. It appears to me that the church has rightly embodied the biblical teaching in her dogma of two natures, and that, far as the statement may be beyond our comprehension, it is the only existing formula which takes all the biblical facts and statements into account. To the philosophical objector the best reply is that in fact the divine and human did coexist in one historical life. It is, of course, no explanation of the mystery. But it brings to us a Master truly and consciously divine, freely revealing through a truly and consciously human life the character and will of God—a revelation which is perfectly trustworthy, because the person of Christ transcends in his divine consciousness the human; and at the same time perfectly apprehensible by us, because the medium through which the manifestation is made is as human as we are ourselves.

If now it be asked how in this view the growth and limitation of our Lord's humanity is to be reconciled with the continuance of his conscious deity, I reply that the Bible makes no attempt to reconcile them. It fearlessly affirms both, and any attempt to adjust them lies beyond the biblical survey. I cannot forbear remarking, however, that the continuously voluntary character of the self-manifestation of God in Christ appears to supply the means for such an adjustment, so far as it may be possible to our thought. For in each stage of the growth of his humanity the divine Son may be conceived as intentionally manifesting himself in accordance with the condition of his human organ. As child and boy, he manifested himself in a life natural to these stages; and, since his public ministry had not begun, nothing more was necessary. As his human

nature matured, and was, we are told, especially sanctified by the Spirit, such a life of divine revelation as is recorded in the Gospels became possible. It does not destroy the reality of his humanity, nor the bond by which it was united to his divinity, if we conceive of these as respectively used and caused by the will of the latter. He could speak and act under the limitations of his humanity. He could manifest weariness and sorrow. He could even express ignorance. He could cry, "My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" But, again, he could speak out of the undimmed consciousness of divinity, as we have seen; and even when most evidently human we may comprehend in some measure that the human was the voluntary expression of his divine love or of his freely assumed and exercised work of redemption. As it is unbiblical to suppose that the incarnation destroyed the transcendence of the Son, so, it appears to me, his genuine humanity seems the more attractive, helpful, and noble when it is regarded as the deliberate, continuous manifestation of the eternal Son of God through a medium which we appreciate by our own self-knowledge, and yet through which we can see far beyond our own limitations.

In concluding this meager study of the incarnation, biblically considered, I will only say that the Bible has accomplished for religion the marvelous work, not only of giving the idea of an incarnation which is consistent with theism and with man's responsibility, but also of actually describing an incarnate God. It has dared to present the world with the story of such a life and the portraiture of such a person; and lo! the life and the person are felt by all to perfectly fulfil the transcendent idea. We may well affirm that nothing but the historical truth of the incarnation could have produced such an idea of it as that which the Bible gives; and the best proof of the idea, in turn, is the fact of

the life of Jesus Christ. For the more closely we approach that life the more overwhelming does the conviction become that he was and is, what his church has ever confessed him, perfect God and perfect man. It will be well for the church if she keep this truth, not only in its integrity, but in just those relations and aspects in which it is presented in the Bible.

IV

THE INCARNATION HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED

CHESTER D. HARTRANFT, D.D.,
President Hartford Theological Seminary.

IV

THE INCARNATION HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED

IN tracing the history of the doctrine of the incarnation we find the dogma of the Trinity its precursor, and necessarily bound up with its solution. One cannot define the human generation of our Lord without considering the question of his preëxistence, and, therefore, of his relationship to the Father and to the Holy Spirit. Further, in any sequential presentation, we cannot always classify the discussions current in a given age in a logical way, for they do not always originate or develop in that fashion; nor can we invariably preserve the same rubrics for succeeding periods, although one is more able to do so with these affiliated themes than with some others. The limits of such an occasion do not allow any full treatment of these dogmas as they have unfolded themselves in the centuries. We must pass over great names; we must be silent about great treatises; we cannot pause for estimates or criticisms of systems. My hearers must accept a rude outline, which has as its style a necessary dryness and stiffness. Only the transcendence of the subject can give it luminosity.

I. *The First Period.*—The post-apostolic age was a singular secession from the lofty quality and penetration of its predecessor. Experience was about to essay its wings in the new air and garden bequeathed it by the parent time. The tendencies in doctrine moved in germinal forms only; they attained but little development, because there had

arisen no real argument to and fro, concerning the truths themselves; they had been accepted in their simplicity. In Clemens Romanus, Polycarp, and Diognetus, we find an unquestioning support of the evangelical belief. Christ is recognized as the Son of God, both by quotations from the New Testament and by direct assertion; as if that were a necessity of any true thought about Christ. Yet in every naming of the affiliated persons the subordination of the Son to the Father is prominent, without making any distinction between the internal and cosmic relations of the Trinity. The humanity is set forth very positively as thoroughly real, but only in historic suggestion; there is no attempt at any analysis. In the teaching of the Twelve there is not quite the same distinctness and height of affirmation. While the Son appears as one of the persons in the formula of baptism, his subordination to the Father is the predominant thought, for Jesus is the Vine and the Servant, while also Lord. The earliest hymns, it would seem, were the most strenuous witnesses to our Lord's deity. Indeed, that conviction dominated the entire liturgical thought and form, possibly even in the formulæ of baptism and the Lord's Supper in the *Didache*. With these authors the operation of the incarnate Christ concerns salvation mainly. There is a singular absence of the *Logos* idea, and of his connection with the cosmic system in any phase. The chief assault is upon the Docetic notion, but with no allusion to any specific school who professed it. Docetism must be regarded as the first effort to magnify the divine nature at the expense of the human, as well as to sustain the elevation and authority of the spirit over the body. With almost all the primary Docetists matter was viewed askance, either as evil or as lacking dignity at least. Hence to ascribe genuine corporeity to God or Christ was to degrade and enslave both. In the polemic against Docetism

the Pseudo-Ignatius is the most decided and aggressive. These letters abound in vigorous assertions of the deity and humanity of Christ as the supreme realities of religion.

In so-called Ebionism we have the attempt to maintain the divine unity intact. Hence some forms of it indulge in a Docetic interpretation of the humanity of Christ; others lay the foundations of what is generally called dynamic Monarchianism; Jesus is but a man, yet his conspicuous virtues, and certain impartations of grace and the Spirit, especially at baptism, entitle him to the highest consideration; and in some cases worship is accorded him because he is regarded as relatively divine.

Still another movement of thought appears in Hermas. Existence before creation, and, indeed, a participation in the divine councils concerning it, are affirmed, but it seems purposely to stop short of declaring the eternity of our Lord, and, therefore, his essential deity. This appears very much like the beginnings of the higher rationalism, which we shall encounter directly in the school of Antioch. The popularity of this work must have given a wide diffusion to this pre-Arian drift. The speculative tendency fills a large space in this period in what is styled Gnosticism. While Platonic in its hostile idea of evil and in much of its animus, it did not hesitate to seek the comprehensiveness which comes from the eclectic method. And nothing is more curious in the phenomenal complexity and variety of it, than its universality. It swept like an epidemic for a century and a half over Africa, Europe, Asia, and over all the provinces of these countries, and it was as many-hued as the familiar racial and local notions prevalent in the regions it decimated; and whatever its solution of the duality—whether the system proceeded from the unconscious God through his evolution into consciousness or whether it took as its first principle the non-existent and progressed

into the existent to be resolved again into the eternal blank and solitude; whether it found one or two independent beginnings with corresponding independent persons, or used the plan of single or dual emanation of æons—its main thought was to account for evil apart from God, and to eliminate this evil and ignorance from the universe, and in some cases superior knowledge itself from the psychic and higher spheres, by processes of spiritual, light-subtracting, and physical redemption. The media for this salvation were the Logos, the superior and the inferior Christ, the threefold Sonship, and Jesus. Some of these were made to stand in more or less close connection. Sophia was constituted the material channel between the divine and the human, with sufficient passion upward or downward to connect the pleroma's interest in evil with the inherent iniquity of matter; or else there was a separate creator of the hylic elements, with whom she became involved. In most cases the humanity of the Logos or the Christ was simply Docetic, because of the inherent badness of corporeity. Into the minor forms of the system, especially those that exhibited a revolutionary ethical cast, we cannot enter. Suffice it to say that the aim of this massive speculation was to vindicate and liberate the spiritual; but that spiritual was viewed ontologically only, seldom ethically. As a consequence there was little salt left, even in the best of the systems, to save them in the second generation from corrupt practices, and this, too, in their worship. The incarnation was either by an accommodating union of æons or by Docetism.

It was easy for some of these schools of thought to run into an eternal dualism, toward which Marcion and Hermogenes and parts of the Clementines incline, and which Manes elaborated so popularly.

The apologists, as a rule, were of the more educated class.

In them you have the same general views of the divinity and humanity of our Lord, the current historic conception of the incarnation, and its defense. The distinguishing element in their literature is the emphasis on the doctrine of the Logos. He is thoroughly identified with the Son of God and the Messiah. It is he who has become man and is called Jesus Christ. There is the thought of subordination, however, and not of equality, to the God who begat him. He has the second place. Then, too, he is the first product of that generation, without any sexual union, and by a unique genesis. "He is the only Son which is born as God's very own, being his Logos and Prototokos and Dunamis, who by his own will became man." Moreover, the Logos as Reason and Word is connected not only with creation, but with the whole realm of creaturehood; he is Logos Spermatikos, to whom universal human reason and thought are due, and eminently all the revelations, both among the heathen, especially in their philosophy, and among the Jews and Christians. Justin even assails a trace of modalism, although that became a more prominent feature in the earlier part of the succeeding period: "For they who affirm that the Son is the Father are proved neither to have become acquainted with the Father nor to know that the Father of the universe has a Son; who also, being the first begotten Logos of God, is even God," and he became man. We are therefore prepared to find a much higher acknowledgment of the Logos as a person begotten of the Father's substance, or the undivided essence of the Father; here is a crude and primary distinction between the person and the essence. Athanagoras and the other apologists are a little less affirmative, although clear in the deity and humanity; and with them invariably the Logos is the Son of God, and he is God.

There is still another tendency which finds the com-

pleteness of the incarnation and the Messianic conception in new revelations and a new personality. Such were the movements of Simon Magus and Dositheus, Mani, the Clementines in a way, and a no inconsiderable section of Gnosticism. In all these the action is represented as from above downward; it is not a dynamic elevation, but a descent of God to men. Genuine Montanism, however, must be distinguished from these dual incarnation systems, for that is but the expansion of the universal prophethood of believers, and the uninterrupted flow of inspiration by the Holy Spirit; it does not disturb, it rather confirms, the fundamental tenets of the Christian faith.

We see, then, that this post-apostolic age lacks definition, and it surely has little dream of analysis and synthesis of dogma. Its omissions are, indeed, remarkable; nevertheless the seeds of all the later growths are already planted. The little rills have already taken their rise from the original fountain, and are on their way to breadth of stream and violence of eddies and to volumes of rolling waters.

II. *The Second Period.*—The old Catholic Church is marked by the first attempts at determining the relations of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and these controversies, again, are potent in defining the incarnation itself. The direct Christological disputes, however, begin to put forth the earliest shoots. In the interpretation of God, dynamic Monarchianism secured a wide geographical hold. The Ebionitic name sank into desuetude, but a series of teachers and their followers in this vein appear in all quarters of the empire. While we know nothing of the positive tenets of the Alogians, their very name indicates the denial of the Logos as a person at least, and apparently they excluded the Logos records of John from their canon. We have a more positive averment of the dynamic quality in the Byzantine currier Theodotus, who brought his doctrine to

Rome, where it secured recognition from the bishop himself. His tenet conceded the intervention of the Spirit in the birth of our Lord, but allowed of no union between the divine and the human. Christ was simply man, who, however, was eminently distinguished from others by God in virtue of his righteousness. A later teacher of this group in Rome was Artemon. There remains, however, no sentence by which we can judge of his treatment of the dynamic concept. It is well to remember the claim set forth by him, that the convictions of the bishops of Rome prior to Victor (189) were of this school.

A remarkable expounder of this system was Paul, Bishop of Samosata. In order to sustain Monarchianism, he resolved the Fatherhood, the Logos, both as *endiathetos* and as *prophorikos*, and the Sophia into attributes of the one God. He conceded the intervention of the Spirit in the birth of Christ from the Virgin; but the progress of Christ into divinity was due solely to the expansion of implanted excellence and worth, or else the divine reason was imparted to him in a supreme degree, but with no other relation than that of an energy.

A peculiar dynamic subordination tendency appears in Theodotus, the banker, at Rome. Melchizedek to him was a higher manifestation of God than Christ. Our Lord was given a station second to that of the king of Salem, as if in the latter there were more of the elements of deity, and because our Lord is made a high priest after the order of Melchizedek. That servant of the Most High God he regarded as a mediator for angels, while Christ was only so for men.

The next tendency is modalistic Monarchianism, whose first appearance we have seen combated by Justin Martyr. Of course its object was to maintain the oneness of God. Its incipient phase was to identify the divine beings as

one and the same, and particularly so with regard to the Father and the Son. A variety of expressions has been left us to describe this substantive identity. The Father himself became incarnate as Son, and passed through all human experiences, but both these are movements and manifestations of the one God. It was on this account that its professors were called Patripassians. The doctrine was brought to Rome from the East by Praxeas and Noëtus, and obtained recognition among the bishops of that city, especially Callistus, which fact led to the persecution of the subordinationists. By this interpretation the reality of the humanity was thought to be preserved, as well as the unity of the Godhead to be confirmed. Certainly this was the intention; but the difficult questions of the immutability of God, and his sovereignty in the interval of the human limitations, were not answered by this exposition, and the phenomena of crucifixion and death were apt to receive a Docetic resolution.

Perhaps we may discover a subtler outline of modalism in the fragments of Beryllus, Bishop of Arabia. The pre-existence of Christ seems to have been recognized, but its distinctiveness was lost, for our Lord had not his own share in the essence, but possessed that of the paternal Godhead. This looks like a variant of the *Logos-endiathetos* theory, for apparently this paternal essence exerted no influence in forming a union with human nature by means of the supernatural birth. It would appear that, after all, Beryllus regarded Christ as a mere man, whose uplift was due to the inherent energy of his virtue, or the communicated gifts of God, or the power of the merely indwelling, but not united, Logos. Origen converted him from these errors.

The subtlest and most widely diffused cast of modalism was that of Sabellius. He carried it to Rome, indeed, but it had its strongest following in the Pentapolis. The natural

sun in the heavens is one substance, but it has three energies: the form of the periphery, the capacity of light, and the function of heat. Similarly God is a monad, at first quiescent; through expansion and contraction he assumes successively the masks of Father and of Son and of Holy Spirit, and performs their respective offices. The entire monad is in each of these manifestations, and after the respective functions are fulfilled there is the return into the original divine solitariness. The processes of incarnation and procession are set forth from the divine side; the human certainly loses its reality; the phenomena do seem masks, and carry the air of Docetism. By Sabellius we have the abundant use of the great words which enter into the portentous debate. The *hypostasis*, the *prosopa*, the *ousia*, the *homoousia*, are all in his vocabulary. And this very fact necessitated subsequent changes in their meaning, and became a barrier to their general acceptance, and led to interminable confusion in their use during the heated discussions to which we come in the next period.

The school whose teaching was reaching forward to a Trinitarian statement which could harmonize with the reality of the incarnation and the distinctness of the procession, still labored with the problem of reconciling Godhead with the facts of subordination. The interrelations of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit were not clearly distinguished from their operative conditions. The subordination was carried within the divine council itself; the facts of the ungenerate and the generate, which from human analogy seem to require a sequence, added to the difficulty. The use of the speculative terms of the Logos as *endiathetos*, and as afterward *prophorikos*, complicated the problem still more. Another element of disturbance was the identification of the Sophia of Proverbs with the Logos;

and the famous passage viii. 22, according to the Septuagint, read: "The Lord created me a beginning of his ways for his works." Had they but known their Hebrew! Subordination, then, had to begin at its lowest rung in Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, and work its way out of the chaos into order and light.

Out of the multitude of writers of this period, Eastern, Western, notably the presbyters whom Irenæus quotes, Irenæus himself, one of the chief intellects of this date in determining the old Catholic faith, Hippolytus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, together with the incipient church creeds so frequently alluded to and quoted by them, the following tendencies became apparent:

(a) Subordinationism. The extreme statement of this was made by Dionysius the Great when he declared that the essence (*ousia*) of Christ was as alien to that of the Father as the husbandman to the vine and the sailor to the boat, and was like a work which had no existence before it was produced. This extreme utterance was really designed for a polemic against Sabellianism. Athanasius apologizes for him. Indeed, the unfortunate sentence verges on the later Arian position; but under the persuasion of his namesake at Rome, he withdrew his objectionable phraseology. While in general the deity of Christ is confessed, and, therefore, the distinctness of his hypostasis, he nevertheless is called, as previously, the second God, or as a God after the God. Origen also urges a difference of *ousia*, while in other places he dwells upon Christ's selfhood, his self-activity, his distinctness of attributes.

(b) The persons begin to be distinguished, and the essence is viewed in its differentiation from the personality. The attributes are mainly connected with the hypostasis, while the nature, or the essence, is looked upon ontologically or as

simple being. But one is in danger of confusion, owing to the lack of clear statement as to the meaning of the terms, especially those which had been employed by Sabellius.

(*c*) The Logos is now one of the chief terms in the theology, especially of the Alexandrian school under Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen. The spermatic quality is one of the dominating thoughts. The affinity of the Word and Wisdom and Will with all nature and all humanity is beautifully set forth; a truth that Occidental theology, alas! has lost sight of these many centuries, to its own narrowness, to its own aridity, to its hostility, indeed, to the beauty and import of the divine handiwork, and to the life of the heathen; to the suppression of even a poetry of nature, and to the injury of the loftiest conceptions of art. Then, too, the Logos, in his alliance with revelation and redemption, received a stronger accent by men of the East than of the West.

(*d*) The doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son was propounded by Origen, not only as a solitary unique act, but as a perpetual procedure; the Father always generates the Son. The disposition to suggest analogies with human conception and birth, the obtrusive effort to unveil the mystery in physical explanations, is indignantly repressed by the chief theologians. They leave it as a proposition not to be resolved by reason, but to be received as a fact by faith.

(*e*) Tertullian draws attention to a threefold process in the filiation of Christ, which is an enlargement on the Philonic Logos: (1) the immanence of the Son in the Father; (2) the projection of the Son alongside of the Father in the process of creation; and then (3) the Son's incarnation. This forges a logical link between the Son of God and the Son of man; it prepares the way for the development of that theory of the incarnation which will soon meet us.

In the direct Christology of this period, while there are variations of statement in each author, while there is by no means a consensus between different writers even on the more important topics, all do agree in the supernatural conception, in the exceptional quality of the humanity, although its general similarity with our nature is insisted upon; and a certain method of union between the human and the divine is instituted. Let us look at the prominent features in this doctrine:

(a) The generation. As usual, the curious pry pruriently into this mystery; but the greater minds are content with the historic statement; the participation of the Father and of the Holy Spirit in the mystery is recognized; the virginity of Mary is an absolute belief; the Logos presence in the conception is generally accepted, although some think that the divine linked itself with the human after the birth of the child. The blessed union of God and man is a theme of devoutest song and creed.

(b) There is, however, a great obscurity as to the exact nature of Christ's human constitution. The majority of the orthodox are dichotomists. They, for the most part, insist on the body and the soul as components of the man Jesus. But the *nous* of the soul is viewed by some as not a human intelligence; the divine Logos or reason is presumed to have taken its place, and the nexus of the human and divine is found herein. This is an anticipation of Apollinarianism. Some also waver in attributing human necessities and weaknesses, appetite and passion, to the body of Christ, and they are apt to practise a moderate Docetism in the matter of sleep and eating and drinking; notably Clemens Alexandrinus. There were others, again, who held that Christ brought a physical frame with him from heaven; it was a celestial body in which the Logos dwelt. Such was the anxiety to preserve the divinity and majesty of Jesus un-

tarnished. So difficult is it for men to see that, apart from the religious and ethical problems involved, the way of God is always the best, and is the highest and the dearest to himself, whether it lead through lowly tracks or through the most exalted spiritual realms.

(c) The union between the human and divine was not defined, except in the attempt to substitute the Logos for the intellect. Nor were the qualities of the natures differentiated with any accuracy; nor was the relation of the person to the natures made clear, although the bent was to regard the person as the Logos, and therefore divine. Yet in this lay the entire area of future Christological controversy. There was already the vocable *Deus-homo* or *Theanthropos*, and the inclination of the Alexandrians especially was to glorify the divine and minify the human. Indeed, some dared even indulge the conviction that with the ascension of Christ the human nature, body and all, disappeared entirely. With a school like that of Antioch under Lucian, although we have no definite records, it is sufficiently evident that the standpoint was to exalt the humanity at the expense of the divinity, and to make the union of the two natures a mere relation, without a vital interplay.

There are distinct utterances, too, as to the use of the divine attributes in the incarnate sphere. The word $\kappa\rho\upsilon\psi\iota\varsigma$ is already employed to describe the reserve of omniscience and omnipotence; it was contemplated as a necessary stage of the humiliation.

It is noteworthy that the testimony is universal as to the sinlessness of our Lord, even by the majority of the dynamic theologians.

(d) Probably the best summary of the general belief is found in the statement of Tertullian's creed:

"We believe, indeed, in the one God only, nevertheless, in this dispensation which we call economy. So that there

is a Son of this one only God, his own *Sermo*, who proceeded from himself, through whom all things were made, and without whom not anything was made. He was sent by the Father into the Virgin, and was born of her, Man and God, Son of man and Son of God, and called Jesus Christ."

The creed of Cæsarea gives us even a fuller Christology :

"Following the evangelical and apostolic tradition, we believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the Demiurge and Maker and Forethinker of all things.

"And in one Lord Jesus Christ, his Son, the only begotten God ; through whom all things came into being ; who was begotten before the æons, from the Father, God from God, the whole from the whole, the only from the only, the perfect from the perfect, King from King, Lord from Lord ; the living Logos, wisdom, life, genuine light, way, truth, resurrection, shepherd, door ; unchangeable and unalterable ; the immutable image of the Godhead, and of the essence, and of the will, and of the power, and of the glory of the Father ; the first-born of all creation. Who was in the beginning with God ; through whom all things became, and in whom all things consist ; who in the last days came down from above and was begotten of the Virgin, according to the Scripture, and became man ; the mediator between God and man ; the Apostle of our faith and the Prince of life, as he says : ' I have come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him who sent me.' "

III. *The State-church Period.*—This stage is remarkable for its ecclesiastical settlement of the fundamental points in the doctrine of the Trinity, and for its equally distinctive and authoritative definitions in points of Christology. It is, indeed, the age of largest and fiercest controversy, as well as of political interference. The union of church and state in a Cæsaropapistic form had its influence upon the

decisions reached. All sides invoked the imperial force, and all sides in turn felt the humiliation which issued from this perversion of the divine kingdom's liberty.

1. The slumbering rationalism of Antioch asserted itself in the heart of Alexandria under the leadership of Arius, a pupil of Lucian. His chief theses, not without manifest contradiction, were :

(*a*) That there was a time in which Christ did not exist. He is a Son; he is begotten, and not ungenerate. From not being at all, he exists.

(*b*) God was not always the Father, but became one afterward.

(*c*) Christ has no part of the unbegotten one in him; he is not of the Father; he has no property in the essence of the Father.

(*d*) He is a creature and a product; Christ is not true God, but he partakes of God and is deified. He was made before all other things, and not out of anything that exists, and is a product of the divine will.

(*e*) The Son does not know the Father accurately, nor does the Logos see the Father perfectly; therefore he does not have absolutely complete powers. He is susceptible of increase and decrease. He is subject to all the changes of a creature.

(*f*) He is not the genuine and only Logos of the Father, but is simply Logos and Sophia nominally, and by grace he is said to be a Son and a Power. We have here an adoptive idea of the Sonship.

2. The discussion which now arose led to the maintenance of :

(*a*) The identity of Logos, Wisdom, the Son of God, and Jesus.

(*b*) The reality of the Sonship, and therefore the reality of the generation.

(c) The definition of the perichoresis or inner relation of the Trinity: the Father unbegotten, the Son generated, the Spirit the object of procession.

The dogma that the Son was God, consubstantial with God, having the same attributes, distinct in person, that he was therefore eternal.

To attain this end a minority in the Council of Nice persuaded the majority—who, indeed, held to the deity of Christ, as their church creeds proved—to accept the definitive term *homoöusios* as the positive exposition of the sameness of essence. In spite of its previous Sabellian coloring, that seemed the only word that would settle the point at issue; and it did win the day, and determined the central dogma of the church Catholic.

It is well to note here, also, the phraseology of the symbol concerning the human Sonship as over against the Arian conception. After dwelling upon his creative energy, it says: "Who on account of us men, and for our salvation, descended, and became flesh, and became a man." The great end of the incarnation was for the help of humanity, for the salvation of the men who live, who stand in relations, who are in sin, who struggle to better things or sink to lower, who suffer, who die. This is the noble, sacrificial, salvatory end of the incarnation as defined by the Nicene Symbol. It is a universal benefit, for conferring which the benign Logos became also a Son of man.

Into the Trinitarian and Arian battles that ensued after Nicæa, we cannot enter, nor criticize the temper and fierceness and cruelty and falsehood of most of its participants. We may only indicate the suggestions of religious and political compromise in order to escape from the dread and final *homoöusia*. These were mainly four:

(a) The substitution of Homoiousianism, or similarity of substance.

(b) The adoption of Homoism as indicating general sameness, without distinct reference to the substance.

(c) The theory of Anomoism, or total unlikeness.

(d) The dropping of all allusion to the controverted point.

But the Homoöusia triumphed, and the state church finally determined its Christological belief to be:

“We believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God; who was born of the Father before all æons; Light of Light, true God from true God; begotten, not made; consubstantial with the Father; through whom all things were made; who on account of us men, and for our salvation, descended from the heavens, and became flesh from the Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin, and was made man.”

Athanasius is doubtless the best Greek expositor, historically, scripturally, and practically, of the Nicene theology, although by no means the best logician. The treatise on the Incarnation is the positive counterpart of his Apology, and is full of heart and of most loving appeal to accept the excellent way of God in Christ. The incarnation answers the deep needs of man, and that is his choicest argument. In the other treatises there is, with the fascinating history of the momentous debate, a repetition of the arguments, mainly drawn from Scripture. The three Cappadocians made no real progress in the debate. At first they found it difficult to cut loose from the very positive subordination views of Origen. Hilary carried the Athanasian fervor to the West with a superior light, and sometimes fought single-handed against the Arian politicians. It was Augustine, however, who brought a new speculation to bear upon the doctrine of the Trinity. He vacated the Eastern starting-point, as we see it particularly in the Nicene Symbol of God the Father Almighty. He begins

with the one triune God. He also ceases to consider them chiefly in their personal relationship, and builds upon the psychological analogy in man, who has memory, intelligence, and will, and yet it is the one man who possesses and exercises these faculties. Alas! his analogy fails him, and although he confesses the insufficiency thereof he ever recurs to it. The correspondences in the Trinity are wisdom, consciousness, and love. But these are not persons, though they be functions of personality. It was this treatment which gave tone to almost all the subsequent Western treatises. Yet Augustine's work on the Trinity—the affectionate labor of thirty years—will always remain a high classic on this theme. The *Quicumque* contains the clearest result of the *fides Catholica*, asserting the Trinity, guarding against confusion of the persons, upholding the unity of the Godhead; for the three alike are *incretatus, immensus, æternus, omnipotens*, and yet these are all predicates of the one nature. So a bulwark against tritheism is erected. Then the true perichoresis is stated: the Father was not made nor created nor begotten; the Son is from the Father alone, not made nor created, but begotten. Therefore in this Trinity there is no precedence, but coequality; it does not advance to the economic moment. These are the main conclusions in which the Western Church rested for centuries. The Eastern had more positive struggles with tritheism and tetratheism. There were also two curious phases of Logos teaching:

(a) The one by Marcellus of Ancyra, which represented the Logos as first in a state of quiescence and then of drastic energy, issuing from God in his operative occasions. But the Son of God was not preëxistent; that name was won by the drastic Logos in the earthly sphere; it applied only to the Christ of the Gospels.

(b) Photinus seems to have made a still broader gulf be-

tween the Logos and the Son of God. It would appear that he had inclined to a more dynamic view of the humanity of our Lord.

The mystic tendency developed by Dionysius the Areopagite places its goal in the undisturbed enjoyment of the divine vision. The incarnation is esteemed as the medium for disclosing its possibility, especially through the sacraments. The human life of Christ, however, has no place in the system, which really has more to do with the preëxistent Logos after the sacramental grace is once established; it loses itself in a contemplative ecstasy. But this phase of belief, although it originated in the East, exerted an immense influence in all branches of the church, and does so to-day.

Let us now turn to the more directly Christological unfoldings of this period.

(a) As we have already seen, the Arian dip subjected Christ as a creature to mutations. It also limited him on his preëxistent side, but made him susceptible of progress therein, as well as in the human sphere. It has the merit, however, of drawing a profounder attention to the humanity, especially to its capacity for development. In many cases, however, the boundary-lines were conceived of as having in them the possibilities and even probabilities of sin. Arius himself held that the human nature was peccable. The opinions of Aetius and Eunomius tended to nullify even the superior qualities of our Lord's earthly life, and to make him all too much like one of us.

(b) The theandric drift also manifested itself unduly. The Alexandrians were prone to this; Athanasius himself thought that the humanity was well-nigh lost in the union with the divine. Hilary, in the West, reflected much of the sensitiveness that characterized Clemens Alexandrinus on this question.

(c) The problem of the union was taken up with decision in this period first by Apollinaris. His theory was that of a trichotomous constitution, consisting of the body, the un-reasoning soul, and the reasoning soul. Now in Christ the Logos took the place of the rational soul. This was not the incarnation itself, which lay in the fact of the Logos becoming flesh, but it did furnish the basis of the union and the unity as well. Here would be the throne of the thought and the will, by which the entire human life might be kept in harmony with the divine moral necessity. This would prevent a wrong choice; it would also compel an upward development of both soul and body. And this too furnished the fairest opportunity for the interpenetration of the divine into the human. The decision of the councils, however, affirmed the completeness of the human constitution of Christ; he had a rational and an appetent soul and a body, or a spirit, soul, and body, according to another psychological view. Such was the confirmation of the perfect humanity of our Lord.

(d) There came next into dispute the way in which the two natures stood related to one another. The Alexandrian tendency was to make it a real, natural unity, and in such wise, (1) according to one position, that the human was more and more absorbed into the divine; and, (2) according to another impression, that there resulted a *tertium quid*, namely, a real *Theanthropos*, an entirely unique genus, a God-man. Both persuasions began to posit other mediators, especially by elaborating the cult of Mary. She was adored as the *Theotokos*. This second shade of the physical unity developed into Monophysitism, whose profession subsequently led to a permanent division in the church. In the evolution of this doctrine such refinements of discussion arose as these: Had Christ a corruptible body or not? Again, although he was a Son, was his body cre-

ated? Others, again, believed that he had brought a divine body with him into the earth. We cannot enter into phases of conciliar action regarding these larger and smaller debates; we must confine ourselves to indicating the main trend.

The Antiochans, on the other hand, made the union consist in a mere contact—*synapheia*. In some writers the sharpest lines were drawn between the dual elements, but as a rule the theologians held to the dignity of the human nature, and worshiped it with the divine. They also desired to separate the majesty and glory of the divine from all the limitations and suffering of humanity; they did not like such expressions as *Theotokos*, or the phrases that depicted God as subject to anguish or as dying on the cross. They allowed for but little intercommunion of the attributes, whether as between person and natures or as between the natures themselves. In their study of the manhood of Jesus the following theses were asserted:

(a) That Christ in his humanity is peccable, although he did not sin.

(b) That in his humanity he was ignorant of many things and was capable of learning and improvement; in other words, his manhood was progressive. This agnostic thought had its representatives, strange to say, among the Monophysites also—such are some of the cross-purposes of theology.

(c) That there was, therefore, a manifest chasm between the divine and the human; there was no interplay of the attributes.

(d) That, consequently, the humiliation of Christ involved the kenosis of the divine attributes, the actual surrender of exercise, although again here some held only to the voluntary concealment of them.

(e) There was a sort of parallel, after a favorite habit of Gnosticism, between the life of Christ in the incarnation

and onward and the redemption of the race. Christ as the man was put in constant harmonized comparison with the race as a whole.

(f) That his human nature is without personality. The person is divine in which the divine nature subsists, and into which the manhood is assumed. On the other hand, there was a certain trend, and claim as well, for a dual personality corresponding to the two natures.

These conflicting schools, with alternating success, finally closed their individual preferences in the compromise of Chalcedon, whose symbol is of the highest Christological import.

The subsequent efforts to win the Monophysites led to such concessions as theopaschism, a compromise which involved a real physical unity. And still later the effort to establish, by imperial decree, the monotheletic tenet that there is but the one will and theandric energy in Christ, was another such surrender. The church, however, refused to accede, and insisted on a dyotheletic confession—that is, a will and energy for each nature. Will and doubtless consciousness were thus taken from the person and centered in the natures, an important psychologic result, which reappears in Protestant Christological researches.

One of the clearest statements of these Christological conclusions is to be found in the *Quicumque*. As to the incarnation it teaches that Christ is:

1. The Son of God from the substance of the Father, begotten before the ages; and that God is man from the substance of his mother, and born in the world.
2. Perfect God, as before shown in the section on the Trinity; perfect man also, having in his constitution a rational soul and human flesh.
3. Equal to the Father according to divinity, inferior to the Father according to his humanity.
4. He is the only, the one Christ, not by conversion of

the Godhead into flesh, but by the assumption of humanity into God.

5. One altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person.

6. For as the rational soul and the flesh constitute one man, so God and man constitute the one Christ.

The writers who finally shaped the Greek theology on these points were Leontius of Byzantium and John of Damascus. We would draw attention to a few of the distinguishing points of the latter :

1. God was never without the Logos ; rather, the Logos is generated from him. He is enhypostatic, not like our reason or utterance ; he never lives apart from God.

2. The genesis of the Son of God was without time and without beginning ; for he was not produced from non-existence into existence. He is the splendor of the glory, the impress of the substance of the Father ; the living wisdom and power ; the Logos who is enhypostatized. He is coeternal with the Father. His divine generation must be distinguished from creation.

3. The generation itself is eternal. He is of the same eternal essence, just as fire and light are simultaneous. The perichoresis, so far as the dyad is concerned, consists in this : the Father is ingenerate, the Son is generate ; for he is of the essence of the Father, begotten outside of time, and without beginning. He is not an organon or instrument, but a native force.

4. John ascribes properties to the persons and hence to the person of Christ. There are also *idiomata* of the divine nature. The persons are in one another, yet without confusion and mixture ; so with the natures of Christ. It is the Logos-person, who is incarnated through Mary. The *idiomata* of person and natures are communicable. Beyond the theology of John of Damascus the Greek Church made no progress in these themes.

From him we turn to the new periods of world and church history.

IV. *The Western Germanic State Church.*—The orthodox ecclesiastical statements add nothing to the theme under review. But there are certain revivals of ancient trends, which once more lead to repetitions of the old arguments, with here and there a valuable contribution.

(a) The theory of adoptionism was projected by certain Spanish bishops, and after being suppressed in its birth-place, it was some centuries later resuscitated in parts of southern Germany and Italy. The central teaching was that Christ was indeed the Son of God, by nature divine; in his humanity, however, he bore that title, not by birth, but by adoption, just as we are incorporated into the heavenly household. This theory, of course, would lead to the rupture of the continuity of the Sonship, and assuredly militates against the identity of the Logos and Jesus.

(b) It is sufficient to mention the unseemly inquiries into the physiological conditions of the conception and birth and nurture of our Lord. These, however, were very favorite topics. The Mary and Anna cult, as a consequence, took considerable access in this medieval period.

(c) Peter Lombard taught that Christ was born sinless; that it was the divine nature rather than person that was incarnated, and that Christ in his human nature was not an individual; he had no independent being, because he was impersonal; he was rather *aliquid* than *aliquis*; or, as the Master's enemies expressed it, God became nothing in the incarnation. Strong as the trend toward eviscerating the humanity had become even in the West, this caused a bitter controversy. He was charged with nihilism because of this neutralization of the manhood. The controversy served to bring into clearness, especially through Walter of St. Victor, the psychological position

of the church, that nature, although destitute of a distinct personality, does not lose its claim to individual being. From which it ought to have followed, that will and consciousness are predicates of the nature rather than of the person as such.

(*d*) The speculative idealism of John Scotus Erigena. The Trinity with him is rather appellational and attributive; the names signify no functions. In his evolutionary pantheism the period of the Son is simply a great unformed, undistributed, and unconscious aggregate. From its mixed features the Spirit comes to individualize and separate and complete. The Son is idealized as a potency, and yet is not God. Nor does the historic Christ come into any full connection with this idealized Christ of the primal universe. But in him all the race is viewed as inherent; what he does every man does. We participate in the work wrought by him; we are treated as one in him and he in us. The incarnation, and hence the redemption, is universal. In this speculation lay much of the force afterward developed in some phases of mysticism and in the idealism of modern times. While he drew vastly from the Pseudo-Dionysius, his Christological bent was not sacramental, but pantheistic, which viewed all as a monad.

(*e*) It is well, also, to remember the enormous growth of the sacramental Christology in the medieval church, both by its elaborate symbolism and particularly by the doctrine of transubstantiation, a creative act, whereby the chosen elements of nature are converted into the body and blood of Christ, which in turn leads to the reception into the entire constitution of man—body, soul, and spirit—of the complete human Christ—and why not of the divine? Thus does the dearest mystery become a base act of eating, and symbolism is inverted; as with the cradle, so with the cross; as with the cross, so with the body that suffered thereon.

(*f*) An old conception was restored by Rupert of Deutz. He claimed that the incarnation had a cosmic purpose independent of salvation. Christ would have come even if the first Adam had not sinned. It was a necessity of the divine idea to complete the universal order; to give the crown to manhood; to bestow also upon Adam what he would not have been able to attain without the fall. This conception, however, obtained no ecclesiastical nor extended scholastic recognition; but it did find much acceptance among the mystics, both of the scholastic and the free orders, and among some of the Reformers before the Reformation.

(*g*) The Anselmic interpretation of the incarnation was soteriological. Christ became flesh to connect himself with our salvation; it was the preparation for the temptation, the ministry, and the cross, in their vicarious features. The coming of Christ into the flesh would not have been a part of the divine economy had not man fallen and made his future endlessly hopeless, unless he were restored through the interposition of God's love and the Son's generous will.

Into many minor questions of the medieval theologians we cannot enter. They all seek to identify quality with personality; to require of an abstraction that it shall live; of an idea that it shall be, after all, a congeries of ideas, and so become being. Thought and being, or will and being, or love and being—these are asserted to be the same, but they refuse to lose their distinctness. Aquinas makes intelligence the Father and will the Son, while the Holy Ghost is their mutual love; and Duns Scotus demands of intelligence that it desire and so produce the Son, and that it reflect and so spirate the Holy Spirit; while scholastic mysticism sought to make love and God identical.

The inadequate treatment of the incarnation after Anselm

was doubtless due to the growing usurpation of mediatorial functions by the church.

The nominalism of Roscelinus led him to regard substance as a term only; for if the three persons were actually consubstantial, he claimed that they would each have to be incarnated in Christ. But we may argue, that if there be no point of unity in the one essence, the Triad must be resolved into a tritheistic group; he would give us three independent Gods. The harmony of the incarnation and its purpose would be entirely destroyed. This was a uniform danger of nominalistic philosophy, as tetratheism was for the realists.

-Medievalism adds really nothing substantial to these great doctrines, for the simple reason that it did not study the Scriptures in their clear, plain meaning. With the elaborate allegorical system of interpretation there remained no sure foundation in the books of revelation. Even the philosophic principles were borrowed from the worn systems of Plato and Aristotle. With all the acuteness, and sometimes astuteness, of the schoolmen, they carry us into no worthy new fields, and do not expand or cultivate the old.

V. We now turn to the *Modern Period*.

(a) In the Roman Church there has been no further authoritative attempt to define the Trinity or any point of Christology, save by the tenet of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, "the doctrine which holds that the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, in the first instant of her conception, by a singular privilege of the grace of Almighty God, through the protection of the merits of Christ Jesus, the Saviour of the human race, was preserved free from all stain of original guilt." Even this does not go much beyond Peter Lombard, and is a pitiful result.

(b) The Greek Church, in its theologians and confessions, remains by the conclusions of John of Damascus. While

it elaborates the doctrine of the Virgin, it does not attain the logical result of the Roman statement of the tenet. Thus in Dositheus: "We believe that the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, made the kenosis; that is, he assumed in his hypostasis the human flesh from the Holy Spirit in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and so was conceived and incarnated, and was born without giving pain or throes to his own mother, according to the flesh, and without lesion of her virginity." Philaret's catechism contributes no new research in either rubric bearing upon the incarnation. Its exposition of the various phases of the creeds is generally clear and excellent. It confines itself, in accordance with the symbol it interprets, to the soteriological view of the incarnation.

(c) Protestantism. As we turn to the religious revolution we note:

1. The attempt to restore the mediatorial office to Jesus Christ, as the Prophet, the Priest, and the King, and, therefore, to banish all inferior intercessions and authorities from heaven or from earth.

2. The attempt to live in the direct dependence of faith upon the all-sufficient work of Christ, and to imitate his holy example, as the standard of religion and morals.

3. The attempt to simplify the concept and number of the sacraments, so as to deliver the church and nature from the incubus of a false symbolism.

4. The attempt to ascend to the spiritual directly, to lift the heart to the right hand of God, or to recognize Jesus and the Holy Spirit as present invisibly, rather than to bring down God into all visibility and into the sphere of sensuous perceptions.

5. The attempt to come to the Scriptures as plain books, with no esoteric teaching to be obtained by either allegorical or churchly keys.

Now all these inward upheavals, this longing for liberty and simplicity, this assertion of freedom in Christ back and forth, necessarily caused a revival of theological study. But in the beginning there was not so much research concerning the affiliated doctrines under consideration as one would think, simply because the great councils had given a bond of union for Romanism, Grecism, and Protestantism. These matters were not in dispute; there was at least the outward consensus. The Protestant symbols contain no new element in the discussion, save in two respects. In the progress of the controversy concerning the Lord's Supper, Luther defined the relation of the two natures as one of intercommunion of attributes, whereby he substantiated the ubiquity of Christ's body. Certainly there had been much loose language as to the interrelation of the natures. What influence they exerted upon one another, and how they were coördinated in their thought and energy, had never as yet been logically determined. In the progress of the Lutheran side of the discussion the following thoughts appeared :

1. The human nature is capable of the divine. It can be enlarged enough to receive not only its impartations, but can be used as a vehicle or instrument for the infinite and the eternal.

2. The attributes are attributes of the natures, and not of the person exclusively.

3. The bond of union is not in the person, but in the natures; the perfect interpenetration and communion of their proper qualities do produce the true unity, and in that the union must be found.

4. The development of this humanity largely ceased to be ethical from the Lutheran standpoint; progress in character through self-determination and through the exercise of native virtues was put into the background, because of the transcendent infusion of the divine nature.

It is true that the Melanchthonian section controverted some of these points, and that many conceived multipresence to be a better idea than ubiquity; but the compromise in the Formula of Concord left the burden of victory with the ultra-Lutheran division. After that symbol has handled the reality of the union and guarded against the confusion of natures, it states the attributes of each. Those of the human are mainly physical; there is, strange to say, not a solitary lineament of the moral image of God as a counterpart of the divine. Then the intercommunion of these natures is aggressively stated, and hence, too, God is man and man is God. The Virgin Mary conceived and bore the true Son of God; she is truly the *mater Dei*. The threefold division of the *communicatio* obtained quite a recognition in later stages of the debate:

1. That by which the two natures imparted their attributes to the person—*genus idiomaticum*.

2. That by which the person imparted its qualities to the natures—*genus apotelesmaticum*.

3. That by which the divine nature conferred its energies upon the human—*genus majesticum*.

4. A fourth was suggested later, namely, the *genus tapeinoticon*, by which the human imparted its qualities to the divine.

The Reformed churches, in this discussion, varied between different positions:

1. A tendency to hold the strictest lines of divergence between the natures, and especially to a denial of the capacity of the human for the divine. A great wall was raised between the infinite and the finite.

2. A purpose to confine to the divine person the greater work of our salvation.

3. Others, again, acknowledged the God-man's agency as a unit in redemption.

4. An insistence upon the operation of the Logos *extra carnem* as continuous, while the Logos with the human nature also performed its offices.

5. They did allow the humanity to work more independently, religiously, and ethically within its own limits, and made much of the office-work of the Holy Spirit, and the general development under infusions of grace, and the exercise of native sinless powers, especially in the earthly ministry.

The original Melanchthonian tendency, and the Crypto-Calvinistic movements, and the later freer attitudes of the faculties of Helmstädt and Tübingen gradually brought many of the Lutherans to a position very similar to that of the Reformed on this question.

And here it will be well to note the most philosophic and scriptural view of this period—that which was modestly averred by Caspar Schwenckfeld. He held to the general definitions of the church in all enunciated points, but beyond that he drew attention to the fact that while the identities of Christ's humanity are many, there are also differences. There is the sinlessness; there is the union itself; but there is also the fact that God was his Father, in the incarnating process. He is as truly the Son of God by his human birth as he is by the eternal generation, and that to no prejudice of the elements derived from his holy mother. Moreover, it is the law of humanity to be a partaker of the divine nature; it must be supereminently so of a humanity thus divinely produced. Its obligation of progress bears equally upon body, soul, and spirit, Godward and in God-similitude, to be a partaker of God; but this is not a sharing in Christ's own divine nature; he does not participate in himself, we must observe, it is in the general Godhead. The natures are never confused by this progress; although the resemblance increases, it can never become immer-

gence, and it can never be consubstantial. This seems the most scriptural of all the Christologies, and contains within itself the most symmetrical and proportionate explanations of the incarnation. And while the Reformer limits its purpose in its first step to the soteriological idea, and is agnostic as to what ought to have been done by God had not Adam fallen, he holds to the accompanying cosmic effects of that indwelling in the flesh. All nature is concerned in it as connected with man, and participates in the glories of the filial redemption.

An allied question in this period was, What disposition did the Logos make of the divine attributes and functions in the state of humiliation? How could the human nature be ignorant of certain divine facts and suffer under various other limitations? How could Christ exert his authority if he laid aside his powers? The general attitude of the Lutherans in the secondary Reformation years is expressed in the Formula of Concord: "In the state of humiliation Christ deprived himself of the majesty which was always his, and remained so in the personal union. Wherefore he did not always make use of this majesty, but only when it seemed good to him." The theologians of Tübingen held to the possession, and made the kenosis consist in the concealment, of these attributes. Christ had them under his control, and exercised them, or not, in a hidden way, so that he would appear wholly as man, while a God incognito. Probably few controversies in the Lutheran body have been more bitter than this. Others, following the University of Giessen, claimed the possession of the attributes, but the surrender of their use on occasion; and this became the dominant opinion. In our own century the reopening of this question has led to the following positions:

1. That the Logos, after all, does not possess necessarily the complete divine attributes. Being capable of change,

he elected to strip himself of these qualities and become entirely a man; and subsequently regained, through the exaltation, his original condition.

2. That the Logos has emptied himself of the non-ethical attributes of omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence during the earthly career.

3. That the Logos has the capacity to reduce his powers into the human and finite limits, so that they shall be operative only in the bounds of the human nature.

4. That the Logos lays aside his consciousness and is guided solely by the human consciousness and development.

5. That the Logos put by his *δόξα*, toward whose resumption in its fullness, with the addition of human glory, his ministry and suffering and triumph prepare him.

Such are some of the solutions proposed for this mystery. There is not one of them that satisfies either reason or Scripture or the desire of man; and yet the study thereof must not be vacated.

The clearest and noblest discussion of the Trinity and the person of Christ, among the Reformation giants, is that by John Calvin. Not to analyze his thought, which adds nothing new to our problem, I would yet draw attention to his own attitude toward definitions of terms in these dogmas: "If, then, the words have not been rashly invented, we should beware lest we be convicted of fastidious levity in rejecting them. I could wish them, indeed, to be buried in oblivion, provided this faith were universally received: that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are the one God; and that, nevertheless, the Son is not the Father nor the Spirit the Son, but that they are distinguished from each other by some peculiar property. I am not so rigidly precise as to be fond of contending for mere words." While he defends the Nicene and Chalcedonian definitions with lucidity, I have adduced this testi-

mony rather as (1) a defense of his breadth and simplicity; (2) as a voice from the far Reformation century akin to the sounds of discontent in our day, which criticize the ancient terms for their inadequacy, and cry for a return to utter simplicity in stating the theory of the immanent Trinity.

Protestantism moved from its first confessional attitude in the Reformation, to the scholastic theologies, built on the symbols. There were colossal theologians, Lutheran and Reformed, the latter of every nationality; there were colossal systems, but they did not move beyond the confessions. In breaking up the deadness of this level, two powerful factors were set in play, philosophy, inductive and subjective, and rationalism. This was followed by a period of idealism, paralleled by criticism, especially of an historical cast; and so we reach our day. The doctrines of the Trinity and the incarnation have passed through those gradations. We cannot trace them chronologically in each of these stages. We must be satisfied with the effort to group the different modern trends. Narrow, indeed, are the circles of human thought. The ancient world had all the germs, and considerable unfolding of the possible phases, of our doctrine, and it is, after all, mainly in the old categories that we must now move. The West seeks to break loose from the Augustinian analogies, even though it may resort to abstract statements of the immanent Trinity. Many, also, stand in open revolt against ecumenical definitions. We may note:

1. The revival of subordination theories. These are especially apparent in the Arminian theologians. The immanent Trinity was idealized by some, and made to give place to the economic order. We may adduce Clericus, who says, in effect: The eternal Spirit is compelled to maintain within himself many orders of thought at the same time. The threefold self-determination of God agrees

well with the thought of numerical unity. Through a peculiar process of thought God presents himself as Father; through two others as Son and Spirit. These processes of thought are within the circle of God himself. They do proceed into acts, and as such they may be called persons.—This language makes the immanent Trinity one of subordinated ideas, and the economic one of subordinated actions, under persons so called. Leibnitz himself presents the internal and external order in some such concept: "Every process of divine reflection must develop itself into a threefold activity and presentation in an inner circle. The Spirit finds in itself its independent object. It is its counterpart, which under relational exchange separates itself as a second unit from the original; but as it differentiates itself it must recur to this original in a third independent form." The perichoresis or immanent relation is followed by the economic activity.

So Urlsperger: "There is an immanent Trinity of the divine essence. This is obscure, and only becomes intelligible in the three forms of operation, viz., creation, redemption, completion. The Son is the external mediator of these processes. He is elevated above the world as *fons et principium deitatis*. The deliverance of the race and the completion is by him, and by the Holy Ghost, the third potential, and is effected by alternate rises and falls." Bishop Bull, in his defense of the Nicene faith, took refuge in the ancient subordination, which he justly found in the Nicene Symbol itself. Schleiermacher must, in some respects, be viewed as ranking here, for he says that we can regard the persons in gradation only. While he uses churchly terms, his thoughts are different. With him the historic Christ comes first; the ideal or the divine Christ can enter into our consciousness only through the Jesus of the earthly ministry. The Trinity is not an independent

part of the Christian consciousness. In like manner Bushnell: "We take, then, as a first point to be held immovably, the strict personal unity of God—one mind, will, consciousness. The Trinity we seek will be a Trinity that results of necessity from the revelation of God to man. I do not undertake to fathom the interior being of God and tell how it is composed." He, however, affirms reverently and positively the divinity of our Lord. The Trinity he does unfold is economic and operative in the historic sphere. Lipsius also inclines to a subordinational presentation. Immanently God is filled with the thought of love, and he gives it expression in Fatherhood, Sonship, and Spirithood. This is objectivized in the Logos and the Spirit. And this is an explanation of the metaphysical doctrine of the church. Then follow the three economies: (*a*) The economy of the Father: the eternal divine order of salvation, and its relation to history in general. (*b*) The historical revelation of salvation, and the founding of the fellowship therein; this is the economy of the Son. (*c*) The economy of the Spirit, which is the historical realization of the life of salvation in individuals and in the fellowship.

2. There has also been a distinct resuscitation of Arianism. In the curious dual scheme of Campanus, the Son is made before all creatures, and becomes the instrument of God. Clarke, in England, revived a pure Arian teaching. Töllner thought Arianism to be the most likely interpretation of the Trinity and the incarnation. The right wing of Unitarianism in England and the United States had not a few who inclined to these nobler views of exalted creaturehood.

3. Dynamic Monarchianism has had an impressive support. It appeared among many of the so-called Anabaptists, as with Denck and Hetzer. The Socinians, especially, expanded the system, and organized it into a teaching and

worshipping community. The supernatural birth, as based upon a valid record, is strongly emphasized; and yet Jesus is simply a man, with high capacities, who under divine help becomes worthy of extraordinary recognition for character and greatness. In the reign of rationalism, save in the purely deistic and vulgar camps, the dynamic theory ruled, and frequently even to the denial of the sinlessness of Christ. Thus Henke substantially affirms "that the ascription of personality to Christ was due to piety, and to the Johannic Logos teaching, and to the influence of Gnostic emanation upon Christian thought. Christ really distinguished himself from God, yet was not himself divine, but only rejoiced in the work he did for God, which was of a quality superior to the Messianic conception of the Jew." According to Eckermann: "The divine names attributed to Jesus are simply official. He was not the Creator of the world. He was simply a man, but sinless, who wrought out divine ideas for the benefit of men." It took Herder to say: "While Socinianism is antisciptural, nevertheless we must all be Unitarians in the proper understanding of that word, because the doctrine of the one God is the foundation of the Old as well as of the New Testament, and the Triad is clear nonsense." Some assertions of Schleiermacher, in his attempt to mediate between the Christian doctrine and his own philosophy, sound very dynamic, especially with regard to the Trinity.

Of course the great waves of rationalism, and criticism too, in England, in France, and in the United States, have culminated in organized Unitarianism, which, however, has passed through all stages of religious unbelief, even to the surrender of Christ and his system. The Noëtic school of Oxford headed the same way. We can only note these facts, without delaying upon the important names.

Ritschl is no more than dynamic, in that he predicates

being of God the Father, and only becoming of the Son. So, too, the analogies between God and the kingdom and the Son are striking indeed, so far as Christ, through patience, suffering, love, holiness, has wrought them out, but they are not yet fully rounded out by himself; nay, others may fulfil some of them. All this is a relative and not an absolute Godhead. Nor does Kaftan, with all his exalted preparatory strain, come beyond the conclusion that Christ is the man in whom God causes the fullness of his eternal being to dwell, so that he becomes to us the image of the invisible God. The manhood is made the basis of the divinity, not the divinity the basis and support of the humanity; and it is but an indwelling, as with us, not an essence and an absolute reality.

4. Hardly less pronounced have been the modalistic revivals, and in one case proceeding to organization. Pantheism is usually the philosophic basis of this theory; nor does it fail us, as a rule, in the modern instances. Servetus regarded the one God as the source from which emanated all things. "Son and Spirit were but the dispositions of God, issuing into activities. The Logos came to personal objectivity only in the incarnation. After the completion of their expulsive functions they will all return into the original substance." Swedenborg's exposition is of the Sabellian cast, for there is a Trinity of the second divine person, viz., Christ: the Father is what is divine in Christ; the Son is the divine in union with the human; and the Holy Spirit is the divine which proceeds from the Son. So, since Jesus was born of the Virgin by the Holy Ghost, his body is divine. Earthly temptations and sorrows transmute the elements still further. The parts derived from the mother are sloughed off, and he ascended with a body already god-like.

5. Allied to this modalistic form is one which has had

a peculiar fascination for modern thinkers; we may call it the universal idealistic, for its foundation is twofold: (*a*) the ideal man, and (*b*) the race viewed as a unit. Christian Sebastian Franck claimed "that the one universal force, or God, pervades all, and all find their unity in him. The incarnation was not, therefore, a single act in Christ, but is a universal one. God becomes incarnate in each individual." Dippel says substantially: "The eternal Word of the Father is to be seen in Christ. But the incarnation is not to be viewed as a particularistic act; it is the universal indwelling of the Logos in humanity. The progressive generation of Christ in believers is always parallel therewith."

So Kant, in his restoration by means of freedom, would have us set a human ideal before us, such as the Christ of the Scriptures. We must have an example corresponding to the moral good of character suggested by the practical reason. Whether this Christ is of supernatural generation cannot be determined. This resolves the incarnation into an imitation and realization of a norm of excellence. Every one, through his categorical imperative, can reach the standard, and in turn become universal. Tieftrunk, a theologian of his school, held of the incarnation: "The doctrine cannot be proved nor disproved scientifically, because of the limitations of reason. But there is a moral side to it, by which it may be restored. The Scriptures show the Logos as the co-cause and instrument of all activity of the Father. All the practical relations of God to humanity are mediated by him as the primitive image of Reason, Holiness, and Wisdom." Fichte is not far different, though his terms are more Christian: "From the absolute point of view, the eternal Word becomes at all times, and in every one, flesh, in the same manner in which it became flesh in Christ; and manifests itself to every man who has a clear view of his unity in God." Nor does Schelling differ substantially:

“The incarnation is not empirical, as the theologians represent it to be, as if Christ came at a distinct time into the human sphere. It is an incarnation from eternity, in which the eternally begotten Son of the Father of all things appears in every sphere of the temporal, as he appears in the eternal, view of God. Christ remains a wholly intelligent person, and yet as the one in whom God first became truly objective.”

The immanent Trinity is resolved by Hegel into a series of ideas: (*a*) That of simple universality; this is the Father. (*b*) The idea particularized and manifested, which is the Son. This identifies the divine with the human. (*c*) The consciousness, which is the Holy Ghost; or, again, as the Ego, the object and the return. The incarnation, with him, is also universal, and not a particularized movement or individual. So do all these pantheistic motives combine to eliminate history, and to merge the real in the ideal, the particular in the universal, the mass in the unit. In the spirit of universal idealism, Marheineke says: “The incarnation is nothing else than the most complete humanization of the most perfect consciousness of God, a sanctification and penetration of the human nature with immediate divine life and true divine tendency.” So Ch. H. Weisse makes the divine reason the Father, the divine feeling and nature in God the Son, and the divine will the Holy Ghost. The ideal Son of man of this impersonal Trinity becomes the historic Christ or personality. Biedemann’s thought of the Trinity and the incarnation is that the divine ideas are thus realizing themselves, especially in the central point, viz., the human spiritual life of Sonship. The idea of the Fatherhood is founded on this Sonship. The efficient cause or energy for producing it is the Son. The completing cause is the Holy Spirit. This idealism has been the most dominant in the theology outside of the confessions, and, indeed, has affected those not a little.

6. Another theory is that of a somatic incarnation, according to which Christ brought with him a heavenly body; and among some it is also conceived that this body was accompanied with a preëxistent human soul. Prominent representatives of this tenet are Melchior Hoffman, Mathy, Goodwin, and Isaac Watts. This, of course, at once makes the birth Docetic, and destroys the representative quality of his manhood.

7. Some have also contended that our Lord assumed the fallen human nature in order to be in likeness with our present state, and to be qualified to comprehend the conditions of sin, so that the salvation might be effective through his personal triumph over native corruption. Menken, Irving, Trench, etc., are representatives of this view. But it introduces the element of a corrupt disposition, which invalidates his sinlessness, a fact of more importance to our salvation than all his conquest of native evil could be.

There is also a decided leaning toward Monophysitic views, certainly to an extreme emphasis upon the divine nature. This has appeared in the movements of Puseyism, in the high Lutheranism of Germany, indeed in all sacramental theologies, which combine with that trend a sacerdotal conception of the ministry, and the creation of a body of intercessors. Dorner even, although belonging to the mediating school, is not exempt from this color, in that he strives to place the union not in the divine person of the Logos, but in the two natures.

On the other hand, there is an equally marked inclination to exalt the humanity at the expense of the divinity, in what is called the anthropocentric Christology. The limitations of Christ, his bodily weaknesses, his temptations, his ignorance, receive a very undue accent. These elements of his kinship are, indeed, worthy of the most serious and sympathetic regard; but we must not forget the sinews of strength,

the virtues, the sinlessness, the intimacy with God, the exhaustive knowledge, the self-assertion, and the authoritative tone. The growth of our Lord is a blessed fact. It is the law of humanity radiant in him. But this, too, may be pressed beyond bounds, when it is referred to the consciousness of his mission, of his relationship to God, of himself, and of his Father; especially when it is pushed to such an extreme statement as that of Dorner: "The incarnation is not to be thought of as at once completed, but as continuous, nay, augmentative, seeing that God as Logos ever seizes and appropriates those of the new sides which are generated by true human development, just as, conversely, the growing actual receptiveness of the humanity combines consciously and voluntarily with ever new sides of the Logos." This is a confusion of appropriation with assimilation, and, therefore, growth with birth. The difficulty in all this discussion is that we diminish the value of the truth we assail, and enhance fictitiously the truth we seek to establish.

Owing to the seeming impossibility of regarding the human nature in Christ as independent, as individual, if it be impersonal (unhypostatized), many theologians insist on conceding to it a separate personality, so that there would be two hypostases in the Christ, the divine and the human. This has an accession of favorable argument from the fact that there would be no will or consciousness for the manhood, apart from that in the divine person, if these be predicates of personality and not of nature.

There is also current an educational idea of the incarnation, which is just, if not made exclusive. The presentation of his sinlessness, of his communion with God, of his lofty moral aims, serves as an appeal to the world to better its life under this stimulus, and to constitute a fellowship of

the good. This theory connects itself readily with the moral-influence theory of the atonement.

The incarnation certainly does also set forth the harmony between the ideal and the real man. In this perfect union between two natures, and in the symmetrical meetness of the man Jesus to be in eternal relationship with the Logos, the imperfect Adam was to find his goal; and the fallen man now seeks Christ's help for elaborating life into graces, and into fruits of the Spirit, and into maturity for the eternal and perfect vision of the Son and the Father.

Let us consider for a moment, also, the effort to break away from the mere mathematical explanations of the Trinity, in order to reach a transcendental mathematics such as our Lord suggests in his high-priestly prayer and in other unexplained sayings. His conception of unity there is certainly not one of mere figures. As Lessing has said: "There is sufficient ground in the reason to posit a transcendental unity in God which does not exclude a certain plurality." "He therefore explains the Son as the completest presentation of God, of his identical image, and of the Spirit as the harmony of both." Here the mathematical Trinity gives way to the moral Trinity, or the mathematics higher than numbers. Coleridge, too, while not ignoring the authority of the Scriptures, found in his own constitution, in his own aspirations and necessities, a moral reason for the incarnation and for the Trinity: "Christ could be the Saviour only by being divine. The idea of redemption involves belief in the divinity of our Lord; and our Lord's divinity, again, involves the Trinitarian idea, because in and through that idea alone the divinity of Christ can be received without breach of faith in the unity of the Godhead." Nor less does he ground it on the intellectual side: "The Trinity of persons in the unity of the Godhead

would have been a necessary idea of my speculative reason. God must have had coeternally an adequate idea of himself, in and through which he created all things. But this would have been a mere speculative idea. Solely in consequence of our redemption does the Trinity become a doctrine, the belief of which as real is commanded by the conscience." The establishment of the doctrine by the testimony of experience, as by Gore, is a veritable helpmeet to the scientific study, but not more final as to definition and authority, than the consciousness of Coleridge and the idealistic schools, or of the mediating theology. One of the strongest evidences for the divinity of our Lord must ever be his sinlessness. That has already proved a most fertile apologetic source of, and one of the most practical incentives as well to, the revival of purer religion and to the formation of more earnest character, and, as Liddon has used it, an equally powerful argument for the conviction of the reason.

Nor dare we ignore the practical value of these related doctrines. What so elevates our conception of the domestic relations as this transcendent antetype? Can a home remain on a dead material level wherein the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are worshiped daily as such? And the infancy and childhood of Christ, the manger and the cradle, the home and the shop in Nazareth, are not these factors to regenerate all childhood, apart from the mystic influences that radiate from the holy Infant? And what has so hallowed the year and the centuries as the return and celebration of that natal day? It has become the guide of chronology, not to be changed. What art, conventional or liberated, that has not found its chief beauty in this ideal of humanity? What music, medieval or modern, that has found its highest form adequate to express the theme? And yet is not every essay toward such an emotional delineation

tion most dear to our hearts? And what significance has Jesus not given to each mourner and pilgrim and impoverished one; to the hungry and thirsty; the weary and the heavy-laden, in every one of whom we may see him, and so see the Father? And what is the initial and central power of his kingdom, numerically and spiritually, save the little children whom he eternally blesses, and whom we are to become like in spirit and trustfulness? And what goal is there for us all greater than this: to wear the image of the heavenly; as sons, to see the Father as he is; to be as God? This practical bent is the subject of a beautiful acknowledgment by Maurice to Kingsley: "As to the Trinity, I do understand you. You first taught me that the doctrine was a live thing, and not a mere formula to be swallowed by the undigesting reason; and from the time that I learned from you that a Father meant a real father, and a Son a real son, and a Holy Spirit a real spirit, who was really good and holy, I have been able to draw all sorts of practical lessons from it in the pulpit, and ground all my morality and a great deal of my natural philosophy upon it, and shall do so more and more."

In conclusion, we must note the immense dissatisfaction with the terminology in use: persons, nature, subsistence, substance, consubstantiality, etc. There remain also the unsolved difficulties of the attributes of the person and the attributes of the natures. There is no explanation of the union that does not leave conscious gaps. There is no valid interpretation of the kenosis. There is a constant strife between the critical, the historic, the idealistic, the metaphysical, and the mathematical schools. Fichte has said, the metaphysical, and not the historical, will save man. Rather is it faith, devout, loving, trustful faith in the transcendent mystery, the one God, God in three, three in one; the divine and human Logos, Son of God, Son of man, Jesus. Let

us company with the innumerable hosts in their concentration of worship :

“ All there, who reign in safety and in bliss,
Ages long past or now, on one sole mark
Their love and vision fix'd. O trinal beam
Of individual star, that charm'st them thus!
Vouchsafe one glance to gild our storm below.”

V

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

GEORGE DANA BOARDMAN, D.D., LL.D.,

Honorary Pastor First Baptist Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

V

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

MR. PRESIDENT: In speaking of the doctrine of the church, I wish to confine myself in the main to two of the many meanings which this term "church" has, presenting it, first, as a divine organism, and, secondly, as a human organization; or, to use more familiar but less accurate phraseology, "the church invisible" and "the church visible."

I. THE CHURCH AS A DIVINE ORGANISM.

And, first, the church as a divine organism. Observe, I do not now, at this stage of our discussion, mean by this word "church" any local organization, or the aggregate of organized churches, or the general mass of professing Christians. But I do mean by this word "church" the one organic, universal, spiritual church of the living God; that ideal church of his which he has bought with the blood of his own adorable Son. In other words, I mean by the church the kingdom of God as administered by his Son in the hearts of men.

Glance, then, for a moment at some of the differences between a church in the sense of a human organization and the church in the sense of a divine organism. An organized church is a voluntary association, dependent on conditions of place and time and form. It may be, and often is, rent

by dissensions; it may suffer extinction; it acts on itself legislatively and executively, receiving or dismissing or disciplining or excluding its members according to its own will. The relation between its components is constructed and temporal. In brief, it is a human organization.

But the church organic is a divine society, independent of conditions of place and time and form. It was never "constituted" in human time and space; it was born of a past eternity, chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, having immortality for its birthright and creation for its heirloom. Its members are not inserted into it by baptism or by letters of transfer from other churches; they are corporate, essential, living parts of it. Being that spiritual body of which Christ is the spiritual head, there is between them, as between him and them, community of sentiment, thought, experience, judgment, purpose, movement—in a single word, life. And this ideal church, surveyed as a whole, in and by itself, has never had an outward, formal organization. True, it has its creed; but this creed is not written in any stone tables of theological symbols—this creed is written with the Spirit of the living God in tables that are hearts of flesh. It has its condition of membership; but this condition is neither baptism nor vote of those already members—this condition is faith in the divine Father, as revealed in Jesus Christ his Son, through demonstration of the Holy Ghost. It has its member-roll; but this member-roll no mortal eye has seen—this member-roll is the Lamb's roll of life. It has its sessions; but these sessions are not held in any structures of wood or brick or stone—these sessions are held in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus. It has its pastor; but this pastor no earthly presbytery has ordained—this pastor is the minister of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, not man. It has its music; but this music is not the audible melody of solo or chorus—

this music is the silent rhythm of human works and divine grace. It has its baptism; but this baptism is not in any earthly water—this baptism is in the Holy Spirit. It has its communion; but this communion is not in any earthly bread and wine—this communion is in the living bread and the living water that came down from heaven. It has its polity; but this polity is not the polity of written constitution and by-laws—this polity is the polity of holy living and godliness. It has its liturgy; but this liturgy is not the liturgy of rubric—this liturgy is the liturgy of daily character. Take all these things away—take away creed and member-roll and sanctuary and minister and music and baptistery and communion-table and liturgy and discipline. What have you taken away? You have taken away only what is formal and incidental and transient; the church of the living God, in all the essentials of her nature, still survives.

Not that I would for a moment hint that we do not need church organizations or the enforcement of our Master's ordinances. These we must have and must strenuously maintain; for they are, at least in this world, essential not only to the spread of the gospel, but also to the preservation of the Christian life itself. Indeed, I am almost ready to affirm that without churches—that is, formal organizations—we could hardly have the church—that is, the spiritual organism of which I am speaking to-day. In fact, all life tends to organization, even as all death tends to disorganization. Accordingly, a church in the sense of a formal organization is as truly a divine institution as the church in the sense of a spiritual organism. He who is too good for a local, visible church is not good enough for the universal, invisible church. In short, a church is Christ's appointed means to the church. Nevertheless the church which is the subject of my address at this point is

larger and diviner than even the ecclesiastical organizations of the apostolic period. It is the church of the heavenly Bridegroom; the corporation of regenerated characters; the body of Jesus Christ; the kingdom of God.

I have dwelt thus long on this point because this distinction between the church as a human organization and the church as a divine organism is of the utmost consequence, doctrinally and practically. This word "church" is so ambiguous that unless we use it discriminatingly the spirit of a remark, or even the tenor of a whole volume, may be misinterpreted. Let us, then, cherish the habit of using this term "church" scrupulously, ever carefully distinguishing between a church organized and the church organic; between a church local and the church universal; between a church divisible and the church indivisible; between a church mortal and the church immortal; between a church nominal and the church ideal; between a church constructed, or man's fabric, and the church born, or Christ's body.

This Organic Church a Unity.—And this body of Christ—not the organized churches of Christendom—is an organic unity. St. Paul portrays this unity under a sevenfold aspect thus:

"There is one body [namely, the one Christian church]; and one Spirit [namely, the one Holy Ghost]; even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling [namely, the one heavenly vocation]; one Lord [namely, the one Lord Jesus Christ], one faith [namely, the one faith in this one Lord]; one baptism [namely, the one baptism in the one Spirit by the one faith into the one body]; one God and Father of all [namely, the one All-Father-God], who is over all, and through all, and in all." (Eph. iv. 4-6.)

This churchly unity is also divinely foreshadowed in such figures as these: many stones, one temple; many branches,

one vine ; many folds, one flock ; many tribes, one Israel ; many members, one body. Listen especially to a classic analogy of our Master's greatest Apostle—an analogy so profound that it will outlive all theories of Christian society, because founded in living physiology, it being, so to speak, a natural parable of the church of Jesus Christ :

Analogy of the Human Body.—"For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body ; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free ; and were all made to drink of one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body ; it is not therefore not of the body. And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body ; it is not therefore not of the body. If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing ? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling ? But now hath God set the members each one of them in the body, even as it pleased him. And if they were all one member, where were the body ? But now they are many members, but one body. And the eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee : or again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much rather, those members of the body which seem to be more feeble are necessary : and those parts of the body, which we think to be less honorable, upon these we bestow more abundant honor ; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness ; whereas our comely parts have no need : but God tempered the body together, giving more abundant honor to that part which lacked ; that there should be no schism [rending, dismemberment] in the body ; but that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffereth, all the members suffer with it ; or one

member is honored, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof [members each in his part]." (1 Cor. xii. 12-27.)

Of course this paragraph does not teach that Christ and his church form a corporeal structure having bodily organs. It is an analogy, not a proposition; accordingly it is to be taken sense-wise, not sound-wise. And what the analogy teaches is this—the relation between Christ and his church is as real, as vital, as reciprocal, as organic, as the relation between the head and its body. And now let us attend to some of the lessons which this profound analogy suggests.

Christ and his Church one Personality.—And, first, as the body, including head and members, forms one organism, so the church, including Christ and his people, forms, so to speak, one personality.

The statement, you perceive, is twofold. First, Christ himself is the head: "Grow up in all things into him, who is the head, even Christ." (Eph. iv. 15.) The church is no headless torso. Being himself the head, Christ is, so to speak, the nervous center of his church, sharing her sensations, whether of joy or of grief, coördinating her faculties, directing her movements, unifying her activities, maintaining her life. And as there is but one Christ, so there is but one head. The Lamb of God is no hydra-headed monster. And, secondly, as Christ is the head, so his church is his body: "Gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him who filleth all in all" (Eph. i. 22, 23), the overflowing receptacle of his measureless amplitudes. Being his own body, his church is, so to speak, a part of his own personality, drawing from him her life, sharing his experience and character, executing his will. As Augustine profoundly says: "*Totus Christus caput et corpus est*" ("The whole Christ is head and body"). Or, as another Latin proverb states it still more compactly:

“ *Ubi Christus, ibi Ecclesia* ” (“Where Christ is, there the church is”). And as Christ is not a monstrosity in the sense of being many-headed, so his church is not a monstrosity in the sense of being many-bodied. As there is but one Christ, even the head, so there is but one church, even his body. Christ and his church form one personality.

Christ and his Church a Manifold Diversity.—Secondly, as the body involves diversity of members and functions, so does the church. As the body is not all brain or heart or eye or foot or blood or nerve or bone or cell, so the church is not all conscience or reason or sensibility or will or creed or polity or minister or layman or sex or sect. The church has all variety of gift, faculty, grace, temperament, experience, vocation, method, opportunity, conception. And as uniformity is a mark of the lowest stage of existence, so variety is a mark of the highest. The nobler the life the more complex and differenced. For example: how wonderfully life complicates and diversifies, as, starting with the lowest forms of animal existence, we trace its ever-multiplying differentiations in the amœba, the polyp, the clam, the spider, the salmon, the lizard, the eagle, the lion, and, finally, man himself! Indeed, one of the happiest definitions of life is this by Professor Guyot: “Life is the mutual exchanging of relations.” And the higher the life the intenser the exchanging. Contrast, for instance, the child of barbarism and the child of civilization. How simple the wants of the savage! how few and rude his tools!—you might almost gather them into a single shop. But how diversified the wants of the civilized man! how numberless and complicated his instruments!—the vast grounds of our Columbian Exposition could not contain them. In brief, differentiation is the very condition of life. Dead things are uniform; live things are multiform. Every

growing thing grows by multiplication of organs and functions and their consignment to specific ends. Development is by specialization. How wonderfully this comes out in the growth of the germinating vesicle of the egg or the cell! And the higher the grade of being the more individualized, as well as the more complicated, become its organs and functions. Now the church is the superbest finite instance of differentiation and specialization; and this alike in respect of organs, functions, gifts, opinions, methods. The church is a myriad-fold diversity.

Christ and his Church a Diversified Unity.—Thirdly, as the body is diversity in unity, so also is the church. For consider for a moment what unity means, specially as distinguished from units. A unit is a single one, surveyed externally, in isolation from other ones; a unity is also a single one, but it is surveyed internally, in its parts, each and every part being in mutual adjustment to one common end. A unit is a single, isolated one; a unity is the systematized union of several diverse ones into a state of oneness. A unit is one in the sense of numerical singleness; a unity is one in the sense of harmonious pluralness. For example: a molecule of water, considered in its wholeness and in distinction from other molecules of water, is a unit; but the same molecule of water, considered in its parts as consisting of eight weights of oxygen and one weight of hydrogen, is a unity. But unity implies something more than harmonious variety of parts; it also implies the subordination of these various parts to a common end. It is this coöperation of diverse parts for a common end which makes these diverse parts as a whole a unity. For example: the separate blocks in a stone-yard are not a unity—they are only units; but actually bring them together and fit them to one another in due shape and order, for the purpose, say, of a temple structure, and they become a unity. In

brief, it is the coördination of diverse units for a common end which makes a unity. And observe the effectiveness of a duly grouped, coördinated unity. How is it that a steam-engine, although small compared with the mass it moves, is able to drive a mighty craft, with her ponderous cargo, in teeth of billow and tempest, from continent to continent? It is not merely because it is made of iron and worked by the power of steam; it is also because valves and pistons, cranks and wheels, shaft and propeller, all work in reciprocal adjustment and harmonious coöperation for a common end, namely, sending the steamer across the Atlantic. But let some slight derangement of the machinery occur—some valve refuse to work, some pin give way—and the engine, which has been a useful unity, becomes a mass of useless units. That is to say, unity consists in converged diversities, where all the ends are means and all the means are ends. Or, to illustrate from St. Paul's great analogy of the bodily organism: A finger, surveyed as a finger in distinction from other fingers, is a unit; but the hand, surveyed as a system of fingers, is a unity. So a cell, surveyed as a cell in distinction from other cells, is a unit; but the body, surveyed as a system of cells coördinated into a common organism, is a unity. And this convergent diversity is indispensable to the unity. If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If all the members were similar members—all eyes or ears or noses—where were the body? But now they are diverse members, and therefore one body. And this diverse co-membership is mutually co-necessary: the eye cannot say to the hand, "I have no need of thee." And this necessity of diversity is especially true of the smaller, obscurer members of the body: those members which seem to be more feeble are necessary. If there were no cells there could be no blood, and if there were no blood there could be no body, either corporeal or personal.

Thus the unity of the body consists in the unified diversity of its parts. And the church is the noblest specimen of a body, because she is Christ's body: he the head and she the members. Accordingly the church, in the adjustment of her own most multiform organs, in the coördination of her own most diversified functions, in the unification of her own most heterogeneous elements and conditions, is the consummate, finite instance (Deity is the infinite instance) of unity as well as of diversity; of unity because of diversity. "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!" (Ps. cxxxiii. 1.)

The Holy Spirit the Secret of the Church's Unity.—Observe, now, that it is the Holy Spirit who is the unifying force in the church or body of Christ. He it is who diversifies the gifts, allots the functions, and unifies the whole. Let me read another classic paragraph from St. Paul:

"Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God, who worketh all things in all. But to each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit to profit withal. For to one is given through the Spirit the word of wisdom; and to another the word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit: to another faith, in the same Spirit; and to another gifts of healings, in the one Spirit; and to another workings of miracles; and to another prophecy; and to another discernings of spirits: to another divers kinds of tongues; and to another the interpretation of tongues: but all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally even as he will." (1 Cor. xii. 4-11.)

Thus it is that in one Spirit, even the Holy Ghost, all we were baptized into one body, even the spiritual body of Christ, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free, whether Baptists or Quakers; and were all made to drink

of one Spirit, even the divine. (1 Cor. xii. 13.) The Holy Ghost is the secret of the church's unity.

Thus the diversified unity of the bodily organism is the palmary symbol and type of the spiritual organism, or Christ's mystical body. And Christ's mystical body, or the spiritual organism, is in a certain sense the divine model for our ecclesiastical organizations, or the actual church of Christendom. And the great practical problem of ecclesiology is to make the church organized, or man's fabric, coincident with the church organic, or Christ's body—a problem which, like the famous problem of squaring the circle, though incapable of absolute solution, is nevertheless capable of approximations ever closer and closer.

II. THE CHURCH AS A HUMAN ORGANIZATION.

And this leads us to our second point, namely, the church as a human organization, or the church of man's structure. Alas! we must now move, at least for the present, in a lower plane.

The Organized Church a Disunity.—For observe, with grief and shame, the disunity of the organized church. She is, indeed, literally speaking, a church militant on a war footing. Unfortunately, however, this war footing is an internecine strife. Instead of her wrestling against the dark principalities of the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenlies, she is wrestling against her own flesh and blood, making schism in her own body, tearing asunder the limbs of her own personality. Survey her manifold and bitter divisions and subdivisions; her clashing sects, creeds, politics, rivalries; her shibboleth dins of "I am of Paul"; "I am of Apollos"; "I am of Cephas"; "I am of Christ." Paradoxical as it sounds, the church militant will never become the church triumphant till she becomes the church

pacific. Instead of her being one united Israel of Jehovah of hosts, she is rather a captive and dismembered Israel, her dislocated bones lying scattered in the great valley of this world's Babylonia. And were James the Just or Peter the Rock to return and indite another Epistle General to the church of God, I fear that he would still have to address it somewhat as follows :

“To the twelve tribes which are of the Dispersion, even to the elect sojourners scattered in the Pontus of Baptis- malism, the Galatia of Episcopalianism, the Cappadocia of Presbyterianism, the Asia of Methodism, the Bithynia of Lutheranism, greeting.”

Evils of Sectarianism.—Who of us does not feel that this is a most deplorable state of things? Consider for a moment some of the evils of sectarianism—I mean the spirit of sectarianism, not the mere fact that there are sects. Sectarianism, for instance, alienates the brotherhood, setting the members of the one great family in Christ against each other; it narrows our spiritual horizon; inverts the gospel order by exalting ordinances above principles, ritual above character; caricatures truth by magnifying its fractions and minifying its integer; dissipates spiritual energies by scattering them instead of concentrating them; involves needless expense by rearing and maintaining several kinds of churches in a neighborhood where God would be better served were there but one church; repels the onlooker, for he will not confess a divided, sectarian Christ; worse than all, arrests moral growth. Listen to St. Paul as he expostulates with the sectaries of Corinth :

“Brothers, I could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, as unto babes in Christ. I fed you with milk, not with meat; for ye were not able to bear it: nay, not even now are ye able; for ye are yet carnal: for

whereas there is among you jealousy and strife, are ye not carnal, and walk after the manner of men [not Christians]? For when one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not men?" (1 Cor. iii. 1-4.)

That is to say, catholicity is the output of maturity, the full costume of manhood; sectarianism is the stair-bar of infancy, the small-clothes of babyhood. Such are some of the many evils of the denominational spirit. Taking everything into account, I am inclined to think that sectarianism is the church's mightiest obstacle in her march to the City of the Foundations. For every kingdom divided against itself cannot stand, but must come to desolation. If Messiah's forces are divided, how then can his kingdom stand? But let us be fair, and not overlook the true church's real unity. For at all essential points Christ's church—the church organic—whatever the land or age or sect, is at bottom sublimely one. And for that one church of Christ every true member of it, whether Baptist, Quaker, or Romanist, will, if need should arise, be equally ready to die. But, although Christ's church in its essentials is one, men's churches in their incidentals are many and diverse. What we quarrel about is not moralities, but ceremonies; not divine commandments, but human inferences; not God's truth, but men's interpretation of it, that is, men's creeds. Nevertheless our blessed Lord has prayed the Father that the members of his body may be perfected into one; and surely he did not pray in vain.

Problem of Ecclesiastical Unity.—And so we pass to ponder the problem of ecclesiastical unity. How shall we make the church of man and the church of Christ—the church organized and the church organic, the church of manner and the church of matter, the church of form and the church of life—coincident? In short, how shall we

bring about the ideal, promised unity? It is a mighty problem, and as gracious as it is mighty, wholly worthy the best thought of Christendom.

Is the Unification of Christendom Desirable?—First of all, then, is the unification of Christendom desirable? “*Unification*,” I say—not “reunion.” For I am not aware that Christendom has ever been united in such a way as to make a reunion desirable. The sad fact seems to be that the church of the primitive period, in so far as it was organized at all, instead of having been, as we so often fondly imagine, a concord of brothers, was largely a discord of wranglers, so that St. Paul felt himself constrained to rectify the doctrinal heresies of Rome; to pacify the warring sectaries of Corinth; to reclaim the theological apostates of Galatia; to guard against a pagan life in Ephesus; to exhort Euodia and Syntyche to be of the same mind in the Lord in Philippi; to warn against the dangerous tendencies in Colosse; to rebuke the disorderly walkers in Thessalonica; to caution Timothy and Titus against the heresiarchs who were already subverting the churches. If the “Christendom” of Christ’s day was already a union, why did Christ pray that his followers might become one, “perfected into unity”? The truth is, the primitive church, like every other thing of life, began in infantile imperfection, yet subject to the blessed law of growth and perfection. Ideals, always excepting the one Perfect Man, are ever before us, never behind us. “That is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; then that which is spiritual.” (1 Cor. xv. 46.) Our question, then, is not, “Is the reunion of Christendom desirable?” but our question is, “Is the unification of Christendom desirable?” And to this question I must answer both no and yes. Let me, then, discuss this problem of ecclesiastical unity both negatively and affirmatively.

Unity Cannot be Secured by Decreeing Uniformity.—And, first, negatively: the church cannot unify herself by decreeing uniformity of outward organization. For recall our definition of unity. Allow me to reëmphasize this point. For while the longing of many of God's chosen spirits for the unification of Christendom is one of the blessed signs of our times, I fear that this longing is in many instances as vague as it is intense. Accordingly one of my principal objects in this paper is to clear away, so far as possible, the mists which envelop this great problem, and this by showing wherein church unity really consists—what it does not mean as well as what it does mean. For when the mists lift, Jehovah's watchmen will see eye to eye. Recall then, I say, what church unity means. It does not mean outward uniformity of creed and polity, not even an organized union of churches and sects; that is an artificial combination or mechanical union which can be ordered, and also revoked, by decrees of councils and by votes of assemblies. On the other hand, church unity does mean an inward, organic, so to speak, divinely biological life, wherein all varieties of organs and functions are vitally convergent to one divine end. You can organize an external organization—that is man's work. You cannot organize an internal organism—that is God's work. All attempts, therefore, to ordain ecclesiastical unity, either by decrees of hierarchical conclaves or by votes of congregational assemblies, are attempts at human manufacture rather than recognition of divine offspring, and, therefore, sooner or later issue in moral failures. Here is the secret of the inevitable failures of all ecclesiastical irenica, whether the Pope's recent paternal encyclical, or the Episcopate's splendid overture, or the Disciples' generous propositions, or the catholic declaration by the Congregational Association of New Jersey, or your humble speaker's proposal at Florence, Italy. The

truth is, all attempts at singleness or uniformity of outward formal organization are against all the analogies of organic living nature. Take the plant world: what varieties of structures and functions, from the cedar of Lebanon to the hyssop that springs up by the wall! Take the animal world: all flesh is not the same flesh: but there is one flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of birds, another of fishes. (1 Cor. xv. 39.) Take the man world: what varieties of races, statures, sexes, faculties, temperaments, customs! Take the church world: what varieties of creeds, polities, gifts, missions, graces! To undertake to decree that there shall be but one kind of church organization is as unnatural and futile as to undertake to decree that there shall be but one kind of plant or one kind of animal or one kind of man. Many different members, but one common body. True, an unvarying uniformity of creed and polity and ritual in all lands and through all times, such as the Church of Rome signally illustrates, is in a certain way very impressive. But there is peril in this very uniformity; and the exacter the uniformity the more perilous. For decrees of concordance or "Acts of Uniformity" imply an autocracy which is more than apt to become despotic. See how, in the case of Rome, ecclesiasticism has tended to supplant character; the church, the Bible; the Pope, our Lord. Thus the very uniformity of Romanism (and there is no splendorous sample of homogeneity) is morally perilous, tending to extinguish individualism and to deify churchism, and so annihilating the very idea of unity. No, church unity cannot be secured by decreeing uniformity of organization.

Unity Cannot be Secured by Abolishing Sects.—Nor, again, can the church unify herself, at least in this æon, by abolishing sects. In fact, I believe that each Christian sect, in so far as it really has Christ's own spirit, has a divine mis-

sion of its own. Who would wish to erase from the history of Christendom the story of the Waldenses, the Lutherans, the Puritans, the Moravians, the Jansenists, the Episcopalians, the Methodists, the Congregationalists, the Quakers, the Baptists? Of course I cannot go into a detailed statement of the mission of each one of the sects. Let me only attempt a swift characterization in roughest outline of the more salient features of the more prominent denominations. A chief distinctive mission of the Roman Catholic branch of Christ's one church (I mention it first only because it has by far the largest number of members) is, as it seems to me, to give play to the body side of our nature; and this it does by its appeal to our senses in the way of architecture, statuary, painting, music, colors, forms; and nobly is it fulfilling its sensitive vocation. A chief distinctive mission of the Lutheran branch of Christ's one church is to give play to the reformatory side of our nature; and this it does by protesting against ecclesiastical and theological perversions and insisting on a return to the apostolic evangel; and nobly is it fulfilling its conservative vocation. A chief distinctive mission of the Presbyterian branch of Christ's one church is to give play to the theological side of our nature; and this it does by the prominence it assigns to creed and catechetical instruction; and nobly is it fulfilling its sturdy vocation. A chief distinctive mission of the Episcopal branch of Christ's one church is to give play to the worshipful side of our nature; and this it does by the prominence it assigns to liturgy and esthetics; and nobly is it fulfilling its devotional vocation. A chief distinctive mission of the Methodist branch of Christ's one church is to give play to the active side of our nature; and this it does by the vigor of its ecclesiastical system and its recognition of the lay element in its class-meetings; and nobly is it fulfilling its robust vocation. A chief distinctive mission of

the Quaker branch of Christ's one church is to give play to the passive side of our nature; and this it does by its doctrine of the inner light and by its disuse of forms; and nobly is it fulfilling its placid vocation. A chief distinctive mission of the Congregational branch of Christ's one church is to give play to the personal side of our nature; and this it does by its insistence on the right of each congregation to ecclesiastical independence; and nobly is it fulfilling its manly vocation. A chief distinctive mission of the Baptist branch of Christ's one church is to give play to the exacter side of our nature; and this it does by its demanding literal obedience to the scriptural ordinance of baptism; and nobly is it fulfilling its stalwart vocation. Thus each of the sects has its own peculiar mission, and each, I doubt not, would be benefited by some absorption of the peculiarities of the others. I am quite sure that we Baptists (and this without abating one jot or tittle of our distinctive mission) would not be harmed by a little infusion of the Presbyterian polity, the Episcopal esthetics, the Methodist discipline, the Quaker simplicity. For all things are ours; whether Paul—the apostle of advance—or Cephas—the apostle of arrest—or Apollos—the apostle of culture; all are ours; and we are Christ's; and Christ is God's. (1 Cor. iii. 21, 22.)

Unity Cannot be Secured by Compromise.—Nor, once more, and most decidedly, can the church unify herself by compromise. This is the mistake of those unfortunates who are afflicted with cardiac hypertrophy or diseased enlargement of heart. Compromise is often right in matters of policy or method. Compromise is always wrong in matters of principle or duty. Truth abhors compromise as light abhors darkness. Truth advances her kingdom by affirmation, not by evasion; by victory, not by surrender. If there is in all this world a sacred right it is the right of

every human being to have his own personal moral convictions. If there is in all this world a sacred responsibility it is the responsibility which every human being has before his God and before his fellows for those convictions. If there is in all this world a sacred obligation it is the obligation which rests on every human being to be true, at whatever cost, to those convictions. For the man who is willing to surrender his own convictions for the sake of "unity" is a man whose convictions for the sake of unity or of anything else are to be distrusted. For he who begins with being false to himself will end with being false to everybody else. Moreover, the unity which is brought about by compromise is not unity at all; it is only a weak, sentimental, flabby uniformity. The boneless, pulpy compromiser, like a composite photograph in which every sign of individuality is merged, looks remarkably kind and also remarkably weak. No, unity cannot be secured by compromise.

Unity Can be Secured only by Comprehension.—How, then, shall the church unify herself? And so, affirmatively: the church must unify herself by comprehension. Here was the grievous mistake of the beloved disciple when he said to his divine Teacher:

"Master, we saw one casting out demons in thy name; and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us." (Luke ix. 49.)

It was the outburst of an intense sectarianism. It mattered not to John that this stranger was really doing a blessed service in Christ's name. The trouble was that he did not belong to St. John's little coterie; he was marching under a sort of independent flag. That was enough to condemn him; the Master had no use for irregular outsiders.

"But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man who shall do a mighty work in my name, and be able

quickly to speak evil of me. For he that is not against us is for us. For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink, because ye are Christ's, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward. And whosoever shall cause one of these little ones that believe on me to stumble, it were better for him if a great millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea." (Mark ix. 39-42.)

It is as though our Master had said: "No one who is really doing good in my name—in the sphere of my character and work—can be false to me. I even declare that he who does not array himself against me is really on my side. Whoever does us any service, however slight, shall have a heavenly reward; but whoever, by harsh treatment, causes one of these little ones or outsiders who love me, however obscure, to fall into sin, it were better for him that he had suffered a felon's death. Instead, then, of repelling the stranger, you ought to have bidden him God-speed." You see, then, our Master's attitude in this matter of comprehension. The coming unity of his church is to be secured, not by exclusion, but by inclusion.

"But to what extent would you include?" I hear you asking. To the extent of Christianity's horizon, I reply; including anybody and everybody, of whatever sect or no sect at all, who can be described by that august word "Christian"; or, as the Apostle Paul expresses it (1 Cor. i. 2), "All that call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place, their Lord and ours."

"I will not ask my neighbor of his creed;
Nor what he deems of doctrine old or new;
Nor what rights his honest soul may need
To worship God—the only wise and true;
Nor what he thinks of the anointed Christ;
Nor with what baptism he has been baptized.

“ I ask not what temptations have beset
 His human heart, now self-abased and sore ;
 Nor by what wayside well the Lord he met ;
 Nor where was uttered, ‘ Go, and sin no more.’
 Between his soul and God that business lies ;
 Not mine to cavil, question, or despise.

“ I ask not by which name, among the rest
 That Christians go by, he is named or known ;
 Whether his faith has ever been ‘ professed,’
 Or whether proven by his deeds alone ;
 So there be Christhood in him, all is well ;
 He is my brother, and in peace we dwell.

“ If grace and patience in his actions speak,
 Or fall in words of kindness from his tongue,
 Which raise the fallen, fortify the weak,
 And heal the heart by sorrow rent and wrung ;
 If he give good for ill, and love for hate—
 Friend of the friendless, poor and desolate—

“ I find in him discipleship so true,
 So full, that nothing further I demand.
 He may be bondman, freedman, Gentile, Jew :
 But we are brothers—walk we hand in hand.
 In his white life let me the Christhood see ;
 It is enough for him, enough for me.”

Now this idea of comprehension is the modern contribution to ecclesiology or the doctrine of the church. The old method was to search for similarities ; the new method is to recognize diversities. The church’s true policy here is not rejection, but adjustment ; not insistence, but assistance ; not as Paul and Barnabas angrily parted at Antioch, but as Abraham and Lot peacefully parted at Bethel ; not as John, who cried, “ Forbid ! ” but as Jesus, who replied, “ Welcome ! ” ; not as cave-dwellers moping in solitude, but as cosmopolitans living in God’s open air. O ye Christian sectarians ; ye who are dwelling in dark glens of denomi-

nationalism; ye who, like Elijah in his cave, imagine that you alone are Jehovah's true prophets; ye who live in the hamlet of your sect, and

“ Think the rustic cackle of your bourg
The murmur of the world ”—

come out from your dark little glen into the sunlight of God's open country, and see how vast is the dome of his sky.

Catholicity the Ideal Church Form.—But how shall this unity by comprehension be effected? And so I pass to present for a moment catholicity as the ideal church form. For each Christian sect, in so far as it has Christ's own spirit, does have its own divine mission. Each sect is a facet in God's great diamond of truth, flashing prismatic hues, the union of which makes the white light. It is not given to any one man or to any one set of men, however great, to comprehend all truth; for, if it were, men themselves would be infinite. Accordingly, while sectarianism is born of sin, and is devilish, sect is born of finiteness, and may be even angelic. Do not try, then, to secure unity by hammering diversities into monotonous flatness. But try to secure unity by soaring high enough to comprehend diversities, even as God's own sky comprehends ocean and forest, valley and mountain, man and flower.

As a matter of fact, each denomination, in rearing its own ecclesiastical structure, works selectively. That is to say, each sect, in building its own creed or polity, builds on the remembrance of certain Scriptures which it regards as favorable and on the oblivion of certain other Scriptures which it regards as unfavorable; equally skilled in the art of remembering and in the art of forgetting; dexterously adjusting its powers of memory and its powers of oblivion to the supposed necessities of the case. In other words,

each sect errs not so much in what it believes as in what it fails to believe. The coming ideal church will be built not on a selection of Scriptures, but on the Bible in its wholeness. Can there be any better way of bringing about the unification of Christendom than by the occasional and considerate interchange of Christian views in quiet and informal conferences of representative Christian thinkers of all communions? If the church is ever to be perfected into one, that perfection will be effected, not by resolutions of conventions or decrees of councils, but by the gradual and silent permeation of Christian sentiments throughout Christendom.

The Coming Ideal Church.—One thing is certain: the coming ideal church will neither be wholly Baptist nor Episcopal nor Methodist nor Presbyterian nor Roman nor Quaker; but it will be Catholic with "Roman" left out. For Christianity, or the kingdom of God, is larger than any denominational province in it, even as the United States is larger than the State of Pennsylvania. Christ's body is larger than any one member of it. Our Lord Jesus has but one body—he is not a monster. Denominationalism still has its place in the economy of Christendom; but that place is no longer in the foreground; that place is to be henceforth in the background. We are still to work along denominational; lines but we are to work along denominational lines only with a view to the church as a one Whole. Christians are not *dissecta membra*; they are members one of another, and there is but one divine body. Is Christ divided? Can Satan dismember that blessed body, and toss one member into the camp of the Baptists, a second member into the camp of the Methodists, a third into the camp of the Presbyterians? Was Paul crucified for you? Were you baptized into the name of Peter or Luther or Calvin or Wesley or Fox or Bunyan or Swedenborg? No; One

is your Master, and all ye are brothers; fellow-members of that one body of which Christ is the one Head. And the fellow-members are coördinate. The eye is a member of the body, and a very important member; but was the eye created to gaze only in a mirror and see nothing but the image of itself? The ear is another very important member of the organism; but what becomes of its importance if it is separated from the body? All the worth it has lies in the fact that it is a part of the body and ministers to it. If the whole church were only one gigantic Congregational eye, or one colossal Methodist ear, or one stupendous Episcopal hand, or one enormous Baptist thumb, or one measureless Presbyterian foot, where were Christ's one, yet many-membered, body? But now they are many members, yet but one body. Accordingly the Episcopal hand cannot say to the Methodist ear, "I have no need of thee;" nor, again, the Pontifical head to the Waldensian feet, "I have no need of you." For all Christians form the one body of Christ, and each Christian is a functional member thereof. And the one body of Christ is healthy and effective in proportion as each Christian faithfully discharges his own organic function, all the members—whether eye or hand, ear or foot, sinew or nerve, bone or cell—working together in reciprocal coöperation.

Our Topic Momentous.—Our topic is indeed momentous. I am quite aware that this struggling after Christian unity is often sneered at as a girlish sentimentalism, unworthy the sturdy muscle of denominational champions, contending earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints. But does it never occur to these redoubtable knights of the faith once for all delivered unto the saints that this ancient faith meant, and still means, chiefly this: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself";

there being no other commandment greater than these, since "on these two commandments hangeth the whole law, and the prophets"? (Matt. xxii. 37-40.) Do these doughty warriors of the primitive orthodoxy never catch a glimpse of the majestic truth that (Rom. xiii. 8-10; Gal. v. 14; James ii. 8) the whole law is summed up in this royal word, namely, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," this love being itself the very "bond of perfectness"? (Col. iii. 14.)

Aye,

" I'm apt to think the man
That could surround the sum of things, and spy
The heart of God and secrets of his empire,
Would speak but love. With him the bright result
Would change the hue of intermediate scenes,
And make one thing of all theology."

This matter, then, of the unification of Christendom is more than a mere sentiment or sweet privilege; like humility or prayer or faith, it is not even a matter of option; it is the most imperial of the commandments; it is the ordinance of the ordinances. "Now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love." (1 Cor. xiii. 13.) And no wonder; for God himself is love, so that he who abides in love abides in God, and God in him. (1 John iv. 16.) In brief, love is the characterizing mark of the Christian religion, separating it discretively from all other religions, and by that fact proving it to be divine: "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." (John xiii. 35.)

Auspicious Auguries.—Thank God, we are living under happy auguries. The growing catholicity of our times, as indicated by such expressions as these: international arbitration; international law; international congresses for securing a common standard of time, of distance, of weight, of money, of signals; international Sunday-school lessons;

a universal alphabet; the world's fairs; the world's week of prayer; the numerous union societies throughout Christendom—the Evangelical Alliance; Young Men's Christian Associations; Christian Endeavor Societies; King's Sons; King's Daughters—the McAll Mission; the overtures of a liturgical church and the responses of at least some non-liturgical churches; the interdenominational salutations and reciprocities; the growing observance of ecclesiastical comity in mission stations; the letters of commendation and transfer from one denomination to another; the growing care for the poor and feeble and "uncomely parts"; the marked tendency toward coöperation in Christian reforms and charities throughout the world; the recent recognition of the Sunday before Christmas as the universal Peace Sunday; the already well-nigh observance of Sunday itself as the world's common Sabbath; the Parliament of Religions; the growing disposition to maximize the points wherein the sects agree, and to minimize the points wherein the sects differ; the interchange of ecclesiastical opinions by the American Institute of Christian Philosophy, under the auspices of Methodist Chautauqua; in brief, the growing desire to "follow after things which make for peace, and things whereby we may upbuild one another" (Rom. xiv. 19)—all this, and such as this, is auspicious of the happy day when "Ephraim shall no longer envy Judah, and Judah shall no longer vex Ephraim." (Isa. xi. 13.) And in that day of everlasting amity all Christians, of whatever sect, will be "Low-churchmen," because true to man; all will be "High-churchmen," because true to God; all will be "Broad-churchmen," because true to God and to man. Or, to borrow phrases from continental parliaments, all Christians will belong to the "Right," and all will belong to the "Left," and all will belong to the "Center"; because Jesus Christ—himself the Master of Assemblies—is alike center, radius,

circumference. Then shall all earth become one Jerusalem, and all days one perpetual Pentecost, wherein the unity of mankind, lost at Babel, shall be restored in Christ, and all men shall again be of one speech.

Heaven grant us the blessedness of seeing with our own eyes what many prophets and righteous men have from the beginning desired to see, namely, one Christian church throughout the world, even

THE ONE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH OF THE SON OF GOD!

Collect for All Saints' Day.—"O Almighty God, who hast knit together thine elect in one communion and fellowship, in the mystical body of thy Son, Christ our Lord; grant us grace so to follow thy blessed saints in all virtuous and godly living that we may come to those unspeakable joys which thou hast prepared for those who unfeignedly love thee; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

VI

THE CHURCH AND THE PROBLEMS OF SCIENCE
AND PHILOSOPHY

By HENRY MITCHELL MACCRACKEN,
Chancellor of the University of the City of New York.

VI

THE CHURCH AND THE PROBLEMS OF SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY

THE church is the body of men and women who enlist to serve God and Jesus Christ. The single fact of enlistment—which word I use as equivalent to promising in public or deliberately engaging with others—constitutes these men and women a visible organism. No rite or ceremony beyond the declaration of service is needed in order that an individual may join the church visible. When David sang to his father and mother, “The Lord is my shepherd,” he joined the church. When Ruth said to Naomi, “Thy God shall be my God,” she joined the church. When the younger son said to his fellow-swineherds, “I will arise and go to my father,” he became part of that organization, and no baptism, or communion, or vote of session, or confirmation by bishop, could do any more than impress the fact on his own attention and that of others. This body, the church, has a single end: to present itself, in each of its constituent members, perfect before God and before one another, “without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing.” The object at which the church aims is to save. Salvation is likeness to God; godliness is godlikeness. To be like God is achieved by choosing to be like God. Salvation demands, therefore, as the first question, What are we to believe concerning God? Learning God is the earliest necessity of the soul; it is also the latest necessity in order

to salvation. The church is a school of men and women learning God because, intending to become like God, they fix their minds on this; they begin also to love God as much as they know how. They love also and sometimes even more intensely objects which they think show God to their minds—a brazen serpent, a ceremony, a creed. It is an old mistake to substitute the creature for the Creator, the ordinance of God for the Divine, Perfect One.

Turning from this statement respecting the church and its object, I take up the other member of my theme, namely, "Science and Philosophy." The theme, as assigned, does not, to my mind, follow the order in which we should approach the subjects named. Instead of "The Church and the Problems of Science and Philosophy," it should be "The Church and the Problems of Philosophy and Science." It is in the interest of clear thinking that we attach to each of these words a definition as nearly as possible exclusive of the definition given the other. Philosophy asks, What and whence the world? and, as involved in this, What and whence myself? What, if any, higher intelligence than myself, and what relation exists between us? In science, self observes phenomena or facts, reasons upon them and reduces them to a system of proposition—in other words, reduces them to laws. Science is the superstructure; philosophy is the foundation. The results of science often seem more real than philosophy; so the bridge towers and cables seem more real than the foundations. They impress themselves upon the attention, while with the substructure the proverb is true, "Out of sight, out of mind." If the engineer of the proposed bridge across the Hudson, which Congress has authorized, would let me dictate the part of the bridge under water, I could make it impossible for his bridge to carry its own weight. If the church let university professors dictate its

philosophy, the theology or morals of the church may be discovered, to our amazement, to rest on nothing and to be nothing. And there are plenty of university professors ready to present us with a philosophy.

Even novel-writers, nowadays, define philosophy and science. Mr. J. Marion Crawford has recently published a story which I was led to read because the scene was laid in New York City, and in the part of New York City where I have for ten years past had my home. He puts in the mouth of one of his characters this deliverance on philosophy and science: "We know everything that's true, and it all seems old *because* we do know it. I don't mean little peddling properties of petroleum and tricks with telephones—what they call science, you know. I mean about big things that don't change: ideas, right and wrong, and the future life, and the soul." This character, albeit not the hero or heroine, is not altogether without a notion of things as they are.

The first question is, therefore, What do we know? What is it the church knows? What philosophy can the church tolerate? To what, if to any, must she be intolerant? If we take as the church's motto, "*In necessariis veritas, in dubiis caritas,*" what is *necessarius* and what *dubius*?

Let me turn to the problems of philosophy, asking you to recollect that the question is, What shall the church do with them? The most recent book on metaphysics—sent to me, as a professor of philosophy, for an opinion—may serve for illustration. It is published in English this year for the first time. It is written by a professor of philosophy in a North German university. It declares: "The simple, fundamental question of all philosophy is, What is the world?" The answer makes God to be the world and the world to be God. It says of theism: "It is the fundamental dogma of primitive Judaism, according to which

the world is created by a personal being similar to ourselves—an hypothesis at the boldness of which we are not surprised, only because we are accustomed to hear it from our youth up.” “This view,” the writer continues, “seems to have been not so much a result of natural development as, rather, the inspiration of a single man, of Moses, whose greatness it is not easy to overrate. With the people it never became very popular.”

“If any one tries,” he goes on to say, “to understand what personality really means, he will be inclined to regard this conception of the Being of beings as personality almost a blasphemy. It is, rather, a supernatural power, a world-forming principle, a something which no eye sees, no name denotes, no concept reaches nor ever can reach. And this Being [with a capital B], in the last and profoundest sense, is *ourselves*.”

With such a notion of theism this professor of philosophy at Kiel University is, of course, a pantheist.

“All is Will” [with a capital W]. “Only negative assertions about Will are possible to us.” “Every being in nature is a manifestation of the whole and individual Will.”

If any student thinks that the rejecter of theism and upholder of pantheism will be obliged to quarrel openly with the creed of Christianity he little knows the skill of such jugglers of language. This writer (who has visited India, and quotes copiously from Hindu metaphysics) amazes by his linguistic jugglery more than an Indian juggler amazes by his manual dexterity.

After saying that the Being of beings, in the last and profoundest sense, is ourselves, he says this same supernatural power is the Holy Ghost. But not only do we know God and the Holy Ghost as ourselves, but, also, we become the Christ who delivers or redeems the world, when we reach

the point of redeeming the world from the sphere of real things, and of looking on it as "a nonentity."

Having thus defined God and the Holy Ghost and redemption, he is ready to explain the ground of duty:

"Why should I love my neighbor as myself? The answer is not in the Bible, but is in the Veda: 'Because you *are* your neighbor, and mere delusion makes you believe that your neighbor is something different from yourself.'"

Also he explains immortality: "There is no real continuance of life beyond death." But the Will "hastens from generation to generation to an ever new expansion of its being."

I have presented this writer at some length because his book is the latest that has come to me. He is professor of philosophy in a Christian university. And a great educational publishing-house in New York writes me, asking me if this book will not suit me for class-room use, and if I cannot commend it. The book, no doubt, is sent to every college professor of philosophy in the land. It is only one specimen—the latest specimen—of one philosophy—pantheistic philosophy. But I must not let this philosophy go without a quotation from its metaphysics of morality:

"The eternal saving doctrine of denial appears in Christianity as the giving up of one's own sinful will to a holy will conceived as personal. This," he says, "is an anthropomorphic conception, irreconcilable with science, and favors eudemonism. On the other hand, we cannot hope to find a form more capable of moving the soul, one more conducive to the spirit of genuine religion. Therefore, for the people, it will still have currency as exoteric teaching." He instances Christ as practising exoteric teaching when he uttered parables; then adds: "Enough if by means of science we succeed in leading the thinking portion of man-

kind from exoteric to esoteric Christianity," which, says he, is the metaphysics of Schopenhauer.

Here is the latest morality: People believe that there is a personal will above theirs. This is false; but let them believe it and think that they have Christianity. Really only we have got hold of the essence of Christianity who hold that there is no will above ours, and who follow Schopenhauer.

This affords me an opportunity for my proposition regarding the church and philosophy. The church has a philosophy. She can tolerate only one philosophy, and she can no more endure any one of the other three philosophies than a man sailing from the south seas can look east, west, and south in order to sail north. The church's relation to philosophy is not to discover new continents, but to steer the ship in the known channel, deep and safe. It is not to be a Christopher Columbus, but a Palinurus; a Palinurus, however, who keeps wide awake, with firm hold on the helm.

Every man has a philosophy, original or second-hand. A man's philosophy makes him or mars him. A man's theology rests upon his philosophy as a wall rests upon its foundation.

Suppose false *theology* win the day so far as to convince men that Christ never lived; or, if he lived, he was crucified and buried, but he rose never at all. Still there would be a church that would say, "I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth. I believe in the life everlasting."

But suppose false philosophies win the day. Then there will be no church, because we shall all have entered into esoteric Christianity, and found that the giving up of one's own sinful will to a holy will conceived as personal is unscientific and untrue.

The church's relation to philosophy is to know the false philosophies when they are taught, and to expose their falseness, and to exclude whoever insists on teaching them from the place of a Christian teacher. Less than this is for the church to propagate a lie and to make herself a liar.

I have said that though antichristian belief should win the day, and convince men that Christ never lived, the church must remain, because the faith would exist, as it existed in David or Isaiah, that Christ could live and would live. It would be only the matter of waiting till we had the proofs of a Christ among us.

A saying of John Stuart Mill, in his posthumous work, has ever had a weighty influence on my mind, namely, that the Christian faith is open to no philosophical objection that does not hold equally well against theism. That is, theism as a philosophy makes miracles reasonable and probable. It becomes no longer a question of philosophy whether Christ rose and ascended to heaven; it is question of evidence for the jury. Paul's saying, that "if Christ be not risen, we are of all men most miserable," has always meant to me that Paul could disbelieve the resurrection only by disbelieving God altogether. This antithesis is between Christ and the materialism which he quotes as saying, "Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die." Paul was as sure of Christ's living as of a living God. He did not mean to say that provided a man could cling to his Heavenly Father, even without faith in Christ's resurrection, he would be most miserable, but that he himself could not do it; that if he let the latter go he let everything go. We are many of us not quite like Paul in this belief. We say not, "If we let the historical Christ go we let God go," but that, "If we let the possibility of the resurrection go we let theism also go." The church, in order not to let everything go, must not let the philosophy of theism give

ground one instant to false philosophies. She must not rest as confident and indifferent as now. She must attack pantheism, with its assumption of the eternal "Substance" of Spinoza, "the absolute Idea" of Hegel, or the "Will" of Schopenhauer, as a theory going in a circle and explaining really nothing. According to it God evolves the world, yet is only realized in its evolution.

We attack atheism and agnosticism as contradicting every kind of knowledge and reducing every proposition of every science to a nothing. We attack materialism as a half-baked theory or hypothesis giving as the basis and origin of self-consciousness, of duty, of imagination, of a Paul, a Moses, or a Christ, the motion of particles that we know by sight and touch. It is blind to the deeper knowing that we have immediately of our own soul.

If time allowed I should like to show at length how active is the propaganda of agnostic philosophy; how suspense of judgment, in regard to the greatest questions, is considered not only allowable, but a work of wisdom. As John Stuart Mill writes, "The rational attitude of a thinking man toward the supreme force, whether in natural or revealed religion, is that of skepticism, as distinguished from belief on the one hand and from atheism on the other." In connection therewith it could be shown that the heir apparent of agnostic philosophy is materialistic philosophy. Time forbids my entering upon this question.

I accept it that the question of philosophy is, "What is the world?" because that question involves, "What is God, and what is soul, and what is the relation of each to the other two?" also, "What is duty?" and so includes the relation of rightness. Science asks, "What are we to do with phenomena or facts?" It observes, reasons, and reduces to a system of laws or propositions. This is so in psychological science and physical science, political science and

theological science, biblical science and ethical science, historical science and linguistic science. But science does not deal with certain questions that are presupposed. The questions which I have named—What is God? What is the world? What is soul? What is duty?—these are philosophy.

Science has to accept its foundation from philosophy. In the science of the stars you accept that the star is; that self is; that there is a relation between them called knowing or knowledge; and that certain knowledge is infallible—for example, that a star is ego or non-ego; it cannot possibly be an entity between these two.

Now what has the church to do with science? I have intimated that it has everything to do with philosophy. But what has the church, organized to present souls perfect in purity before God, to do with physical and psychological science; with ethical and political science as a body of facts reduced to laws or propositions; what to do with linguistic and historical science; what with biblical science, as a science of theology derived from the Bible; or with theological science, as gathered not only from the Bible, but from universal observation—the world of nature and of man?

He is a very dim-sighted person who does not see that the question what the church has to do with science divides itself at once into two. Because the church is an organization to make men like God, it has everything to do with theological science, or what God says, and ethical science, or what ought we to do. Because the church has accepted the Bible as the infallible rule of faith and practice, it has everything to do with biblical science in the sense of the science of what the Bible teaches we are to believe concerning God and concerning the duty God requires of man. But as to mathematics and physical science (I mean apart

from the philosophy of the soul and of the world; I mean as a system of observed phenomena), as to psychological and linguistic science, historical, sociological, and political science, and the rest, I am sure the church, as such, is not called to elaborate or to know them. The greatest mistakes the church has made have come from thinking that she had everything to do and to say about them as mere sciences.

The foundation mistake of the church has come from the same feeling that turned the Hebrews from Jehovah to the golden calf, from God to the temple, from the weightier matters of the law to the trifles of tithings and ablutions. It is the tired feeling that comes over the soul in trying to keep company with its Maker. It grows weary, and still it is afraid not to be religious; so it deceives itself by substituting for studying God and serving God and toiling to win men to be like God, studying something more tangible and material—for example, what the Bible says about the mode of creation or the mode of civil government or the shape of the earth—and then setting up its theory on a pedestal to be idolized, and toiling to win and to coerce men to bow down thereunto.

It is not religion, but antireligion; it is not Christ, but antichrist, that has brought the church into conflict at any time with true science.

Now I grant that the Bible touches in some part every science that I have mentioned. It seems in psychological science, to men like Delitzsch, to make body, soul, and spirit—a trichotomy; to others, and to myself, only body and soul—a dichotomy. It seems to Mr. Jasper to teach “the sun do move,” and so it seemed to the church that condemned Galileo. It seems to us not to enforce this proposition in physical science. It seems to many to teach that varieties of language all came from the occurrence at

Babel; to others that they came by a long evolution; and in this it touches, albeit very slightly, linguistic science.

It was an important and, I think, accurate saying of one of my predecessors on this platform when he declared that higher criticism does not belong to biblical science, but to historical science. Biblical science is to concern itself exclusively with the question, What does the Bible teach as to what we are to believe concerning God, and what duty God requires of man?

Historical science settles when and how the Bible was written. I have had serious questions as to whether the problems of higher criticism do not belong to a professorship in the university faculty of arts and science, rather than to a professorship of theology. Higher criticism is not vital to theology in the same sense in which philosophy is vital to theology. Yet no theological seminary has a professorship of philosophy. A General Assembly might be fairly well qualified to sit upon a question of philosophy, because philosophy is to be settled by data in the possession of every man. A General Assembly might be well qualified to sit upon a question of biblical science in the sense of what the Bible teaches about God and duty. But it is very poorly qualified to sit upon a question of historical science, because historical science requires the teaching of a vast number of facts; the reasoning upon them; the reducing them to propositions. The pope, the embodiment of a large part of the visible church, has been often found very poorly qualified to sit upon a question of natural science.

If I were amending things I would transfer every theological professor who wants to devote himself to higher criticism to the university faculty of arts, and give him full sweep there. Then I would transfer the decision of such questions as, "Who wrote the latter part of Isaiah?" to a

conference of university professors of historical science. Many a student of theology receives very much such a return from the theological faculty as the Englishman complained of receiving when he went to hear a celebrated preacher. Said he: "I went to learn the way to heaven, and the only information I got was how to travel to Palestine."

Biblical science is what the Bible teaches of God and duty. Biblical science is not political science nor sociological science. Biblical science is not the whole of ethical science. That is, while the Bible is an infallible rule of duty, it does not relieve the individual from the use of his intellect in working out the application of the ten commandments, or of the eleventh and new commandment, to the condition of facts by which he is surrounded. The value of the Bible is that it is human and counts nothing human foreign or hostile. This has made it the cyclopedia of generations—nay, the library; the common school—nay, the university. But the Bible itself nowhere proposes to be a cyclopedia of any science.

Here comes in frequent mistake. Albeit the Bible itself records moral advance in its writers on questions of applied ethics or ordinary civil law, as, for example, in the matter of polygamy and the matter of divorce: in one age Bible writers allowing polygamy and arbitrary divorce as quite moral, while Christ distinctly teaches that they are immoral—nevertheless some are unwilling to look at the Bible as progressive in its ethical science.

We claim that the Bible for each generation has been the infallible rule of faith and practice, in the sense that it was ever perfect in its philosophy of God and man, of the world and duty, and the highest possible rule for each generation in applied ethics and also in applied science. But we find the Bible also a history of the growth of the church

in morals and doctrine. The greatest misuse of the Bible is to treat it as if it had fallen down complete from the skies, like the fabled image of Diana. Mistaken interpretation of the Bible has attended every conflict between the church and true science.

The relation of the church to science demands that the church place in its creed only what it is needful to believe concerning God and concerning duty. Whether this should be as brief as the Apostles' Creed or as elaborate as the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church is something that the church must decide. But it must mark out the line by this test: Is the proposition one that is needful to show God and to show duty? Adopting this rule, the church will often enough touch the field of this or that science outside biblical or theological science. It is well that the preacher should not be afraid of any fence round any scientific inclosure. Outside his office as a preacher he may debate Darwinism or woman-suffrage; debate higher criticism or prohibition. But do not let him drag the church, as the church, into the arena, and try to stretch the creed that is to teach God and duty to cover any and every subject. On the other hand, let the church give wide liberty of opinion and teaching as to all questions that do not necessarily conflict with her doctrine of God and of obligation. The church of the first centuries gave wide room to Gnosticism, except when Gnosticism forsook the questions of science and shook the foundations of theology because she inculcated false philosophy.

The scientists who profess agnosticism are in one respect very like their predecessors who professed Gnosticism. Gnosticism speculated in respect to the intelligences above man. It speculated celestially. It guessed what kind of and how many intelligent beings were in the next grade above man, and in the degree above that, and so on.

In that age there had been comparatively little observation of the material universe, for there was no telescope nor microscope nor spectroscope. Hence speculation was in regard to the world of intelligences. In our day agnosticism speculates not at all celestially, but altogether terrestrially: How shall we fill in the gaps, not between man and the highest intelligence, but between man and protoplasm? I do not mean to say that all who speculate are agnostics, but as a rule agnostics are speculators. I have no objection to this speculation so long as it does not proceed upon a false metaphysic. But it should be borne in mind that there is a deal of hypothesis that remains as purely mere guess as the Gnostic hypotheses were mere guesses; you could neither prove them nor disprove them.

The attitude of the church toward a vast deal of the natural science of the day should be patient waiting; and of individual church-members, kindly skepticism or agnosticism.

May I draw a leaf from my own experience? For some time after leaving college my attitude as to the Christian creed was undecided and skeptical. When I accepted it and chose to follow it I resolved to employ any agnostic or skeptical tendency of my mind chiefly in reference to new hypotheses in science. I have practised this for thirty years with a decided economy of both intellect and feeling. It has been a misfortune for the church and the pope, and many a lesser teacher of morals and religion, that as to science he was not ready oftener to say simply, "I do not know."

It is an excellent time now for the church to say, "I do not know," as to sociological matters. There are not a few people who would commit the church to this or that solution of the strifes between the employed and the employer. They would make it obligatory upon employers

and employed to accept arbitration as the solution of every difference of opinion. They would prescribe wage-sharing to every business enterprise. They would settle the number of hours in a day's work.

Now, interesting as these questions are as a part of sociology, I submit that the church, as such, is not qualified to solve them. She must leave them to specialists to work out, confining herself to the ethical rules which she is sure of, as covering all questions. But she must exhort her sons, her mightiest intellects, as individuals, to give themselves to these questions, and to find their solution. She must quicken the intellect and conscience of her members, till they apply the law of love, far and near, to the relation of the employer and the employed. She must quicken the conscience and intellect of the nations, so that when men will not be amenable to the law of love the sword of the ruler shall be upheld as a terror to evil-doers and a comfort to those who do well.

I fully recognize that on what the church should teach and practise as duty there will ever be divergences. Within our own lifetimes we have seen one part of the church formally proclaiming slaveholding sinful, another part excusing and upholding it; one part proclaiming every use of intoxicating drinks sinful, other parts of the church at least tolerating it; one part of the Roman Catholic Church suspending Father McGlynn for his sociological theories, another part championing him, and the pope at Rome, as usual, effecting a compromise on the question.

There never will come a time when the church will agree with herself, still less when she will agree with the world outside, as to what is needed in her sphere of instruction, which is to embrace all that we are to believe concerning God and concerning what duty God requires of man. Hence comes the expediency of divers denominations in

the one church, which I assert and maintain with all my heart. All theories of a church without denominations resolve themselves, to me, into, first, either independency (every parish, with its preacher, a denomination, or every person his own denomination, like David Deans, in Walter Scott's "Heart of Mid-Lothian"); or, second, the church declaring and teaching only a-b-c's of theology and ethics, and not venturing into deeper questions, and so presenting apparent uniformity; or, third, the church calling itself one denomination, as the Romanist Church has called itself, with Thomists and Scotists, Jansenists and Jesuits, within its fold, and pretending falsely that it has no denominations.

Among such extremes the true mean is found in accepting denominations as having a right to exist, but only when they have something to say in ecclesiastical science or theological science, in ethical science or biblical science, that is not said already, and that, in the judgment of those who have learned it, needs to be said for the glory of God and the good of mankind.

The relation of the church to science means to many persons especially its relation to natural science. This relation, let me say, is one of suggestion, inspiration, and true aid.

The church accepts doubt and questioning as the forerunners of truth in religion. This is the pedagogic of the church as to religious discovery. The same has proved the method which leads to scientific discovery.

The church teaches final cause. When it sets children to answering the first question of the Shorter Catechism, "What is the chief end of man?" it suggests what is the chief end of the earth, of animals, of plants, of steam, of electricity. This acceptance of a divine end for everything has ever been a stimulant to intellect to discover ends or final cause.

The church teaches that order is God's law; that he is the Father of Lights, with whom there is no variableness nor shadow of turning. And this naturally impels a Kepler, a Copernicus, and an Isaac Newton to inquire into the universe as a cosmos, being first sure of God, and that God is a God of order, and that there is an order of the universe, if it can only be discovered. The order of the solar system never was found out by Greek or Roman, but only by devout Christians.

The church has been (beyond all that books of science have ever admitted) the friend and promoter of true science of every kind. She must continue to be the same. How? It seems to be a requisite of the true scientist that he be a thorough theist. A distinguished writer upon physics says: "There is not a single one of the founders or great originators [of physical science] who has not been placed under the influence of the idea of a mighty and wise Creator, and who has not received, from that lofty contemplation, the rays of light which have directed his steps."

This is diametrically opposite to the assertion often made that the chief discoverers in the field of science are agnostic. I find the roll reads thus: Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Newton, and Herschel; Descartes, Pascal, and Leibnitz; Linnæus and Cuvier; Davy and Liebig; Ampère and Faraday; Owen and Agassiz; Brewster and Clerk Maxwell; Thomson and Tait; Dawson and Beale, and Pasteur. It seems, then, that not the pantheistic atmosphere, nor materialistic, nor atheistic, has nourished scientists, but the air of countries where the church has been an influence.

There is nothing so sophistical as writers who, when they discuss the conflict of new truth with old error, identify old error with the church, new truth with the antichurch. It is because they identify the church with some official bureau.

I heard Dr. McGlynn distinguish between the Catholic Church and the official "ring" in the city of Rome. At the Reformation the old error and the hierarchy that imposed itself upon the church were in league; but the real church, which included the members who were preëminent in faith and good works, was with Luther, and aided new truth everywhere. Whence came new truth as to the rights of man and free government, if not from John Calvin and John Knox? It was in the very nature of their doctrine to inspire men with the feeling that it is worth while to inquire into and learn whatever is useful to mankind. Their science was political science more than physical science, and I excuse them for omitting the latter when I find that these two men virtually organized the principles of free government which have blessed Switzerland and Holland, Britain and America, for the last three hundred years.

The church, therefore, in teaching man his dignity and responsibility, is maintaining a most fruitful relation to science. It is forbidding the young man to sit down saying as to pure science, as to knowledge for its own sake, "*Cui bono?*" It inspires a man to effort in order to be worthy of himself, and nerves him to deal with this world, taking as his motto, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work;" "We are laborers together with God."

Kant declares, in his "Critique of Pure Reason": "The hypothesis of a wise Author of the universe is necessary for my guidance in the investigation of nature." But who maintains this hypothesis of one God, a Person wise and good, except the church?

There is nothing under inductive logic unless one God is there. When, along with a certain element in the laboratory, I find certain appearances, and when experimenting with the sun and the stars I find the same appearances, why should I declare that I find the same element yonder

in the stars? Except I hold that there is unity in the universe—that is, one God, and he a wise God—I have no basis for any induction whatever.

As I have shown, by far the greater number of the best-known discoverers have not shunned to profess that they worked not as unto man, but unto God. My conception is that when true philosophy and true religion die the funeral of science will not be long deferred.

The head of the Scientific School of Yale said to me, some years since, that more real, public, self-forgetful interest had been shown by the clergymen trustees of Yale in the development of science than by all the other trustees put together. How often have you and I known Christian men, with no special knowledge or enjoyment of the natural sciences, give hearty effort and liberal endowments to astronomy, physics, biology, just because they wanted to help their generation serve God and man by making the most of itself and discovering whatever there is in God's universe to discover!

Neither antichurch nor non-church founded the system of Chautauqua. Chautauqua, in its scientific relations, is a spokesman of the church. It stirs young men and young women to become students to the glory of God. It says: "Choose, if you will, chemistry, biology, or physics as your field of lifelong study and investigation. Strive to discover, or to teach others to discover, new foods, new materials for illumination, new colors, new medicines, new extinguishers of pain, new mechanical appliances, new and more plentiful instruments of pleasure to mankind."

The motive that may be behind such choice and effort may, indeed, be avarice, or love of power disguised as love of knowledge, or it may be curiosity pure and simple; but I have never yet known well any true scientist that did not comfort himself with the belief that he was working with

an additional motive, namely, the motive of love to God and man.

The church fulfils perhaps her greatest work in reference to science at large when she inspires youth with the resolve to investigate and know, in order to add to the worth and happiness of man, and so to exalt and worship Almighty God.

VII

THE CHURCH AND THE CITY PROBLEM

REV. JOHN B. DEVINS,

Pastor of Hope Chapel, New York, and President of the
New York Employment Society.

VII

THE CHURCH AND THE CITY PROBLEM

"THE DOCTRINE of the Church" and "The Church and Problems of Science and Philosophy" have been presented before the American Institute of Christian Philosophy by masters whom all delight to honor. Another eminent teacher was announced for this afternoon, to whom we should all have listened reverently and with great profit; for from his rich experience as a pastor of an institutional church in Hartford, Conn., and as the professor of sociology in the Chicago Theological Seminary, Dr. Graham Taylor would have spread before us a royal feast on "The Church and the Problems of Modern Society." No one regrets his absence more than the speaker. When President Bradford wrote that Professor Taylor could not be here to-day, and added that he wished me to speak on the special features of the social problem, in which I am interested as a mission-worker in New York, my first impulse was to decline the invitation; but, on reflection, it seemed wrong to refuse to say a word in behalf of those to whom we are giving our lives; and with the hope that the facts which I shall give may arouse interest and stimulate inquiry, I have prepared this paper.

- (1) What are the problems of the city that confront the church in its work among the so-called "Other Half"?
- (2) What is the church doing to solve these problems?

(3) What may the church do to hasten their solution that she is not doing to-day?

Will you pardon a personal word as we begin this study together? I come to you merely as a student of the city problem. For nearly twenty years I have given it my daily attention, first as a college student in the New York University, then as a theological student in the Union Seminary, and later in connection with one of the leading daily papers. For several years I went among the working classes every summer for the Fresh-air Fund of the New York *Tribune*, and learned many things about the people and their surroundings. But it was not until, with my wife and family, I moved into the chapel building whose people I serve, a mile east of the Bowery and half a mile below Fourteenth Street, that I really began to know anything about the problem of the poor. After more than six years of daily contact with the people as pastor, friend, and neighbor, I am still a student, and shall repeat to you simply a few of the lessons which I have learned so far, and mention others in the solution of which many men and women are now engaged.

You may have seen recently, in an illustrated paper, a picture entitled "Satisfaction." A pretty society girl sits in an easy arm-chair, wearing a far-away look. On one of the arms of her chair reclines a girl friend, equally pretty, but not so angelic in appearance; and this is the burden of their very interesting conversation:

ARABELLA: Yes, I feel quite saintly these days.

MURILLA: What is the reason?

ARABELLA: Oh, I haven't gotten over the feeling yet that I had when I went to the Charity Ball and enjoyed myself so much for the benefit of the poor.

There are thousands of people who are studying the problem of the city to-day with something of Arabella's

spirit—"enjoying themselves so much for the benefit of the poor." Some of them tell us, in magazine articles and in platform speeches, how to "reach the masses." They know to a certainty. But too many of them, in outlining their plans, beautiful to the eye, lose sight altogether of the human nature of the people with whom they would have to deal if they attempted to carry out their plans. Leave that out of the problem and the solution is not so difficult. But—believe one who speaks from observation and experience—the church cannot ignore the human nature which it finds here.

I. THE PROBLEM OF THE CITY.

Walter Besant, in his "Children of Gibeon," gives us one class of people that the city missionary meets daily. But no writer, no speaker, no camera, can portray the several classes of people as they really are. You cannot present the tenement-house problem on paper: you cannot draw a picture sufficiently vivid to be lifelike. The camera fails here also: you cannot photograph an odor. The stereopticon tells only half the truth: you cannot flash a dwarfed intellect or a stunted soul upon canvas. To understand very much about the homes of the poor you must live with the people and live as they live; you must sleep where they sleep and sleep as they sleep in their poorly ventilated rooms; you must eat what they eat, with quality frequently sacrificed to quantity; you must breathe the foul air which they are obliged to inhale, often through no fault of their own; you must walk through the filthy streets in which they are compelled to spend much of their time, because some one withholds the small parks to which they are entitled; you must read the cheap literature which they read, quality again being a secondary matter; you must climb the steps

of the dark and often ill-smelling stairs which lead to their "room," or "room and bedroom," where frequently five or six persons live, eat, sleep, and die; you must undergo privation as they do—unjustly, it seems to them sometimes, and to others also; you must go to bed hungry and fall asleep from exhaustion after walking for hours looking for work; you must hear the landlord or, worse, his agent, insisting on the rent already overdue, when you have not a dime in the house; you must meet the insurance agent, whose weekly visits alone seem to stand between you and the Potter's Field; you must listen to your children crying for bread, when there is not a crust in the cupboard nor a penny in the purse to supply it; you must watch your wife or child suffer and waste and die, when the prescription lies on the table, and you cannot get the medicine for lack of money: you must know something of these every-day experiences of hundreds of families before you can understand very much about the tenement-house problem and its relation to the municipal government.

When those who influence public opinion realize what a terrible danger to the city the tenement-house as an institution is, a wonderful change will take place. Much is expected from the Tenement-house Committee appointed by Governor Flower, which is to report to the legislature next winter. Efforts to purify politics or to raise the moral standard of the city will be of little avail while the source of the trouble remains untouched. Superintendent Byrnes, of the New York Police Department, is quoted as saying, recently:

"The tenements are one of the biggest cogs in the machine which makes criminals, male and female. The associations of the tenement districts are dangerous—no one knows it better than I—both to the purity of women and the honesty of men. That the overcrowding of the

tenements must fill childish minds with vicious and wicked knowledge is certain. That a large proportion of our population lives in such environment cannot but be a serious menace to society."

The questions that perplex the poor man are as varied as those which concern his more fortunate brother. The daily struggle for bread and clothing and a home for himself and family; the education of his children, that they may have a better start in life than he had; the religious life, especially the Sunday question, which presents itself to the car-driver from a different point of view than to the stock-holder; the true relation of capital and labor, with their strikes and their lockouts; the tenement-house, with all its evils; the corner groggery, often more inviting than the church building that stands near it; the daily temptations, of which you and your children have never so much as dreamed, which meet the sons and especially the daughters of the laboring man, as they leave home, at an age when they should be in school, to earn the two or three dollars a week needed to eke out the monthly rent—these are a few of the pressing features of the problem which daily confronts the laboring man and those who are working among the poor.

American cities are too near home for us to grasp the problems bound up in them as we should if we were dealing with Tokio or Peking or even London. It is not good form to have a pessimistic spirit regarding our great country. Our national pride is touched when the spiritual needs of our own cities are faithfully presented. "Darkest England" moved America to tears, and yet London has a very small percent. of foreign population and New York has more than forty percent. When the true "Bitter Cry of Outcast New York" is heard, the Christian world will be stirred to its depths. Let us glance at a few facts appa-

rent to the most casual observer of the problems confronting the church in the gateway of the nation.

Between the dawn of two days one hundred and sometimes two hundred people die in New York City; one body in every ten fills an unknown grave in the Potter's Field. One and sometimes more of these unknown, uncared-for people are girls and young women from the streets, many of them born in the quiet country towns and picturesque villages in which some of you may live. Two thousand people, it is said, live in the canal-boats which lie in the docks around the city during the winter, responsible to no church in particular, and no denomination caring especially for them. The sailors on the high seas fare far better than these poor boatmen and their families. A great French colony on the West Side is almost wholly destitute of religious instruction or religious care. We send generous contributions to the McAll Mission in France, and we do well; but this colony is so near us that we overlook its needs. The colored people living in New York are far less romantic to us than are their brethren, the freedmen, living in the South. I have never heard of a freedmen's board carrying the gospel to the negroes in our city. The Presbyterians have one small church for the colored people; they have a single Bohemian church and two or three missions for the immense Bohemian population eager to hear the gospel of Christ. Within five miles of the heathen temple in Mott Street—an abomination in a Christian land—are three or four thousand Chinamen who will rise up in the judgment-day against some of us, I fear. And the sad fact must be added that many American women associated with these Celestials are heathen practically quite as much as are the followers of Confucius.

More people live in the lodging-houses of New York than the entire population of many of the most important

cities of the nation. Do you know what a cheap lodging-house is? Did you ever see one in operation? One midnight visit will keep you from ever saying again, "We are of all men most miserable." Come with me to one of the Mulberry Street dives after midnight. Your heart will be moved to pity as you see the miserable men and women herded together, drinking stale beer, singing vile songs, and cursing their ill luck. Let us visit together the five-cent and the two-cent lodging-houses. The farmer who did not provide for his cattle better than these people are cared for would be arrested for cruelty to animals; and yet these rough bodies that we see cover souls whose destiny is eternal. Do we care where they spend their eternity? Are they mere cattle to us? With a policeman and a health officer I entered one of these dismal dens, not long ago, in a James Street basement. There was at least a foot of water on the floor, and the considerate proprietor had placed boards on little piles of brick, and thrown straw over the boards; and there, like so many swine, lay men and women and children, the water within a few inches of their bodies, but not near enough to do the good for which water was intended. When the tide in the East River was high the water rose, and another brick was added to the pile.

In one house in Bone Alley, not far from Hope Chapel, eighty families live to-day. I tried to hire two vacant rooms in this tenement-house a few years ago, that we might start a mission-school there for the scores of apparently neglected children in the alley. The housekeeper refused to rent them, and when I pressed her for a reason she told me that every one of the eighty families in the building earned its living by picking bones and rags from the street barrels. She added that she had positive orders from the owner of the house not to rent the rooms to any one but a rag-picker or a bone-picker. She did not know

my errand, and as she stood in a room in which there was a large pile of rags—not new ones either—I had no reason to doubt her statement. Imagine a village of four hundred people in one part of these Chautauqua grounds, if you please, supported by ash-barrel refuse. I will not say that I wish them here, but I would be glad to have them out of New York. I can take you to an alley on the East Side where only blind people live; but their very affliction is their capital.

Think of the Italians in the city—an army of them—for whom very little is done by the Protestant Church. Angelini touches our hearts and our pockets with his earnest plea for sunny Italy; but the rag-picker who soils our sidewalk, or the seller of fruit on the next corner, is too near us to excite our interest or our sympathy. More Italians landed at New York two years ago than the entire population of Camden, N. J., or of Reading, Pa. Russia, without Poland, sent a city in that single year larger than Paterson, N. J. If the immigrants landing at New York two years ago had all settled on the shores of Chautauqua Lake—and I devoutly wish they had—they would have formed the fifth largest city in the United States. More immigrants came in 1891-92 than the population of any city in the Union except New York. Every seventh person, perhaps every sixth, in the metropolis is a follower of Abraham, with only here and there a follower of Jesus among them. There are nearly as many Jews in New York at this moment as there are people in Cincinnati or Pittsburg. The Protestant Church sends missionaries to Brazil, Belgium, and Italy, but lets severely alone the great body of Catholics in our own country.

A down-town clergyman—not a Presbyterian—says of his parish: “On one side of me is a block in which, the police say, thirty-nine languages and dialects are spoken.

Within four blocks is a city more foreign than any city in Europe this side of Constantinople. I have found nothing in Whitechapel so squalid." Of a thousand men employed in one branch of relief work last winter, twenty-seven nationalities were represented, counting all who call themselves Americans as one nation. For years I had intended to be a foreign missionary, and had that field in view; but Providence directed my steps otherwise, and I find that after all I am a foreign missionary: the people have come to me instead of my going to them.

- "I said, 'Let me walk in the fields.'
He said, 'No, walk in the town.'
I said, 'There are no flowers there.'
He said, 'No flowers but a crown.'
- "I said, 'But the skies are black;
There is nothing but noise and din.'
And he wept as he sent me back;
'There is more,' he said—'there is sin.'
- "I said, 'But the air is thick,
And fogs are veiling the sun.
He answered, 'Yet souls are sick,
And souls in the darkness undone.'
- "I said, 'I shall miss the light,
And friends will miss me, they say.'
He answered, 'Choose to-night,
If I am to miss you, or they.'
- "I pleaded for time to be given.
He said, 'Is it hard to decide?
It will not seem hard in heaven
To have followed the steps of your Guide.'"

You will not understand me, when I emphasize so strongly the needs of the poor, to hold that all the saints

in New York are among the "Other Half," and that all the sinners are among those who live up-town. Saintship is not altogether a question of locality; but one cannot help feeling that those who have less of this world's goods than their fellows have more cause for our sympathy and our efforts. Mrs. Lofty has ridden behind her prancing team in Central Park or on the boulevard at Newport today, enjoying the invigorating air and also the attention attracted by her beautiful turnout. Mrs. Lowly has carried her little one down the side street, on the shady side, to the East River; and there, sitting on the deserted pier, she has thanked God for a chance to breathe even the air poisoned by the sewer filth emptying into the stream beneath her feet. The Lord will hold some one responsible some day for denying to the poor of New York the small parks already granted to them by the State. All honor to the noble men and women who have been working for years to secure parks and playgrounds for the working-man and his family.

The children of the poor. "Have ye no pity for the poor, miserable children?" says Canon Farrar. "Is there no voice strong enough to plead 'like angels, trumpet-tongued, against the deep damnation of their taking off'—these children who, in the language of Southey, are not so much born into the world as damned into the world; predestined, as it were, to live lives of disease and degradation, because of the drink in the midst of which they are brought up, and of which they have the hereditary taint in their very veins." Thank God for the St. John's Guild, the *Tribune* Fresh-air Fund, the *Herald* Ice Fund, the *World* Sick Babies' Fund, the *Christian Herald* Fresh-air Fund, and a host of other public and private charities that care for the children of the poor!

Does some one ask why there is so much poverty in the

city? Many people are poor always because they were born poor. They have never had a fair chance in the race, in this world at least. They were handicapped at the outset. Their ancestry, for several generations, were shiftless, and the probabilities are that their descendants will be equally shiftless. New blood must be infused, new surroundings made, new ambitions aroused, before a change for the better will be seen. You remember "Margaret, the Mother of Criminals," a pauper child born in this State a century ago. Mr. E. V. Smalley says of her descendants: "In one generation of her unhappy line there were twenty children, of whom seventeen lived to maturity. Nine served terms, aggregating fifty years, in the State prison, for high crimes, and all the others were frequent inmates of jails and almshouses. It is said that of the six hundred and twenty-three descendants of this outcast girl, two hundred committed crimes which brought them upon the court records, and most of them were idiots, drunkards, lunatics, paupers, or prostitutes." So much may depend upon a single individual. One child's life started wrong set in motion this fearful criminal train. What if one of us may start on the right line a girl who otherwise would be a second Margaret? Would it not be worth the work of a lifetime?

Many men are pure and upright through no effort of their own; it is natural for them to be so. Many men are poor and dependent, some are degraded, and others are vicious, who would not have been so with different ancestry. Dr. Holmes is right: you must begin to train the child of 2094 to-day.

Misfortune is another cause of poverty that must excite our pity. The illness or death of a parent or a child has thrown many a self-reliant family upon the charity of the world. Its little income ceases, the small bank-account is exhausted, and poverty takes the place of inde-

pendence. Well-to-do families have suddenly become dependent through investments that did not prosper, through faithless friends, or through the rascality of some one of their own members.

Much of the poverty is due to circumstances beyond the control of those who suffer. Competition is the curse of the poor. We demand that we shall have cheap living, cheap clothing, cheap furniture, cheap hats—everything must be as cheap as possible. The merchant, to secure our trade, buys of a manufacturer who will sell for a penny less than the one from whom he had purchased before. That penny must be saved, and the man who makes the garment gets a penny less and sometimes two; for “business is business.” A cent on one article, or five cents on one article, for that matter, does not make much difference to you or me; but a single cent on every one of a hundred articles made by the poor man in the tenement-house or in the crowded shop means a great deal to him, especially when work is slack and there are thousands of competitors. A single element in this race for greed is that, while the consumer pays less for his clothing and the workman has received less for his labor, no one has thought of reducing the rent of tenement-houses. Recent investigation has shown conclusively that in a district containing the most congested portion of the world’s population the poorest tenement rooms are more expensive, when space is considered, than the costly apartments in the large houses in the upper part of the city.

The homes of the poor. To walk through some of the tenement streets one longs to do one of two things: tear down the buildings or compel their owners to live in them at least one day in the year. With bad plumbing, filthy yards, and barrels of refuse in the cellars, it would be pretty difficult for you and me to attain a very high degree of spirituality. Can we expect it from those doomed to this

environment? One evening, in a pastoral call, less than three hundred feet from our chapel, as I knocked, the mother opened the door and said through the darkness, "Are you the plumber?" As I was only a minister my visit was not so much appreciated as it would have been if I had been a minister and a plumber. The mother showed me a sink filled with refuse, due to a broken pipe. Three or four times within as many days she had gone to the agent of the house and urged him to have the pipes mended. I did not leave any tract there, nor did I offer a prayer aloud. I did not quite dare to do so, for while talking to the mother a full pail of slops from the upper floors came into the sink. With her little children clinging to her dress or playing on the floor, the patient woman dipped out the dirty water without a word. I have in mind another house where, a few weeks ago, through a similar cause, one child died from diphtheria, and the family moved carrying a second child suffering from the same disease, into a better tenement-house, thereby exposing the new household to diphtheria. I would not be surprised if in some of these families the clothing displayed so beautifully in Broadway stores was being made at that time. Suppose the landlord's son should buy a suit, and the disease should be carried from the tenement to the mansion, who would be guilty of murder?

II. HOW THE CHURCH TREATS THE CITY PROBLEM.

What is the church doing with the problem of the city? Studying it as never before; trying honestly, in the fear of her Master, to better the conditions of the laboring people; sending many of her noblest sons and most consecrated daughters into the neglected field as volunteer workers; pouring out her treasures in funds of various kinds

for alleviating the distress found in the tenement districts ; starting free kindergartens, in order to shape the twig while it is yet tender ; providing for the safety of young men and young women by clubs under the care of the church ; and in various ways showing practical sympathy for those who need friends more than they need alms. In rescue missions, in mission-schools, and in chapels and churches once prosperous, you will find every week hundreds of earnest Christians working, on Sunday and week-day alike, for those who are not always so grateful as one could wish. Ladies whom you would expect to meet at a reception in an up-town parlor, you will find in a humble home planning a vacation trip for the mother and babe ; one may be carrying the information that she has secured a position for the eldest boy in the store where she does her purchasing.

“The superintendent would not see John or his mother,” she tells you, “but he seemed pleased to grant my request.” Her wish was that this poor boy should get work. God bless those who “consider the poor” ! It is easier to feed them, but the blessing goes with the “considering.”

The church is supporting many chapels and missions among the poor in addition to the voluntary work of which I have spoken, and in addition, also, to the large amount spent for charity—between nine and ten millions of dollars annually—much of which comes from Christian people. One church of which I know gives \$6000 a year to support its two chapels. Another contributes \$8000 to a single chapel. The pastor of a third church asks his people on Sabbath morning for \$13,000 for the three chapels for which they are directly responsible, and that amount is found upon the plates. Should he ask for \$50,000 for the same purpose it would be given as freely. A society with nine missions and churches under its care spent last year about \$60,000 for city mission work, employing, besides its pastors, sev-

eral workers among the Germans, Italians, and Jews, and more than forty experienced trained nurses and missionaries. The Protestant Episcopal Church has several modern buildings in which the life that now is is not forgotten while providing for the life to come. The Collegiate Church and the Presbyterian Church, the Methodist Church and the Baptist Church, and the Congregational churches and other religious bodies, are working along institutional lines to some extent.

Nor must the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations be omitted. The value of the distinctively religious work in the main building and the branches is scarcely greater than that afforded in their class-rooms, libraries, gymnasiums, labor bureaus, lecture courses, etc. For many thousands of young people they take the place of church, club, and home. The Hebrew Institute in East Broadway reaches weekly twenty-five thousand people, who go there for instruction and enjoyment. The rescue mission work, like the McAuley Mission, the Florence Mission, the Door of Hope, the Industrial Christian Alliance, the Cremorne Mission, the Slum Brigade of the Salvation Army, St. Bartholomew's Mission, the Metropolitan Meetings conducted by Mr. Yatman—this class of work deserves a lecture by itself, for to my mind it is the most difficult and discouraging form of religious work in the world. So many of the "rescued" men and women have to be saved so often, that it requires a faith that can actually remove mountains to stand the frequent shocks that come to the workers.

A member of my church was for many years a drinking man, and even now, though I believe him to be an earnest Christian, he sometimes falls under the temptation of drink, and then he is a devil incarnate. At such times he cares, apparently, for no one except his pastor. An indulgent

father naturally, wife, children, and friends are made the special subjects of his insane temper when he is drinking. They may starve, and they often are in a starving condition when I find them. Then comes the talk with the father and comfort for the family, and a prayer, and penitence and reconciliation, and, for six months or a year, reformation. Generally the sad times end, as one did last winter, by the weak Christian brother saying, "Mr. Devins, you hold on to me and I will hold on to you, and we will stand together." Besides the arm of Omnipotence, on which he leans by faith, he needs a human arm which he can feel about him constantly.

What is the church doing to solve the problem of the poor? Did your little daughter ever meet you at night and say, with a shout of exultation, "Papa, I went bathing in the surf to-day"? You congratulate her upon her splendid daring, and she receives it with as much complacency as if you did not know that all she means is this: She had her little dress pinned about her waist, and with bare feet she pattered down toward the surf as brave as a man, till she saw a long breaker just beginning to dash into foam far out beyond the life-lines. Then her bravery oozed out rapidly, and she started up the hill faster than she started down. As the wave receded her courage rose, and so she played with the mighty ocean stretching out before her. Now and then, in spite of her agility, a spent wave flowed over her tiny feet, and she tells you, with something of truthfulness, that she has been surf-bathing.

The church is solving the problem of the city in about the same manner that your little daughter battled with the surf. Without taking back a word of all that has been said regarding the men and the money engaged in city missionary work, we are reaching the masses only on paper. Individuals in many churches are doing yeoman service,

but individuals are units. A half-million people live below Fourteenth Street and east of Broadway. The Congregationalists have one small Welsh congregation and one mission-chapel in that district, and not another church within a mile of it. The Baptists let one of their noble men die at the foot of the Bowery. Pleading for money, pleading for helpers, the brave worker went to his grave. But his death was not in vain. A splendid work has sprung up where he labored so faithfully amid great discouragements. The Methodist Church has supported liberally the great meetings in the Academy of Music and in Metropolitan Hall; but the denomination which pours out its wealth so lavishly in this way is not equally generous in the support of its churches among the poor. I know a Methodist pastor in New York who received last year the munificent salary of \$750; and out of that he paid a missionary to assist him in relieving the poor and the distressed that crowded about his doors. God pity those who let this heroic, uncomplaining servant stand in the breach with such support!

And as for the Presbyterian Church—here you have the child at her surf-bathing. Two years ago a committee of the Presbytery of New York, appointed to investigate the spiritual needs of the city, made this report regarding the down-town districts: "The region, with its third of a million of mostly foreign population, is genuinely foreign missionary ground, where methods well adapted to or even moderately successful in other localities are likely to prove of little service. Just as soon as the Presbyterian Church finds itself in honest shape once more, occupying buildings that are paid for, its duty toward this district will be imperative. This will be its first duty in the direction of missionary work." Within two months after the reading of that report two leading Presbyterian churches—one of them almost the strongest, financially, in the denomination—gave notice that they

would soon move up-town. One is now three miles and the other four miles farther away from this missionary region than they were when the report was read; and since that time the Presbyterians have decided to sell another church building. Before the incoming tide of immigration our church is receding rapidly, leaving chapels and missions to take the place of the churches which have followed and sometimes led the up-town movement; for people move up-town to be near their church quite as often as the church goes to be near its people.

III. WHAT SHOULD THE CHURCH DO WITH THE PROBLEM?

Let her first read again what Professor Drummond has so happily termed "the program of Christianity." In the Nazareth synagogue the Master said: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord."

Having studied anew this program, the church must "follow Christ." He might have sat in his cheerful home, or in the Nazareth synagogue even, and invited all who desired his help or his teaching to come where he was; or he might have erected a church—the Church of the Messiah, if you please—on the leading avenue of Jerusalem, announcing in the morning papers the hours of service, and had a sufficient number of ushers present on Sabbath morning to see that the pewholders were seated before he began his sermon on "Love"—love to God and love to fellow-men. But this was not his way. It would not seem as though the representatives of the Christ would find the Master by walking in that direction.

The church has many representatives at work among the people, so called. This number must be vastly increased before the problem can be solved. A regiment from the Bay State marched proudly down Broadway thirty-two years ago. Every soldier bore evidence of an ancestry that knew no defeat. Puritan principle and Puritan pluck were seen on every countenance.

"How often can your State send out such a regiment?" asked a New-Yorker.

"Once a week for months to come," was the proud answer, "and," the officer added, "if we cannot put down the rebellion, Massachusetts herself will step to the front." We have many soldiers of the cross in the field to-day, but the church as an institution is marching to Canaan's happy land too frequently through Harlem, Brooklyn, and New Jersey. American independence dates from 1776; but between the signing of the Declaration, on July 4th of that year, and the evacuation of New York by the British, on November 25, 1783, there was a great deal of practical coöperation, and you will recall that the severest battles were fought at the front. The church of Christ must do all that she is doing now, and as much more as possible, and still remember that

"It is not the things we have done here,
But the things we have left undone,
That will give us the bitter heartache
At the setting of the sun."

The church must study the changed conditions of the city. Across the street from our chapel stands a double tenement-house where three private houses were four years ago. Forty-four families live to-day where there were three or four then. A saloon has been opened in the same block where there was a grocery three years ago. Next to

the saloon there is a large garment factory with a stable or two on the lower floors. The street has changed in character quite as much as in appearance during that time.

The church must study the various questions that interest the poor, not so much from the church's point of view as from the people's point of view. Take the temperance question. The other night I distributed invitations to a temperance meeting in our chapel to the customers in twenty-five of the one hundred and seventy saloons within twelve hundred feet of our home. Many of my people see more harm in the coffee which their pastor drinks at the midday meal than in the beer which they drink at the same time. He does not consider it a sin to drink the coffee, nor do they to drink the beer. They think that I waste money in buying a quart of ice-cream. Their pail of beer is to them not a luxury, not even a stimulant, but, from their point of view, an article of food—a necessity. When the church has studied the temperance question from its several points of view, then her representatives must unite in some practical method of fighting the evil. It may not be your method nor mine which will be adopted. Theories, resolutions, platforms, will not kill the saloon. After the study of the question there must be coöperation.

Or take the labor problem. The church of the Galilean carpenter is the working-man's best friend. She should be, and he should know it. Too often I fear that he looks upon the church as a club, where one negative vote black-balls; and he is afraid that his rough hands and his plain clothing and his untaught manners will lead some one to cast the negative vote, and he hates to run the risk: so would you and so would I. Or he looks upon the church as a vestibuled train of sleeping-cars upon which only the "classes" may travel.

"Out of work, is that all?" said a friend the other day,

in speaking of a neighbor of ours. Is that all? What worse evil could one wish for his bitterest foe? Out of work! The father comes home at night weary, hungry, foot-sore, discouraged. The little money laid aside for rent goes for food. Work is promised soon. The month closes—nothing yet. But hope is not gone. The agent demands the rent. "Pay up or move out," says he, in answer to the prayer of the wife for a few days' delay; and the little bank-account is soon exhausted, and still no work. And finally, when evening shades will partly conceal her movements, the mother steals away to a pawnshop and exchanges some jewel dearly prized for a few cents with which to buy bread for her crying children. The clock follows the jewelry, and the clothing the timepiece, and frequently the clothing from the bed on which the parents sleep. The children's bed is the last to go—and yet no work. Were you ever hungry? Were you ever out of work? Did you ever walk the streets looking for it, willing to do anything? I know something of the experience which I am suggesting: the sense of loneliness; the feeling that with so much to do in the city there must be a place for you; the feeling of inequality, of injustice. God pity those who are willing to work, but cannot find one willing to hire them!

One of the bright little German girls in our chapel, ten years old, said to Mrs. Devins the other day: "My papa walks all day every day looking for work. Yesterday he walked clear up to One Hundred and Fiftieth Street and back [fifteen miles], and after all there was no work. He has been in every coal-yard and stone-yard and every factory that he can hear of in all the city. Sometimes I go with him and talk for him; and last week he and I walked forty-six blocks up and forty-six blocks back, and I was that tired before I got back that I had to sit down on every

curbstone to get strength to walk to the next. Oh, my feet ached! and I cried when I got home, I was so tired. This morning mama had only six cents in the house, and papa heard that perhaps he could get work over the ferry; so she gave him that six cents to ride over the ferry, and then there was no work after all, and mama cried. I wish my papa could get some work. He tries so hard all the time, Mrs. Devins." The first thing we did with little Hannah and her brother Bethel was to send them through the *Tribune* Fund to the ideal summer home for city children, at Curtisville, Mass., supported so generously by Mr. John E. Parsons, of New York. When more men of wealth realize that they are trustees rather than owners of the property which they hold, the question of capital and labor will not be raised so frequently as it is now. Having secured an outing for the children, we tried to get work for the father. It is work, and not money, that this family and thousands of other families need.

When it was found, last winter, by the police census that there were seventy thousand unemployed men in New York, a committee, representing various churches and benevolent societies, was organized to help a few of them by giving them work. A dollar a day was paid to those sweeping the streets and renovating the tenement-houses, and seventy-five cents a day was given to the tailors. The efficient chairman of the East Side Relief Work Committee was Mrs. Charles Russell Lowell, of the Charity Organization Society, a woman of rare judgment, and indefatigable in her work among the poor. The College Settlement, the University Settlement, the Roman Catholic Church, the Hebrew Institute, the Society for Ethical Culture, the City Mission Society (undenominational), the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, a Presbyterian chapel, and, later, a Unitarian church and a Congregational church were represented on the committee. Tickets were sent to all the churches,

societies, and labor organizations in the neighborhood. In five months \$125,000 was spent in the relief of the unemployed. Not a dollar was given in direct relief—every penny was earned. We employed five thousand heads of families. Hundreds of the vilest tenement-house cellars were cleaned, and nearly four thousand barrels of refuse were carted away. Three thousand halls, cellars, and rooms were whitewashed and scrubbed. Almost the entire East Side of the city from the Bridge to the Harlem River was swept daily. Quantities of clothing were made and distributed among the cyclone sufferers of South Carolina and the destitute of New York. The central work of the committee was carried on at the rooms of the College Settlement in Rivington Street.

Hope Chapel was made the center of the sanitation work, and branches of the street-sweeping and sewing departments were established there, \$40,000 of the relief fund passed through our hands. Seventeen hours a day were given to this work for five months. The tales of suffering which were poured into my ears—many of which I investigated and found to be true—I would not dare to tell you. More than one of the men whom we employed said that he thanked God for the hard times, for, while he had suffered severely, he had found that the church really loved him and cared for his family. Cain's question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" is not heard much now. It should never rise to the lips of those who say "Our Father."

"Say not, 'It matters not to me,
My brother's weal is *his* behoof ;'
For in this wondrous human web,
If your life's warp, his life is woof.

"Woven together are the threads,
And you and he are in one loom ;
For good or ill, for glad or sad,
Your lives must share one common doom."

When the relief fund was exhausted the need was by no means at an end, and some of the workers formed a permanent organization, which has been incorporated as the New York Employment Society, and is virtually an employment agency, free to employer and employee. Among the directors are Presbyterians, Baptists, Episcopalians, a Congregationalist, a Unitarian, a Roman Catholic, and a Hebrew. This, Mr. President, we believe to be a long step toward Christian unity. It is not unity on paper—it is practical unity backed by bank-checks. Besides investigating the references and the moral character of some fifteen hundred men who have applied for positions in six weeks, we have secured positions for about two hundred men. We have sent some men out of town, and as rapidly as possible we shall extend this branch of our work; and we invite the coöperation of all those who can help us. The church must do more than feel sorry for the laboring man; she must help him. Mrs. Browning says somewhere, "Most people are kind, if they only think of it." "To sympathize with distress," said Horace Mann, "is human; to relieve distress is godlike."

Another phase of practical coöperation is the plan adopted by the Federation of East Side Workers. Here again Protestants, Catholics, and Hebrews are found willing to forget their "ism" for the time and unite upon what they can agree upon. We learned last winter, in working for the poor, that there were many phases of work where coöperation was possible. The Protestant learned, also, that his Roman Catholic brother had a heart for the suffering poor in New York, whatever he might think of the papal authority of Rome. The Roman Catholic found that his Protestant brother, like the Master of them both, goes about doing good, whether Luther's theses were right or wrong. The Jew saw that the Christian considers the

poor as well as he. The Christian discovered that no race on earth exceeds that of the Hebrew in giving aid to the destitute. Catholic and Jew, Christian and agnostic, found that none of the others had divided hoofs.

The object of the new Federation is to increase the efficiency of benevolent work among the half-million of people living below Fourteenth Street and east of Broadway. No new relief-giving society was needed, but brotherly feeling, practical federation, a united front—this is what the world has a right to expect from those who are laboring there, especially in the humane work in which the churches and philanthropic societies are alike engaged. Every phase of life will be carefully studied, and the evils found will be corrected so far as possible. Lectures will be given on practical topics, such as the care of the home, the training of children, the rights and duties of citizens, the relation of capital and labor, the question of wages, rent, improved dwellings, temperance, etc. The tenement-house problem, existing sanitation laws, public baths, small parks, etc., will receive the attention of the committee. While the immediate needs of the people in distress will not be overlooked, self-help rather than direct relief will be the goal.

What may the church do to solve the problems of modern society? First, study the problems on the ground, recognizing the changed conditions of the people; and then carry help, temporal and spiritual, where it is needed. Professor Graham Taylor said recently that Chicago needed a hundred missionaries. "New York," said that prince of men, Howard Crosby, a few weeks before his death—"New York will be evangelized when every Christian becomes an evangelist." The church will solve her knotty problems when her representatives, regardless of ecclesiastical connections, set themselves to the task, willing to learn, willing to coöperate.

When Napoleon asked for one hundred men to lead a forlorn hope he explained that every man would probably be killed the moment the enemy opened fire. Now who would die for the emperor? "A hundred men forward! Step out of the ranks!" And not a hundred men, but the whole regiment, we are told, as one man, sprang forward in solid line and rang their muskets at the feet of the emperor.

You will pardon me, Mr. President, for referring to your family; but I believe that the noble, consecrated life which Miss Bradford, the cultured sister of our honored president, is giving to the poor in Jersey City is worth more to the people who come under her refining influences than bags of gold would be to them. The uplifting power of the Whittier Home, instituted and sustained, in part, if not wholly, by this earnest Christian woman, is one of the strongest arguments for the religion of Jesus Christ to be found in that city. Miss Bradford is good, she does good, she goes about doing good. A hundred equally consecrated women should offer her their services. And what Miss Bradford is doing in Jersey City the College Settlement women in Rivington Street, and the Tenement-house Chapter of King's Daughters in Madison Street, and the University Settlement men in Delancey Street, and many other circles and bands and societies and individuals are doing in New York. Their aim is to share their lives with the people, to follow the Christ as they come in contact with human men and women and children longing not for alms, but for unselfish friendship.

But there are those who think that the church of Christ, as a church, and individual members representing the church, as an institution, should do this very work. In something of this spirit is Dr. Judson's splendid enterprise in Washington Square, which has been called "a college set-

tlement plus religion." Dr. Judson says: "God wants his church to be the center of spiritual and intellectual activity, the seat of aggressive and philanthropic enterprise, the ideals and teachings of Christ translated into a definite social organ." There is a danger lest these outside agencies, unless bound to the church in some way, will become formidable rivals and not helpful allies. But, at any rate, they have already served a grand purpose in calling our attention to the need of personal work and in showing its beneficent results.

Finally, the church must solve her problems by reaching the people as individuals. This was the Master's method. Andrew hears John's words about the Christ; he follows Jesus and brings Peter to the Saviour. Philip, imbibing the spirit of the Master, brings Nathanael under the same blessed influence. Every church, every chapel, every mission, every humane agency, needs its Andrews and its Philips to-day. The prayer of Holmes may well be ours to-day:

" God give us men. A time like this demands
Great hearts, strong minds, true faith, and willing hands."

What an opportunity for personal service every Christian has in helping to solve the problems before the church! An individual is only a unit; but one man may do so much, and one woman may do so much, when the Christ life rules and the Christ spirit is manifested among the lowly!

During those memorable days in 1863 when New York was in the hands of the draft-rioters it is said that a mob of lawless men and boys was headed by one of the most daring and godless of the six or eight thousand that had gathered by the time Madison Square was reached. The yelling, hooting crowd had for its objective point the house of a prominent man on Murray Hill. As the mob reached

the house the leader rushed up to the door. Hardly had he reached the steps when the door swung open, and a lady greeted him with a smile and asked how she could serve him. For an instant they faced each other—the desperate man with murder in his heart, the woman as gentle as an angel, her beautiful face an index of the Christlike spirit within.

For an instant only they faced each other. Not a word was exchanged. The leader turned to his followers, drew his revolver, and said deliberately, "The first man whose foot touches these steps dies. I will lay down my life for this lady and her home. Wheel, forward, march!" When the astonished crowd deemed it wise they asked their leader what had changed his plans. This was his reply:

"When the door opened I recognized in that lady whom you saw one who had visited my home when I was out of work last winter. My wife was ill and the children were nearly naked. She brought food and clothing for my children; she brought dainties for my sick wife, prepared by her own hand. She was kind to me when I was in trouble, and secured work for me."

Here, to my mind, is the key that is going to unlock the Problem of the City, and that is going to answer the questions how to reach the masses and how to fill the churches at the second service. When the rich know how the poor live by personal observation, and the poor know how the rich work, the chasm between the "masses" and the "classes" will be bridged; and in this manifestation of personal Christianity we shall be exhibiting the spirit of our Master, "who went about doing good." Shall we follow the Christ?

VIII

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM AS IT APPEARS
TO AN EPISCOPALIAN

REV. GEORGE HODGES, D.D.,

Dean of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.

VIII

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM AS IT APPEARS TO AN EPISCOPALIAN

As it appears to *one* Episcopalian. For it is more true of the Episcopal Church than of any other religious communion with which I am acquainted, that it is made up of people who differ one from another.

Those temperamental distinctions to which we give the easy names of "high" and "low" and "broad" belong to our universal human nature. They are found in every considerable company. Some there are always whose look is *up*, toward God, and for whom the largest word in religion is "adoration"; others there are whose look is *in*, toward their own soul, and for whom the essential word is "conversion"; and others still are to be found whose most frequent look is *out*, toward their neighbors, and for whom the emphatic word is "ministration." They who are of the first sort are forever trying to enrich the services; they who are of the second sort seek appealing sermons, and delight in prayer-meetings; they who are of the third sort endeavor to approve religious truth to the reason of men, and to apply religious precepts to the bettering of present living.

These various attitudes are discovered, not only in every congregation of Christians, Roman or Protestant, Unitarian or Presbyterian, but are found more or less developed in every good Christian individual. It is plain, however, that

each of us inclines especially in one or other of these directions, rarely holding them in balance. And it is equally plain that different religious communions belong, upon the whole, to one or other of these elemental parties. Thus the Roman Catholic communion is distinctly "high church"; the Methodist communion is distinctly "low church"; the Unitarian communion is distinctly "broad church."

But among Episcopalians these three strains of religious character are so blended that no man may definitely apply to this church any one of these descriptive adjectives alone. The citizens of one town, judging from the example of the Episcopal parish in the midst of them, may say that the Episcopal Church is a high church; that it is devoted to forms and ceremonies; that it burns candles and waves smoking censers; and that it holds that the ministers of other communions are but intrusive and presumptuous laymen. But in the next county the inhabitants of another town may argue from the same premises and reach an altogether different conclusion: they may say that the Episcopal Church is intent upon the supreme task of saving souls; that the revivals, the prayer-meetings, and the inquiry-meetings which are held within its walls bespeak the most vital sort of evangelical piety; and that the clergyman walks with his ministerial neighbors of other names as brethren. Let the religious reporter ask questions about the Episcopal Church from people who live in New York next door to the church of which Dr. Rainsford is the rector, and next door to the church of which Dr. Heber Newton is the rector, and next door to the church whose parish priest is Father Brown, and let him compare the answers.

The fact is plain, then, that while in any church it is impossible for anybody to represent everybody, in the Episcopal Church the idea of such a general representation is not only idle, but absurd. We speak each for himself. The

harnessing of an Eskimo pack illustrates the state of things: each dog is fastened to the sled separately. They all pull, and the sled goes on, but each one pulls in his own way and by himself. This paper, accordingly, is the statement of one Episcopalian. Another Episcopalian may put the case quite differently.

I have dwelt upon this unique construction of the Episcopal Church with so much emphasis not only for the sake of defining my own single responsibility for the views of this paper, but also in order to assure our brethren of other communions, who are accustomed to follow with interest the discussion of the reunion of Christendom, that they must not be discouraged when they hear protesting voices raised against the fraternal positions which some of us maintain toward them. There will always be protesting voices; that is in the nature of things. There will always be even bishops who will insist upon narrow interpretations. For our bishops are elected by our clergy and laity, and represent often the predominant party of their own diocese. No bishop represents the church. No six bishops setting down episcopal signatures one below the other, with episcopal seals attached, represent the church. They speak only for those who agree with them, and the number may be small or great. The time will never come when any terms of ecclesiastical fraternity with any other religious communion whatsoever will be agreed to by everybody. If the invitation, or the proposition, comes from a fair majority of our household, our brethren may take it as the action of the church.

I. This characteristic of the Episcopal Church establishes the *possibility* of the reunion of Christendom.

Men have lived together in one church in the past—men of all the temperamental differences which appear in human nature; and men equally different are living to-

gether in one church to-day. If reunion means uniformity we will have none of it; that we all agree to. The experience of the past teaches us that. No plan for Christian unity can gain acceptance which contemplates the sinking of subordinate differences. The eternal fact of difference must be taken into account. God has made us different. We do not look alike and we do not think alike, and God never meant that we should. He never intended that the great orchestrated oratorio of religion should fall at last into one note, all the various instruments playing that one note, all the different voices joining in that one monotonous, everlasting note. The reunion of Christendom must be brought about with full recognition of the righteousness of difference.

The idea that in the united church we must all use the Book of Common Prayer is not held by very many Episcopalians. When the bishops and the representative clergymen and laymen met in the last General Convention, and solemnly set forth those elements of religion which we in this church consider essential, the Prayer-book was not mentioned. The missal and the breviary will be counted among the books of authorized devotion in the united church; and so will the order of service which is set forth in the Presbyterian directory; and so will the no-order of service which the Salvation Army finds most expressive of its praise and prayer. Ritual uniformity will not characterize the reunited Christendom.

Gradually, no doubt, we will come closer together. That is going on at present. The missal and the breviary would need some doctrinal amendment before they could be accepted as permissible by the new Christendom. Other services would shape themselves according to the desires of the people. The fittest would survive. We Episcopalians believe that that survival would greatly resemble that

form of adoration and petition which has stood the test of centuries, which breathes the spirit of all that is most heroic, most saintly, and most Christian in the past, which is the common heritage of Christendom, and which is to be read in English between the covers of the Book of Common Prayer. But that should come about, if it came at all, not by legislative enactment, not by the old fashion of a date from which all churches should conduct their worship after that manner, but by the growing appreciation and the general wish of the people. It would then be left to every branch of the united household to say its prayers in its own way.

In the Episcopal Church there is, indeed, a uniformity of worship, but the common form is so changed from parish to parish, to suit the wish of the worshippers—here as simple as the use of old Geneva, and there as elaborate as Rome—that the principle of difference has ample play. People who are almost Presbyterians, people who are almost Roman Catholics, belong to the Episcopal Church. There are not only ritual differences among us, but doctrinal differences also, answering to them. We are Calvinists and Arminians; we hold the widest and the narrowest views of inspiration; we disagree about everlasting punishment, and about a score of other matters of more or less importance; and yet we are all brethren in one communion.

And this, I say, demonstrates the possibility of Christian unity. The idea that some folks are born Methodists and can never be anything else, or are born Cumberland Presbyterians and can never be anything else, is a mistake. Human nature has not greatly changed. People who were born Methodists and Cumberland Presbyterians in the middle ages were baptized in the medieval church and grew up good Catholics, becoming Franciscans or Carthusians, perhaps, but never needing to go outside the church. And

there are people with the Methodist temperament and with the Cumberland Presbyterian temperament in the Episcopal Church to-day who do not feel compelled to go out of it. The uniformity of Christendom is, indeed, forbidden by the constitution of human nature, and there is not the least likelihood that that disastrous experiment will be tried over again. But the reunion of Christendom is a possibility which is to-day in a small way realized in the Episcopal Church, and thereby shown to be a reasonable thing.

II. We are also agreed, in the Episcopal Church, that the reunion of Christendom, which our own experience proves to be possible, is highly *desirable*.

This we deduce partly from our readings in Holy Scripture and partly from our daily observation of the course of human events. We are sure that our Lord Jesus Christ does not approve of our present disordered and combative, or, at least, unfraternal condition. He came to establish a kingdom of heaven, in which order should prevail, wherein the united citizens should work together in obedience to the King's will. St. Paul spoke words of no uncertain meaning when he saw the beginnings of our present unhappy divisions. It is of no avail to point to our general spiritual agreement and to our invisible union. When that agreement and union are real enough to amount to something they will certainly bring us together. So long as the visible fraternity is lacking we must apply the same argument concerning the reality of the spiritual brotherhood which we apply to the seed at harvest-time from the appearance of the fruit. "By their fruits" is the test.

And, anyhow, looking only into the face of present conditions, we see the need of far more union than we have. For the Christian church has a work to do and a battle to fight, and in order to any sort of success we must stand together. Fifty men labor to move a rock, and they go

up five men at a time and push, and the great rock does not stir. Then all the fifty push together, and up comes the mass of stone out of the earth. That is what united action does. Or the time comes when a man must strike a blow, and he extends four fingers and a thumb against his adversary, and strikes with these. What does such a blow accomplish? It hurts the man himself; it does not hurt the other man at all. The only effective blow is that which is struck with the good, hard, concentrated fist. We have been fighting the devil, for now these many, many years, with our foolishly extended hand, in the four-fingers-and-a-thumb fashion, with the Presbyterian finger and the Baptist finger and the Methodist finger and the Roman Catholic finger and the Episcopal thumb. No wonder that we have made so small an impression. We must smite the devil with our doubled fist.

Thus we learn the need of the reunion of Christendom both from the Bible and from human life. And we Episcopalians realize the need. That is one of the rare things upon which we all agree. When we come to consider ways and means we part at once into various sides; but that this better and more efficient Christian condition must somehow be brought about we are of one accord.

Thus one of the changes in our recent revision of the Prayer-book was the addition of a prayer For the Unity of God's People. This prayer had been already prayed by many of our people for many years, being printed in various much-used manuals of devotion. It has been in especial use, and is still, among those of us who are commonly accounted the most exclusive and self-centered—our High-churchmen. All people know of the propositions looking toward closer unity which were first put forth by our bishops at Chicago, afterward by bishops of the whole Anglican Church at the conference called at Lambeth by the Arch-

bishop of Canterbury, and finally by the General Convention, representing the whole Episcopal Church in this country, convened at Baltimore in October, 1892. Our desire for the reunion of Christendom has thus been made evident beyond mistake.

III. It may need to be said, just here, that what we want is the reunion of *Christendom*. And Christendom is of wide extent. It takes in a great many very different kinds of Christians. Our allegiance to the eternal principle of the rightfulness of difference is here tested with a severe and perilous test.

This sort of reunion means much more than the coming together of various Protestant bodies. It includes the Roman Catholics and the Greek Catholics. It touches not only evangelical, but unevangelical communions, so called. It means the coöperation of all people everywhere who call Jesus Christ their Master. It does not mean a union of errors, a confraternity of heresies, a subordination of truth. It implies a great many changes, concessions, compromises, adjustments, amendments. Reunited Christendom, according to the Episcopalian ideal, will accept the same Scriptures, accounting them to contain all things necessary to eternal salvation, and will recite the same brief and venerable creeds, and will administer the same essential sacraments—the two of the Lord's own appointing—and will be included within the same general scheme of church order whereof the Historic Episcopate is the visible sign.

It is in this last provision that the Episcopal Church most markedly contemplates a reunion of all Christendom. For the Historic Episcopate has to do with the past, the present, and the future.

1. It reaches back into the past and links our own day with the age of the apostles. There are certain simple

statements which the Episcopal Church maintains as elemental truths touching the constitution of the church.

(1) The first is that Jesus Christ founded a society, and that that society is shown to be visible and capable of ready recognition, like any other organized company of human beings, partly by the parables which compare it to a field sown with wheat *and tares*, and to a net containing fishes good *and bad*, partly by the institution of a sacrament of initiation whereby persons become members of it, and partly by the historic appearance of it in the Acts of the Apostles and so on through the centuries.

(2) The second statement is that Jesus Christ intended that this society should continue. He said plainly that he would be with its officers always, even unto the end of the world, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it.

(3) The third statement is that the perpetuation of this society, as of any other, depends upon the orderly succession of its officers. It is evident that if for any reason in any organization some of the members decline to accept the regularly appointed or elected president and secretary and treasurer, and go apart to choose others for themselves, they thereby forsake the original organization and begin anew. In the account of the church contained in the New Testament at least two kinds of ecclesiastical officers appear. We may call them "appointing officers" and "appointed officers." The appointing officers are few, the appointed are many. The appointing officers go about from place to place; the appointed officers are stationed each in his own town. The classic passage is that in which Titus, appointing officer for Crete, is directed to ordain elders in every city. (Titus i. 5.) Presently, when history again gets a good sight at the church, after the con-

fusion of the first century of its life, the appointing officer is plainly seen going about his duties, and named bishop, and the appointed officers appear also, named presbyters and deacons; and it is a settled understanding in the Christian society that no man may become a lawful officer of that organization unless he is regularly directed to his duties by the action of the bishop. Whenever any members of the Christian society became, rightly or wrongly, dissatisfied with the administration, so that they withdrew from the fellowship of the regularly appointed officials, and irregularly chose others of their own, they were accounted to have departed from that organization which Jesus Christ founded, and of which the apostles were the first ministers. Those departures were in many instances for good and sufficient cause; men were sometimes compelled to choose between Christ's doctrine and Christ's society. But the effect of the departure was, nevertheless, to introduce division, and to bring in, finally, that unhappy condition of things which we are just now trying to get out of.

This Historic Episcopate, which marks to-day the original apostolic society still continuing, and which is thus of itself a note of unity, is possessed by the Episcopal Church, and is offered by that church as its especial contribution to the cause of the reunion of Christendom. At the Reformation the church in England effected its own amendment; nobody needed to go out of the Christian society. There was no break with what was essential in the past. The pope, a comparatively new officer, not contemplated in the apostolic ordering of the church, was, indeed, rejected; but the bishops, the original appointing officials, the characteristic and necessary ministers of the church from the beginning, continued without interruption, and have since continued, and are alive to-day and busy at their old tasks in this country in the Episcopal Church.

2. The value of the Historic Episcopate for the present and for the future is shown, *first*, by the fact that Christendom is chiefly composed of Christians who both hold and prize that apostolic government, and who are not likely to be persuaded at this time of day to forsake it and join any brand-new experimental Christian church. If we intend as our ideal the reunion of Christendom, and not simply the combination of a dozen friendly Protestant denominations in the United States of America, we may set down the Historic Episcopate as one of the essential characteristics of that millennial church in which Greeks and Romans, Presbyterians and Methodists, Episcopalians and Baptists, shall say their prayers together. To form an association upon the basis of the abandonment of the Historic Episcopate would be only to erect another barrier across the way into the kingdom of heaven. It would be the gaining of a temporary, local, and delusive advantage at the cost of losing all opportunity of that genuine union of all Christians for which we daily pray in the Lord's Prayer, and which God in his own good time will surely bring about.

This, I suppose, was in the minds of the bishops when they returned their negative answers to the informal proposition to permit an interchange of pulpits. They felt that the gain would be small and unreal, and that it is of importance to maintain, for the sake of future larger unity, a difference which shall be easily visible between the ministry of apostolic appointment and other ministers ordained in other ways.

A *second* fact looking toward the present and the future value of the Historic Episcopate is that which Dr. Shields has admirably stated in his monograph upon this subject. The only working-center of union is that which is afforded by a common government. Only thus can free play be given to our temperamental differences. We cannot unite

on ritual; if we could, such union would avail little. We cannot unite on doctrine—not, at least, upon a body of doctrine like the confessions of the fathers of the Reformation. We must be free to think. But we can unite in allegiance to a company of officers of our own choosing; their powers properly limited by a written constitution of our own devising, and their ordination given in the ancient regular manner of the church of the ages. In natural loyalty to these living men, taking hold upon the actual present, and having their faces turned toward the future, a living church may live. These leaders may lead us, a united and effective army, against the allied forces of the world, the devil, and the flesh. Unity we want, not for the sentiment of it, but for its working and fighting quality. And such unity, in the opinion of the Episcopal Church, the episcopate has given in the past—even when inadequately ordered—and is giving in the present, and will give in the future.

The doctrine of transmitted grace does not enter in. The phrase “Historic Episcopate” was substituted for the old phrase “Apostolic Succession” in the bishops’ articles of union, and the emphasis was thereby transferred from a private opinion to a universal truth. The Historic Episcopate means effective Christian leadership. When we get it we will not need to dispute about the grace of orders. The blessing of the God of Pentecost will rest upon the reunited church.

IV. As to the way by which the reunion of Christendom may best be brought about the Episcopal Church has expressed a decided opinion.

The *first* step, in our judgment, is a statement on the part of all concerned of what are held to be essentials. What is our own best? What do we feel bound to maintain as the condition of our entrance into this Christian

union? What especial contribution do we bring to this church of the future? This is the initial step. This is necessary to any kind of understanding.

Accordingly the Episcopal Church set the example. We drew up a statement of our own position. We said that, for our part, we must insist upon the Scriptures, the creeds, the sacraments, and the Historic Episcopate. The next natural step would have been for the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists and the Methodists and the Roman Catholics and our various other brethren to have done likewise. What are the essential Presbyterian positions? What do Congregationalists consider vital? and so on. Instead of that the action of the Episcopal Church was in many quarters misunderstood. The brethren, instead of determining their own essentials and bringing them into friendly conference, began to attack ours. Some of them even reviled us for making any statement whatsoever.

All this, however, comes naturally into the day's work and is to be expected. We have so long lived in a state of envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness that fraternal words are reasonably open to suspicion. What hidden purpose lay behind these plausible, smooth, probably hypocritical propositions of ours?—that was what various dignified members of ecclesiastical conventions wanted to know. Surely it was some sort of shrewd prelatial trap into which the brethren were lured to walk, that they might suddenly find themselves snared in the superstitions of episcopacy. It was simply incredible that we meant just what we said—that was the conclusion. And it looked for a time as if confusion were to be but worse confounded, and as if our "precious balms"—in the language of the Psalter—were to serve no better purpose than to break our heads withal.

Yet the Episcopalian proposition remains the only reasonable road toward reunion. Let us each make an essen-

tial statement. And then, *secondly*, after the essential statements are in from as many Christian communions as are willing to make them, let us institute a careful comparison; let us see of what elements the reunited church, on this basis, must consist. Then we may be ready for a fair debate. Then the adjustments, the more efficient phrasings, the compromises, the reasonable changes of position, may begin, and not before. Out of this parliament of churches, this federation of communions, this new ecumenical council, wherein each deputy holds in his hand, as he prays the Lord's Prayer at the opening service, a statement in brief terms of that which every denomination asks for in the ideal church—out of this new pentecostal company, met in one place with one devout intent, under the guidance of the enabling Spirit, may issue the new church, old as the apostles, defiant of the gates of hell, the Reunited Christendom.

IX

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM AS IT APPEARS
TO A CONGREGATIONALIST

WILLIAM G. BALLANTINE, D.D., LL.D.,
President of Oberlin College.

IX

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM AS IT APPEARS TO A CONGREGATIONALIST

“BEHOLD, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!” Theologians have exercised a good deal of ingenuity in defining what they have termed the “notes of the church”—that is, the marks by which it may be determined whether any given company of people is or is not a part of the body of Christ. Our Lord himself gave us one, which, since it has his express sanction, should be written down first: “By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have *love* one to another.” In his last great high-priestly prayer Jesus prayed: “Holy Father, keep them in thy name which thou hast given me, that they may be *one*, even as we are.” Unity, then, or at least the spirit of unity, the impulse toward and effort for unity, “as much as in us lieth,” is the first note of genuine Christianity.

It is passing strange that this great truth has been, until recently, so much neglected. Those of us in middle life, or past it, can remember, among the hundreds of sermons to which we have listened, but very few upon the duty of promoting unity among Christians. To most people it seems a far more hopeful undertaking to convert the heathen than to persuade Christians to give up their prejudices. Besotted as the pagans are in superstition, it appears less visionary to attempt to carry them all the way

from fetish-worship to Christ than to carry a Christian from sectarianism to catholicity.

But Christian thought has come now to a point where unity among Christians is recognized in its true character as a duty. And what is more encouraging still, many Christian hearts are crying out for larger fellowship. The necessities of the great work of saving the world are forcing us to see the folly of wasting men and money and labor in jealousy and mutual opposition. Common enterprises of benevolence are bringing us into fellowship so sweet that we cannot pull asunder.

Christianity, indeed, is above all things a fellowship. "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin." The Apostle John, in his wonderful First Epistle, develops this idea that the Christian life is a fellowship with the Father and with the Son and with one another. The Christian life cannot be lived in isolation, surrounded by a Chinese wall of suspicion and censoriousness. It is a common life like that of one human body. We are all members one of another, and Christ is the head. This is true not simply of the local church, but of the universal church—the holy catholic church.

The tendency to division among Christians early showed itself, for it is a natural product of the carnal mind. Paul sternly rebuked the Corinthians for this fault: "Whereas there is among you jealousy and strife, are ye not carnal, and walk after the manner of men? For when one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not men? What then is Apollos? and what is Paul? Ministers through whom ye believed; and each as the Lord gave to him." Yet in the face of the Apostle's express condemnation of such a course we have gone on to the

present time saying, "I am of Calvin," and "I of Luther," and "I of Wesley," and "I of Christ."

The question before us now is how these shameful and harmful divisions in the one church may be healed, and how we may return most quickly and most sweetly to the original unity around our common Lord. The mere enunciation of such a proposition ennobles us all. It is like a breath from heaven quickening every holy emotion. May He whom we all adore—the Prince of Peace—guide us in genuine progress toward a happy consummation !

1. At the outset it is necessary to consider attentively those two fundamental principles of Christian relationship and association which Paul unfolds in the fourteenth and fifteenth chapters of his Epistle to the Romans, the neglect of which is the cause of all our present unhappy divisions. These two principles are :

- (1) Mutual Independence.
- (2) Mutual Self-subordination.

The more intimately people are associated the more need there is for regulative principles. With such a diversity of mental endowments, tastes, and temperaments, the brotherhood of all men would be hopeless unless controlled by some sublime universal principles applicable to all situations and adequate for the solution of every difficulty. Such principles Paul clearly laid down and reiterated with all his forceful rhetoric. But the church forgot them, or, rather, never really comprehended them, and hence "confusion and every evil work."

The text, "For none of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself," is usually chosen when a minister is to preach on the solidarity of the human race or of the church. This text is assumed to teach that we are all so interlinked that each affects all, and, consequently, that each owes duties to all. Here is a striking example of that shameful

slovenliness in handling the Scriptures, which even those who profess the highest reverence for them often show, and which loses for us the meaning of so many important passages.

When Paul said, "None of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself," he was not emphasizing our relation to one another, but our relation to God. He was saying that we have no right to judge our brother, because that brother is not living to himself, but to God. Our brother is God's servant, not his own nor ours. A Christian life is no private affair amenable to human supervision. It is a sacred and divine relationship, upon which let no man dare to intrude. The context proves that this is Paul's meaning. He goes right on to say, "For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. . . . But thou, why dost thou judge thy brother? or thou again, why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God. . . . So then each one of us shall give account of himself to God." Paul's point is, each of us shall give account, not of his brother, but of *himself*, not to his brother, but to *God*.

Paul did not attempt to decide all disputed questions, although he was an inspired apostle. Such an attempt would have been futile. As long as men are men differences of view will arise. Paul did not say, "Let the encyclical of the pope, or the resolutions of the National Council, settle all." He did not say, "Appeal to the Conference or the General Assembly." He distinctly said, "Let *each man* be fully assured in his own mind." According to this each Christian stands in direct personal fellowship with God and responsibility to him alone. Upon his opinions and practices no living man has a right to pass judgment.

At the end each shall give account of himself to God; not of his neighbor to God, nor of himself to his neighbor or to the church.

It is of no use to talk about unity or union until this great principle is fully understood and accepted. It is, indeed, the fundamental principle of Protestantism, although most Protestants largely traverse it in practice. This is nothing but the principle of the right of private judgment.

The second great principle of Christian association is like unto the first. It is the principle of mutual self-subordination. Although in Christ I am free from the dictation of all men, yet I am also free, and, indeed, feel the impulse, to make myself the servant of all for their salvation. "Let each one of us," says Paul, "please his neighbor for that which is good, unto edifying. For Christ also pleased not himself." There is no limit to the concessions which, in external things, we may make for a weak brother's sake. We may become all things to all men. No one has a right to judge me for using meat or wine or tobacco, if I do it conscientiously in faith. But if it appears that meat or wine or tobacco makes my brother to offend, I am free to go without it to the end of life. No one may disparage me for neglecting immersion or ordination, on principle. But no principle should dictate my course in regard to those externals but the principle of love for my brother. The fact that each man is "my brother," and that Christ my Saviour died for him, should make me ready even to lay down my life for him.

It is an interesting thing to observe in passing that these two principles of Christian fellowship, namely, mutual independence and mutual self-subordination, with the consequent mutual joy, educed exegetically from the fourteenth and fifteenth chapters of Romans, agree exactly with the philosophical analysis of love so eloquently given by

Dr. Newman Smyth in his "Christian Ethics" (pp. 226 ff.). "Love," according to Dr. Smyth, "contains in its unity a trinity of virtue. It comprehends within itself the three following distinctions: moral self-affirmation, self-impartment, and self-existence in others. Love affirms its own worthiness, imparts to others its good, and finds its life again in the well-being of others."

It may be added, also, that these two Pauline principles are the two principles which we seek to work out in the Congregational church polity. Each local church is absolutely independent, and yet it freely acts in consultation and concurrence and sisterly affection with neighboring churches. Each party to the fellowship participates, not because it must, but because it will.

2. Secondly, in our movement toward unity we must proceed inductively. This is an age of inductive science; and religion, if it is not to fall behind the times, must open its eyes to the objective existence of facts. We are not to construct the church out of our own inner consciousness, as the German metaphysician is said to have constructed the camel. We are not the founders of the church or the authors of its constitution. We are merely converted men who, having found the Saviour, or, rather, having been found by him, are looking about to see what other sheep he has, that we may love them and rejoice with them and labor with them. We are told by our Master that it is our duty to do this. The question is not whether we will admit into our fellowship persons having or lacking certain marks, but, What are the marks by which we may recognize those already in Christ's fellowship? You and I do not own any fellowship to admit people into or to exclude them from. There is but one Head, even Christ. The newly regenerate man may think that immersion is plainly taught in the New Testament, and that it is so simple and beauti-

ful and reasonable an ordinance that it surely is a mark of discipleship. But he comes across a community of Quakers, who have no visible sacraments. Here is a fact as solid and as immovable as Plymouth Rock. No people in the world have a clearer title to the name of Christ than the Quakers. It is of no use to argue; you cannot argue away a fact. There they are, in the visible church, and I, for one, hasten to unite with them, much surprised, I confess, and puzzled, but exclaiming, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past tracing out!"

I have chosen the Quakers as an illustration because they have neither the "Historic Episcopate" nor the "primitive sacraments," and yet they are undoubtedly Christians of the best type. If "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost" are the tests, the Quakers stand high. When facts are appealed to theories must give way. The reunion of Christendom must be on the basis of a full acknowledgment of existing facts. We must check our own pride of knowledge and orthodoxy, and reverently trace the lines marked out by the divine Spirit. We must not deny liberty which the Spirit has sanctioned. As well try to preserve the American Union by asking all of our sixty-five millions to move into the State of Rhode Island as to invite all Christians to reunion within the lines of immersion and the Historic Episcopate.

3. This brings us, in the third place, to observe the unexpected light which falls from the admitted duty of unity upon our theoretical theology and polity. Starting out for what seems a simple, practical duty, something within the domain of "ecclesiastical politics," we find that we cannot do that duty without an entire revision of our theory of the proportions of Christianity. Before we can unite, it

must be determined what we are going to unite about, and in what sense.

We have been accustomed to think of unity as a far-off happy result to come at the end of Christian ages. We have thought that the world was to be converted to Christ by the sporadic efforts of discordant sects, and that theological truth and the best polity were to be wrought out in the heat of partizan controversy and the acrimony of heresy trials; and then at the end, when the millennium had been brought about in this way, we should rush into one another's arms in mutual congratulation. Upon this theory there were many duties more pressing than the duty of unity, and a great many things were right although obviously incompatible with unity. But now that we have come to see that it is our duty to unite instantly, that unity is the primary mark of Christianity, the whole perspective has changed. The whole order of procedure is different. Instead of starting out to make propaganda for our own pet theories of church government or the ordinances, we see that we must accept the church of Christ just as it is, and unite just as we are. The important truths, the vital principles, the basis of reunion, must be not something yet to be accepted by a portion of Christendom, but simply what is already accepted. The old maxim that that is essential Christian doctrine which has been accepted always, everywhere, and by all—*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*—a dictum often ridiculed as utterly indefinite, is now seen to be the only possible truth.

An early result of our search for an inductive basis of union, one formulated after examination of all living Christians, and a statement of that in which they do in fact agree, will be a rediscovery of that sublime truth which Paul wrought out in the Epistle to the Galatians, himself quivering with an intense emotion which even oaths and

curse could not relieve, while on the anvil of his logic he hammered the glowing links of his argument to prove that "in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith working through love." That is, Christianity is purely ethical and spiritual. It is not sacramental nor theological nor hierarchical. The sole question is whether the candidate is a new creature in Christ. It is not, Does he acknowledge Paul as his bishop? It is, Does he yield in life the fruit of the Spirit? If we see in him "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance," then we are to recognize him at once as a brother.

We are not to unite *after* we have settled all our differences, but we are to unite at once, that we may rightly settle them. It may well be true that the denomination called Disciples of Christ are right on the question of baptism; but how can I receive candidly their arguments, and take that brotherly attitude of sympathy which will enable me to reach their view-point, while I am separated from them by a denominational wall, and am in a measure pledged to coöperate with those who reject immersion? The Episcopalians may be right as to the principles of church polity and as to the historic character of the episcopate; but I am at a sad disadvantage in discussing that question while all my immediate associations and personal interests are involved with a different view. The truth of the unity of the church and the duty of unity among Christians are points about which we can all agree. Let us come at once upon that platform, and from that basis work out all the rest. It is more imperative that we should be united than that we should be rightly baptized or rightly officered.

What we want is "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." To unite on any other basis would be a delusion. It would not be Christian union. Union on the basis of

episcopal ordination, or immersion, or faith in the infallible original autographs of Holy Scripture, or acceptance of the Apostles' and Nicene creeds, would not be a step in advance. It would be a step backward. It would be an association under a mistake, putting the physical or the intellectual or even the superstitious for the spiritual. We want a union which will guarantee to us intellectual liberty, not suppress it; and which shall, by necessary consequence, legitimize that variety which always springs out of liberty. The only union of value, the union to be prayed for, is that union which springs spontaneously from mutual recognition of those who have the mind of Christ. As two drops of quicksilver rush into one, so every two neighboring Christian hearts should blend.

An immediate movement for union would force a revision of our ideas of church government. We should have to acknowledge the legitimacy of every kind of polity, and the right of each several company of Christians to follow their own conscientious convictions of duty. Above all, we should have to concede the widest liberty. For myself, as a Congregationalist, I do not find in Scripture or in church history any indication of a legitimate sphere for a government above the local assembly of Christians, each of whom is a king and a priest unto God, an authorized and final interpreter of Scripture, and a creed-maker. If immoralities occur Christ himself has told us how to proceed in expelling the sinful and contumacious member from the local church. If some brother, while conscientious and faithful in practical life, reaches theological convictions which others regard as unsound, there is no legitimate way to get rid of him.

To all this it will be replied that what I am contending for we already have, and that such a union is virtually no

union at all. This I do not admit. True, we are making rapid progress toward what I am advocating. One of the delights of living nowadays is to watch the rapidly advancing reunion of Christendom. Nowhere in the world is that reunion more beautifully manifest than in these delightful groves of Chautauqua. Here under the trees is a genuine and visible and practical fellowship among Methodists and Baptists and Presbyterians and Congregationalists and all the rest, which very nearly fulfils my ideal. We recognize here that what we have in common infinitely exceeds what we hold apart. This is what we wish to realize all over the world.

The true program for those of us who wish to promote the spiritual reunion of Christendom will be somewhat as follows :

1. To concede fully and freely to every Christian and every body of Christians the right to independent assurance as to each disputed point.

2. To cultivate the utmost courtesy in discussion, seeking not for verbal victories, but simply the establishment of truth, admitting that we ourselves may be in the wrong.

3. Just as far as possible to drop all controversy regarding disputed points, inferring at once that if anything is doubtful to any it cannot be of primary importance, although it might otherwise seem so to us.

4. To magnify the things in which all Christians agree, and to put all the cordiality possible into all union efforts, like this at Chautauqua, work like Mr. Moody's and Mr. Mills's, the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, the Young Men's Christian Association, the associated charities, the civic federations, etc.

5. To concentrate Christian attention on the needs of a sinful, ignorant, suffering, and sorrowing world, and the paramount necessity of comity and coöperation in using the means at command for the salvation of mankind.

I myself do not pray for the *organic* union of Christendom. In the church to which I belong we feel no need of more government. We have no use for an historic bishop to set things in order, nor for a General Assembly to revise our creed. We are not impatient to commune with the immersionists, nor to preach in Episcopalian pulpits. Like Gallio, we "care for none of these things." We do not desire all to think and act alike in non-essentials. What we want is the mutual assurance of perfect love and confidence and recognition. If asked in what Christian assemblies I have felt most impressed I should find it hard to say whether most where the anthems of heavenly sweetness, sung by boys' voices, swelled through the historic arches of Westminster, or in a plain Quaker meeting-house in New York City, where in silence a whole congregation waited for the illumination of the divine Spirit. God fulfils himself in many ways. One good custom might corrupt the world. "All things are ours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are ours; and we are Christ's; and Christ is God's."

The practical results of a spiritual union would be manifold. That competition of sects in small towns which is now the scandal of the times would cease. All missionary efforts would receive a new strength from mutual coöperation. There would be an immense enrichment of the Christian life of each denomination by appropriation of the best things belonging to all the others. This has already been accomplished in our hymn-books, so that we all sing Roman Catholic and Unitarian and Calvinistic and Arminian hymns in sweet unconsciousness of their being anything but Christian.

The consciousness of spiritual union with the whole body of Christ would have, I believe, on the individual Christian a

peculiarly enlarging and inspiring effect. What a delightful change of attitude, from suspicion and coldness and opposition to brotherly love ! A new thrill of life and joy and peace, a new sense of power and hope, would come to all. The unbelieving multitudes would feel it ; the cavilings of objectors would sink into silence ; the icy barriers of heathenism would melt, and the world lie conquered at the feet of the Prince of Peace.

X

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM AS IT APPEARS
TO A PRESBYTERIAN

HENRY M. BOOTH, D.D.,
President of the Auburn Theological Seminary.

X

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM AS IT APPEARS TO A PRESBYTERIAN

A PRESBYTERIAN can speak of the reunion of Christendom, because the Presbyterian Church has spoken and is still speaking. The opinions of a Presbyterian may not possess especial interest or importance, while the opinions of the Presbyterian Church, as expressed by a Presbyterian, are entitled to respectful consideration. For the Presbyterian Church is one of the great historic churches of Christendom. The intelligence, the courage, the piety of the Christians who bear this honored name are never questioned. In the forefront of every battle for liberty Presbyterian warriors contend; in the select circles of accurate and profound scholarship Presbyterian theologians are welcome; in the dark places of the earth, which are the habitations of cruelty, Presbyterian missionaries are heroic; and in the relief of poverty, distress, and sickness Presbyterian resources are a dependence. Christendom cannot be indifferent to the Presbyterian Church, and Christendom is not.

Nor is the Presbyterian Church indifferent to the reunion of Christendom. The standards of the church prepare the way for such a reunion by clear, definite, and catholic statements as to the nature of the church and the essential characteristics of the ministry; while repeated deliverances of the General Assembly—the supreme judicatory of the

church—and the writings of many approved divines exhibit the thought and the spirit of Presbyterians on this important subject. A Presbyterian may, therefore, speak with authority, if his speech is in harmony with the utterances of the church, of which he may be only a very humble member.

When the reunion of Christendom comes up for consideration a Presbyterian is ready to ask and to answer three questions: 1. In the reunion of Christendom what does a Presbyterian anticipate? 2. To the reunion of Christendom what does a Presbyterian contribute? 3. With the reunion of Christendom what does a Presbyterian become?

1. In the reunion of Christendom what does a Presbyterian anticipate? When the reunion is accomplished, what will be the condition of Christendom? What is the ideal? Can there be unity without uniformity? Must there be one visible organization, like the Papacy? Is the reunion to be on the basis of dogma, of polity, or of ritual? If dogma is essential will the dogma be Pelagian, Arminian, or Calvinistic? Which one of the existing polities is to prevail? Will the church of the future carry a prayer-book in her hand?

Visible organic union is the avowed aim and purpose of the Roman Catholic Church, whose antiquity, influence, and numerical supremacy are universally recognized. The astute Pontiff who rules this organization from the seclusion of the Vatican Palace is now making overtures to the Greek Church, whose membership is 84,000,000, and is evidently planning to absorb the prelatical communions of every nation. When this result is reached, if it ever is, the Roman Catholic Church will be the exponent of unity, and the churches that are left outside that fold will be the scattered sheep in the wilderness.

It must be confessed that the Church of Rome has exceptional advantages for absorbing the rest of Christendom.

Dogma, polity, and ritual have all been "infallibly" determined. From the verdict of the church there can be no appeal. Submission must be absolute. The pope will rule over all as he now rules over a part, and uniformity will be evident, even if it is the uniformity that is witnessed when the rod of the master has silenced all speech.

The Presbyterian, who consults the Word of God, and derives his expectations from that inspired teaching, is not looking for such organic reunion. It is formal, unspiritual, inimical to the progress of the gospel, and without the warrant of Holy Scripture. The baptized paganism of the Emperor Constantine's reign was responsible for the Dark Ages; and the baptized paganism of the Emperor Vladimir's reign must answer for the Cossack and his career of ignorance and superstition.

He who gave the true ideal of unity by saying, "As thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us," did not encourage the unity of uniformity. For the unity of the Godhead—we say it reverently—is that of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. "These three are one true, eternal God; the same in substance, equal in power and glory;" although distinguished by their personal properties.

There may be many folds, as the true reading of John x. 16 declares, and yet there may be only one flock, and one Shepherd. There may be a sincere attachment to Jesus Christ as the Head of the church, and a genuine sympathy with all who name that name divine, along with intelligent and allowable preferences for dogmas, politics, and rituals which would make a formal organic unity impossible.

If the Presbyterian is not looking for an organic reunion of Christendom, how is it with a federative reunion? Within the limits of several of the historic churches such a reunion

has been accomplished. The Presbyterian, the Methodist Episcopal, the Protestant Episcopal, the Congregational, and other churches, have formed federations for mutual acquaintance, for the defense of the weak, for the dissemination of distinctive opinions, and for the promotion of church unity. It has been felt, and properly, that Christians who are most nearly allied should get together and exhibit their agreement to the other churches and to the world. Thus these federations have become important signs of the times. They have already answered an important purpose, and are destined to be more largely influential. Their danger lurks in the tendency to impose requirements, and to legislate for the people of God. This tendency is a characteristic of ecclesiasticism, and will prove destructive of the true purpose of federation. The liberty wherewith Christ has made us free is the individual Christian's birthright. No man, or body of men, can be allowed to take it from him. If federation means conference and fellowship and work, then it will further the great cause of reunion; but if it means assertion and dictation and undue restraint, it will only prove that the disciples of Christ are unable to live together peacefully when their living is intimate fellowship.

Thus far in their history these federations have for the most part avoided legislation. They have been grand parliaments of believers, who have met to talk about the church and the evangelization of the world, and to consider what may be done to hasten the triumph of our blessed Lord. They have splendid opportunities, because they appear as one body; and their unity gives them exceptional advantages of consideration, and of enabling them to issue statements to the world of the beliefs and purposes of large and influential bodies of Christians. Thus the Pan-Anglican Council of 1888 A.D., which was held in the city palace of

the Archbishop of Canterbury, enjoys the rare distinction of having issued authoritatively four definite propositions as a basis of reunion. These propositions are expressed in clear and definite terms, and are the candid statement of a great church. While we may dissent, as we do, from one of these terms—that concerning the “Historic Episcopate”—let us not fail to honor the spirit that has reduced the convictions of a noble church to these few terms of reunion. If other churches would go and do likewise, stating in simple language the terms that each one regards as essential, the real unity that now exists would be evident. For the Presbyterian Church, it is well known, has met the Lambeth Propositions with a cordial assent as to the first three, and with a desire to discuss the fourth, so that there may be an intelligent agreement as to its meaning. This is certainly an advance upon anything that has hitherto been known. When churchmen can reduce the barriers that separate them from others to one obstacle, never mind what that may be, the Spirit of our blessed Lord is certainly present and influential. All honor, then, to the Anglican Church and to the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States for this suggestive leadership! May it prove to be the herald of many other messengers of peace, who shall bring invitations that those who love our Lord may reason together!

This federative reunion, however, must be the outgrowth and expression of Christian love. “The unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” is more to be desired than any formal compacts, and if it does not precede and accompany such compacts they will only promote the bondage of ecclesiasticism. The New Testament makes very little of organization as such. The spirit is above the letter. “*Ubi Christus, ibi ecclesia.*” Learned writers of all schools agree that the polity of the apostolic age was very simple.

Apparently the synagogue order was perpetuated in the early church. The existing elaborate polities have been a development, and a development that has been rapid when formalism has prevailed.

A genuine spiritual union is a present reality to a degree that few persons appreciate. The one widely recognized Head of the church is our adorable Redeemer, Jesus Christ; the one common ground of salvation is his atoning sacrifice; the one condition of acceptance is repentance and faith; and the one hope of regeneration, holiness, and heaven is the indwelling of the divine Spirit. As the lamented Dr. Schaff said, in the paper read by him before the Chicago Parliament of Religions, "The church of Christ has been one from the beginning, and he has pledged to her his unbroken presence all the days to the end of the world. The one invisible church is the soul which animates the divided visible churches. All true believers are members of the mystical body of Christ."

There can be no more satisfactory statement of the nature of the church than is given in these words of the seventeenth century:

"The catholic or universal church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the Head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all.

"The visible church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel—not confined to one nation, as before under the law—consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation."

Such a statement as that is true to the teaching of Holy

Scripture, and to history, and to the divinely implanted characteristics of the Christian life. It is catholic, for no exclusive human claims are pressed. No one is denied church privileges because he has failed of a prescribed mode of baptism, of an especial mode of confirmation, or of a particular mode of ordination. It does not insist upon any one creed, nor upon any one polity, nor upon any one ritual. It does not unchurch the Arminian, who cannot accept the five points of Calvinism; nor the Baptist, who denies the perpetuity of the Abrahamic covenant in a gracious care of little children; nor the prelatist, who has failed of ordination by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. It declares that the church is the body of Christ, and that all who are joined to him by faith are members of that body and thus members of the church. It is willing to recognize, to work with, and even to unite with, in a modified union, all who profess and call themselves Christians.

This, the statement claims, is the divine ideal. For going, as it does, to the New Testament, the Westminster Confession hears "the Wisest of the wise and the Holiest of the holy" speaking of one vine and the many branches, of one flock and one Shepherd and the many folds; and hears, also, St. Paul, an inspired apostle, who speaks of the many members of the one body, whose Head is Christ, and of the household of God, which is composed of a multitude who were once strangers and sojourners; and listens as St. Peter, another inspired apostle, describes the glory of that spiritual house which is built up of living stones; and is taught by St. John, the inspired seer, who saw the Holy City, Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, with love holding together in perfect harmony the nations of them that are saved, who have gathered from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south.

This is the Kingdom of the older economy, or the Church of the present dispensation, or the City of God of the endless ages. The Lord of life and glory is supreme in all this realm. His presence is magnetic. Redemption is evident everywhere. For whether we speak of Kingdom, of Church, or of City, we refer to that one organized society whose law, whose life, whose purpose, are from him whom saints aforetime called Messiah, and who is now, and ever shall be, Jesus: "for he shall save his people from their sins."

The anticipation of a Presbyterian is simply the realization of this ideal. The unity of love is the reunion of Christendom. Such unity may be trusted to find its expression in dogma, in polity, and in ritual. There is a generous toleration of differences and a large liberty as to details of organization and worship. The end is not yet. Dr. A. A. Hodge remarked, in his "Popular Lectures on Theological Themes," that "the principle of the union is spiritual and vital, and hence it must be the result of an internal growth. The more perfect the inward life the more perfect will be its outward expression. The final external form of the holy catholic church will never be reached by adding denomination to denomination. It will come, as all growth into organized form, alike in the physiological and in the social world, comes, by the spontaneous action of central vital forces from within." Those forces are the power of the Holy Spirit working love, joy, peace, long-suffering, meekness, gentleness, and other gracious results of the divine indwelling in the hearts of all true Christians. A strong churchman, and a distinguished Presbyterian, once said: "I am a Presbyterian, not only by birth, but by conviction, and yield to no man in loyalty to the denomination in whose service my life has been spent and in whose bosom I hope to die. But I do not expect to be a Pres-

byterian, nor anything of the kind, in heaven. And as my sun grows larger and more mellow toward its setting, I would gladly exchange everything that is not essentially Christian for a few of the days of heaven on earth, in the unity and peace of the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." I believe that my beloved and lamented friend, Dr. H. J. van Dyke, fairly represented the anticipations of a Presbyterian. Our baptism is freely offered to all believers and their children. Our table is spread for all who confess Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. Our pulpits are free to all who preach Jesus Christ, and him crucified. We are ready to commune with our Baptist brethren, and to exchange pulpits with our Episcopal brethren, and to rejoice in the prosperity of all brethren who are seeking to honor Him who is the only source of life. As a Presbyterian I am not conscious that I place a single obstacle in the way of the reunion of Christendom. I do not ask other churches to become Calvinistic, although I myself am Calvinistic. I do not ask them to throw away their prayer-books, although I myself prefer free prayer. I do not ask them to dismiss their diocesan bishops, although I myself agree with Lightfoot, Jacob, Hatch, Stanley, and many other notable prelatical writers, that a diocesan bishop is of later than New Testament date. The church that evidently enjoys the presence of our Lord is the church that I wish to welcome into my fellowship. More than that I cannot say. I do not think that I should be asked to accept the distinctive peculiarities of each church. Rebaptism or reordination would be an impeachment of the baptism and the ordination that I have received, and that I regard as valid and regular. I can respect the convictions of a brother even when I cannot always agree with him, and I can love him as a brother in Christ.

In this way the unity of love will bind together, as one body, the hands and the feet, the eyes and the ears, that act in obedience to the will of Him whose we are and whom we serve. When that blessed consummation is realized the world will believe that the Father sent the Son, and that salvation is through him. Thus the prayer of intercession will be answered, and Christendom will be one.

2. To the reunion of Christendom what does a Presbyterian contribute? The Presbyterian Church has made, and is still making, valuable contributions to the reunion of Christendom. These contributions are:

(a) *Biblical Christianity*.—The Presbyterian Church does not claim any monopoly in the ownership or control of biblical Christianity. Yet there is no church in Christendom that honors the Word of God with more intelligent loyalty than the Presbyterian Church does. That Word is authoritative. It is believed that a divine inspiration covers the entire contents of that Word, from Genesis to the Apocalypse. That Word is the source of dogmatic teaching, of polity, and of ritual. The Presbyterian goes to the Bible, rather than to the fathers, and the saints of the post-apostolic centuries, for his theology and practical instruction. For God speaks in and through the Bible, and when the mind of God is known on any subject the last word has been spoken. Beyond that, argument is an impertinence. Bible reading is the birthright of all Presbyterians. Every man can read for himself, and judge for himself. A Bible in every home is true of the Presbyterian Church. Consequently the church is a biblical church. No better service has been rendered than this of giving prominence to the Word of God. The Roman Catholic Church has used ritualistic Christianity in missionary effort, and her success in converting the nations, in purifying common life, and in uniting Christendom has not been conspicuous. Biblical

Christianity can show better results. It is easy to contrast the work of Columba with that of the devoted Xavier, and the work of the Pilgrims with that of the Spanish Jesuits.

Biblical Christianity must prevail if reunion is to be an accomplishment. For the prevalence of biblical Christianity is the only assurance that Christ will be known in all the completeness of his mediatorial character; and until he is thus known the suggestion of reunion is an idle dream.

(b) *Genuine Catholicity*.—Biblical Christianity leads to a genuine catholicity. We can be satisfied to be as catholic as Jesus was, and we need not desire to be more so. This is our position. If in this we err, may God forgive our mistakes. But on this part of our subject it is not necessary that I should enlarge, as enough has been said already to present the attitude of the Presbyterian Church.

(c) *Missionary Zeal*.—It is as true in the church as it is in the nursery that

“Satan finds some mischief still
For idle hands to do.”

A working church is apt to be a church that is ready to meet other churches in Christian effort. On the missionary fields men recognize the help and comfort of Christian brotherhood. Minor distinctions disappear in the presence of a common foe. Soldiers of the Republic may talk about the superiority of their States in time of peace and inaction; but when the battle is on the one flag that commands enthusiasm is the stars and stripes. What care you and I that this sin-stricken world should become Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, or Episcopalian? We want it to be Christian, and for that we care more than for all other things combined. Besides, on the mission fields there is a clear recognition of the important fact that one situation may demand one phase or expression of the church, and

another one quite different. The poetic Orient should never be held firmly to the order that flourished on the shores of Boston Bay. Sunny Italy will call for more of song and of ritual than is required in phlegmatic Holland. There are racial characteristics that present their demands; and He was divinely wise who announced certain principles for the government of his church, and left the nations and the centuries who should believe on him to a large liberty in the expression of those principles. All this becomes evident to a missionary church like the Presbyterian, whose contributions to reunion are thus of a most practical kind.

But time will not admit of an elaboration of these interesting and important points. Let me pass, then, in conclusion, to raise and to answer our third question. It is this:

3. With the reunion of Christendom what does a Presbyterian become? Why, simply a recognized member of the body of Christ. Now he is a member, but unrecognized by many whose churchmanship he is glad to recognize. Then the recognition will be mutual. This is all that a Presbyterian asks. He claims his rights in his Father's house—that is all. Certainly a modest demand. He is not a heretic, although he is so considered by the majority of those who bear the Christian name. He is not unbaptized, although his baptism is denied by many whose faith and service he rejoices to honor. He is not unordained, although the laying on of the hands of the presbytery is not valid ordination in the estimate of multitudes whose orders and sacraments are cordially accepted by him. A Presbyterian asks reciprocity. Love alone can secure this blessed result. For, as a holy apostle has said: "Love suffereth long, and is kind; love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not its own, is not provoked, taketh not account

of evil; rejoiceth not in unrighteousness, but rejoiceth with the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." Add to the words of St. Paul the gracious announcement of St. John: "God is love; and he that abideth in love abideth in God, and God abideth in him." No more is needed. For we have divine authority for the statement that "in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit."

In conclusion I would say that reunion must follow:

1. The prevalence of a sincere Christian spirit. Christians must trust one another and love one another. Without confidence and love reunion would be like a flower-garden on Vesuvius. The exhortation of the Apostle must be met: "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and railing, be put away from you, with all malice: and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you." Such a spirit is not now prevalent in Christendom, and as a consequence reunion is often ridiculed as the dream of enthusiasts. We shall do our best work for reunion by working for confidence and love. When Christians trust one another and love one another reunion will announce its presence.

2. The recognition of the validity of orders and ordinances whose regularity may be questioned. This is the intelligent toleration that a Presbyterian values. With this several of the barriers that now divide Christendom will be swept away.

3. The avoidance of unfriendly competition in missionary work, and the promotion of comity. The field is the world, and the destitute regions are numerous. Why should churches seem anxious to crowd one another in Christian lands, when there is room enough on the continents where

heathenism and Mohammedanism should be crowded to death ?

4. The federation for sympathy and work of all churches whose faith and worship are the same, and the statement of the essential and necessary truths as they are held. What a gain it would be if a church like the Presbyterian could formulate a brief irenic statement of the truths that Presbyterians regard as vital! How many members of other churches would see in such a statement "a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us"! We can sing the same hymns and pray the same prayers; may it not be that we could accept the same creed if the creed could be framed with simplicity ?

A Presbyterian cares more for the spirit than for the letter. He is confident that when the Lord Jesus controls the heart and life the expression will be unity, whatever the form or organization may be; and so he prays, "Thy kingdom come," with the added petition, "Thy will be done."

For more than twenty years of my pastoral life I was permitted to meet with Christian brethren in a ministerial society whose membership was representative of seven of the great churches of Christendom: Lutheran, Methodist Episcopal, Protestant Episcopal, Baptist, Congregational, Dutch Reformed, and Presbyterian. These brethren were earnest men, who had decided preferences which they freely expressed. But Christian confidence and love held them together, so that there was truer unity than can be found in a presbytery, a conference, or a diocesan convention. We often talked together about the reunion of Christendom, and we always agreed that in our fellowship we had such unity as the Lord contemplated in his intercessory prayer.

Such unity, the unity of confidence and love, must appear. For it we may work, by making our Lord known. For it

we may pray, as we plead that Christ may dwell in men's hearts by faith. For it we may hope, as we familiarize ourselves with the promises of Holy Scripture, and look forward to the day of Christ, which is the golden age. When that day comes it will not find Christians under one polity nor with one ritual. But it will find them at peace and in love, rejoicing that Jesus Christ is honored, and that the many members of his body, the church, are obedient in all things to him who is the Head.

XI

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM AS IT APPEARS
TO A DISCIPLE

BENJAMIN B. TYLER, D.D.,
Of the Church of the Disciples, New York.

XI

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM AS IT APPEARS TO A DISCIPLE

IN this meeting I speak as an individual, and not in any formal sense as a representative of the people who are known as Disciples of Christ. Having, however, been born of Disciple parents, bred in a Disciple home, educated in a college under the control of Disciples, and having spent nearly one third of a century in the ministry of the gospel with this people, I feel that what I will say in this presence will be indorsed by the brethren with whom in ecclesiastical fellowship I am most intimately associated.

Permit me, also, in beginning, to premise that I have accepted the invitation to speak upon this occasion with the understanding that our utterances are to be characterized by the utmost candor. Each person will speak honestly and boldly what he thinks concerning the problem of union; or, to change the phraseology, will present the problem of union as it appears to him.

A realization of the evils of division among the people of God, with an earnest desire for such a spiritual unity and visible oneness as will please the Master and hasten the conversion of the world, was the inspiration of a movement in the beginning of the present century which has resulted in the organization of more than seven thousand congregations embracing nearly seven hundred thousand

communicants. These congregations are known in legal documents and in letters of introduction and commendation as simply and only churches of Christ. They are devoted in large part to an attempted solution of the problem of union, as well as to the turning of men to the Lord Jesus Christ by the preaching of his gospel. These congregations of Disciples may appropriately be characterized as Christian Unity Societies. The problem of union among the people of God has ever been—and at no time to a greater extent than at this present moment—a question of the deepest interest to us.

We all agree in regarding “the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing all things necessary to salvation, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.” (“The Historic Episcopate,” Charles Woodruff Shields, D.D., LL.D., p. 24.) We stand on common ground at this point, whether we call ourselves Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, or Disciples. To the writings of Moses and the prophets, of Jesus and the apostles, we make our appeal as to an ultimate authority. From the decision of the Christ and those who spoke and wrote as moved by his Spirit there is no appeal, neither on this nor on any other matter pertaining to our most holy religion.

It is not at all difficult to discover the mind of the Christ concerning the relation in which he would have his people stand toward himself and then toward one another. As he approached the end of his mission among men he uttered a prayer in which he besought the Father that those who would believe on him as a result of the teaching of his elect ambassadors might all be one, “even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us: that the world may believe that thou didst send me.” This prayer, being a prayer in behalf of believers, has for us in the pres-

ent emergency a peculiar interest. We have been led by the testimony of inspired men to believe in Jesus as the Son of God and our Saviour. For us, therefore, and not merely for men who lived in the long ago, did the Son of God pray. For us his desire *is*, not *was*—for he is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever—that we may be joined together in a unity similar to that which exists between the Father and the Son, and this in order that “the world may believe that thou didst send me.” It is difficult, if not impossible, to exaggerate the importance of the problem of unity and union among the people of God.

This prayer will yet be answered. The Master said at the grave of Lazarus, “Thou hearest me always.” In the prayer from which I have quoted, written in the seventeenth chapter of John, the Christ prayed for those who were his personal friends, “that they may be one, even as we are.” The prayer of Jesus at the grave of Lazarus we know was answered; the prayer of the Son of man concerning the unity of his personal friends was also answered; so, too, his petition in behalf of those who “believe on me” will be answered. We may, therefore, labor and pray for the unity and union of believers with the fullest confidence that sooner or later such a oneness, spiritual and visible, will be realized as will fully satisfy the desires of the Master.

When Jesus gave the great commission to his disciples to go “into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation,” he placed upon them an embargo, saying, “But tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high.” Having given this solemn charge to his disciples, with the limitation just mentioned, we are told that “while he blessed them, he parted from them, and was carried up into heaven. And they worshiped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy.” We are told, also, that “when the day of Pentecost was now come, they were all together

in one place. And suddenly there came from heaven a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder, like as of fire; and it sat upon each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. Now there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, from every nation under heaven. . . . And they were all amazed, and were perplexed, saying one to another, What meaneth this? But others mocking said, They are filled with new wine." Simon Peter, "a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ," explained the strange scene, saying to them, "This is that which hath been spoken by the prophet Joel." He then reasoned with the people out of the sacred writings concerning Jesus and the resurrection, reaching a climax when he declared, "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified. Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Brethren, what shall we do? And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. . . . They then that received his word were baptized: and there were added unto them [unto the original one hundred and twenty] in that day about three thousand souls."

Thus the church of Christ began to be on earth. It originated in a protracted prayer-meeting in which the participants, we are assured, were "all with one accord." We are told that those who were turned to the Christ as a result of the discourse on this great Pentecost day, immediately after the coronation of Messiah, "were together, and

had all things common." We are also informed that "day by day, continuing steadfastly with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home, they did take their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people." Turning another leaf in the New Testament, we are not surprised when we read that "the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and soul: and not one of them said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common." It was at this time, when "the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and soul," that the historian assures us there was "great grace upon them all." As to the value of this unity, a unity in perfect accord with the prayer which our Saviour offered, we are told that "the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem exceedingly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith."

That "a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith" indicates the well-nigh irresistible power of the gospel when presented by a united church. Naturally the priesthood was conservative. The priests were satisfied with things as they were. They had interests which were sacred because divinely conferred and on account of their antiquity. But such was the potency of the gospel of Jesus Christ presented by a united church that even these conservative priests turned from their self-interest and became "obedient to the faith." There could be no greater testimony to the effectiveness of a united church in the preaching of the gospel of the grace of God.

In the facts here recited we have two things to which especial attention is directed. We have, in the first place, a record of the exact fulfilment of the prayer of our Saviour in behalf of his personal friends, and of those who through their influence would be led to believe in him. We have,

in the second place, an indication of the tremendous, the well-nigh irresistible power exerted on the world by believers when they were "perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment."

Have we not a right, therefore, to look for the realization on earth among believers of our Saviour's manifest desire expressed in this prayer, and ought we not to labor in hope that even in our day our eyes may behold a more perfect unity and union than at present exists?

Not many years passed, however, until discords and divisions began to manifest themselves among those early believers in Christ. The time came when they were no longer "with one accord"; when they no longer lived in such unity as to have "favor with all the people." How did the men who were especially inspired by the Holy Spirit for their work—how did the men who had the promise of the Christ that they would be guided by the Spirit into all truth in the discharge of the exceedingly difficult duty which had been placed upon them by their Master—how did these men regard the changed relation which the disciples were coming to sustain toward one another?

Paul, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, said that "it hath been signified unto me concerning you, my brethren, by them which are of the household of Chloe, that there are contentions among you." This was what Paul had heard about those in Corinth "sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints." What had he to say to them concerning this matter? Did he approve? Was he indifferent? He said this: "I beseech you, brethren, through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment." And then, having mentioned the message which he had received, he proceeds to describe the character of

their divisions. He said: "Each one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ." Having stated the nature of the trouble, he administers a rebuke in the words following: "Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized into the name of Paul? I thank God that I baptized none of you [schismatics, I think he means], save Crispus and Gaius; lest any man should say that ye were baptized into my name," and so there would be an apparent reason for calling some of the members of the "church of God which is at Corinth" Paulites. Then he recalls to mind—Paul does—that he "baptized also the household of Stephanas."

In another part of this epistle, referring to this same matter, the Apostle says: "And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, as unto babes in Christ. I fed you with milk, not with meat; for ye were not yet able to bear it: nay, not even now are ye able." Why were they so enfeebled? His answer is, "There is among you jealousy and strife." And in his Second Epistle Paul expresses a fear that were he to visit the church of God in Corinth he would find among the "saints" in that city "strife, jealousy, wraths, factions, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, disorders"; that he would, as a result of their unseemly spirit and conduct, be humbled and caused to "mourn for many of them that have sinned heretofore, and repented not." The presence of jealousy and strife among members of the church of God is evidence of a lack of spirituality; is evidence of the presence of carnality. Where there is jealousy and strife there is an absence of spiritual health and robustness. "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ," says that "where jealousy and faction are, there is confusion and every vile deed."

If it was ever lawful or permissible for disciples of Christ

to call themselves by the names of men, and to rally around party banners, it was permissible in the city of Corinth. The men who were elected as leaders by these schismatics were no ordinary characters. Paul and Apollos and Peter are colossal figures in the history of the primitive church. Yet Paul spurns the thought of founding and leading a sect in the church of Christ, and says to these schismatics: Who are we? Paul? Apollos? Cephas? Who are we but "ministers through whom ye believed; and each as the Lord gave to him? I planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase."

Please observe, also, that in the midst of the rebuke administered by this ambassador of Christ to the schismatics in the "church of God which is at Corinth" he specifies the foundation on which they should stand as one body. It is at the eleventh verse of the third chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians that he declares, "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

But Paul says more than this. He does not simply say, "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." This is what he says: "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus *the* Christ." The definite article is employed by St. Paul when he speaks of the foundation of the church in Corinth. Do you ask what is the difference between Jesus Christ and Jesus *the* Christ? I reply, what is the difference between George King and George *the* King? In the one case you have a simple proper name, while in the other you have an official designation. The Son of Mary is not simply Jesus Christ; he is Jesus *the* Christ. He is the Anointed of the Father, full of grace and truth. The statement of Paul is in harmony with what the Mas-

ter said in his conversation with the disciples in Cæsarea Philippi after Simon Peter had "answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Jesus said, "Upon this rock I will build my church." That is to say, on this great truth, this central truth of Christianity, this primitive creed, this original confession of faith—on this "my church" shall be built, and it will stand on this foundation so solidly that "the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it."

In the twelfth chapter of this First Epistle to the Corinthians Paul presents his idea as to the nature of the unity which should prevail among the people of God. It is, he says, similar to the unity which prevails in the human body between the different members thereof. He declares that "in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; it is not therefore not of the body. And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; it is not therefore not of the body. If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members each one of them in the body, even as it pleased him. And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now they are many members, but one body. And the eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee: or again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much rather, those members of the body which seem to be more feeble are necessary: and those parts of the body, which we think to be less honorable, upon these we bestow more abundant honor; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness; whereas our comely parts have no need: but God

tempered the body together, giving more abundant honor to that part which lacked; that there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffereth, all the members suffer with it; or one member is honored, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof." This was Paul's notion concerning the unity which ought to prevail among believers. For this character of unity we ought to labor and pray and hope.

At the present time, remember, we are seeking to discover the attitude of mind sustained by inspired men toward divisions among Christians, and we will see, as we rapidly turn the pages of the New Testament, that always and everywhere they condemned, not merely as impolitic and imprudent, but as sinful before God, divisions among those who have had the name of the Christ called on them in holy baptism.

In the epistle to the saints in Rome, last chapter, the subject comes up, and the Apostle says: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Christ, but their own belly; and by their smooth and fair speech they beguile the hearts of the innocent." Can there be any doubt as to the mind of Paul concerning the evil of divisions among saints?

Turn we now to his Epistle to the Ephesians. I ask permission at this point to quote the language of the Rev. Dr. John A. Broadus, president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, as follows: "What is the key-note of the Epistle to the Ephesians? It is the unity of Christians. The dispute of many years, whether Gentiles should become Jews, is not ended, but the Apostle urges that the

Christians are one, Jew or Gentile. That was the widest idea that ever existed among Christians in this world. None of our divisions of sect, of country, or of race is half so hard to overcome as was that question of the junction of Jewish Christian and Gentile Christian, and the Apostle's great thought in that epistle is that all are one in Christ Jesus. The epistle was intended, apparently, to be sent around as a sort of circular letter to many churches, but that is the key-note." ("Sermons and Addresses," p. 179.)

The heart of this epistle is found in the fourth chapter, in which the Apostle says: "I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beseech you to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all."

The Apostle seems here to say to the saints in Ephesus, and to all to whom this circular letter would come: "Since you are members of one body; since you are animated by one Spirit; since you are sustained by one hope; since you have over you one Lord; since you cherish one faith; since you have submitted to one baptism; since you recognize one God over all and as Father of all, you ought, having so much in common, 'to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.'" The logic, if this be the logic, of this quotation is quite as cogent, yea, more powerful, to-day and in these ends of the earth than at that remote time and in that dis-

tant part of the world. Believers here and now hold so many things in common, and things of the greatest importance, things that are fundamental and essential in our religion, that they ought "to walk worthily of the calling wherewith" they are "called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love."

May I pause here, beloved in the Lord, to enumerate a number of items of the faith which are held in common by all evangelical believers? We all hold to the divine inspiration of the Old and New Testaments; to the revelation of God in the tri-personality of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; to the alone-sufficiency and all-sufficiency of the Bible as a revelation of the divine character and will, and as a rule of faith and practice; to the divine excellency and worthiness of Jesus as the Son of God; to the official authority and glory of Jesus as the anointed Prophet to teach us, Priest to intercede for us, and King to rule over us; to the personal and perpetual mission of the Holy Spirit to convict the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment, and to dwell in believers as their Comforter, Strengthened, and Sanctifier; to the alienation of the race from God, and their entire dependence on the truth, mercy, and grace of God, as manifested in Jesus the Christ, and revealed and confirmed to us by the Holy Spirit in the gospel, for regeneration, sanctification, adoption, and life eternal; to the necessity of faith and repentance in order to the possession and enjoyment of salvation here and hereafter; to the perpetuity of baptism and the Lord's Supper as divine ordinances to the end of time; to the obligation to observe the first day of the week as the Lord's Day; to the church of Christ as a divine institution, composed of such as by faith and baptism have openly confessed the name of Christ; to the necessity of righteousness, benevolence, and holiness on the part of professed Christians, alike in view

of their own final salvation and of their mission to turn the world to God ; to the fullness and freeness of the salvation offered in the gospel to all who accept it on the terms proposed ; to the final punishment of the deliberately and persistently ungodly by an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power. Being united in the belief of these and many other facts and truths fundamental and essential in our religion, we ought, as Paul exhorted the saints in Ephesus, "to walk worthily of the calling wherewith" we are "called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love."

How anxious the Apostle was concerning the unity of believers when he was a prisoner in Rome ! He wrote to his brethren in Philippi, beseeching them : "Only let your manner of life be worthy of the gospel of Christ : that, whether I come and see you or be absent, I may hear of your state, that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one soul striving for the faith of the gospel." He begs them to "have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." Farther along in the same epistle he exhorts : "Do all things without murmurings and disputings ; that ye may be blameless and harmless, children of God without blemish in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation, among whom ye are seen as lights in the world, holding forth the word of life ; that I may have whereof to glory in the day of Christ, that I did not run in vain neither labor in vain."

In the Epistle to the Galatians Paul is led to express his conviction concerning heresies or sects. He regards sects as of the flesh, not of the Spirit. In enumerating the works of the flesh he mentions adultery, fornication, uncleanness, licentiousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strifes, jealousies, indignations, contentions, divisions, sects, envy-

ings, murders, drunkenness, and revels. Over against the works of the flesh he places the fruit of the Spirit. Enumerating the fruit of the Spirit he mentions love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faith, meekness, and self-control. He says that those who do the works of the flesh "shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Having spoken of the fruit of the Spirit, Paul says, "Against such there is no law."

It is well, beloved in the Lord, with these facts before us, that we should give not only attention, but *especial* attention, to the problem of union. Do I exaggerate when I say that, with the New Testament open before me, the problem of the unity of God's people is of greater importance than that of any other topic to which we can now give our attention? Our divisions are sinful: Paul says they are. Our divisions are out of harmony with the mind of the Christ: of this there can be no reasonable doubt. We ought to repent of this sin as of all sins. We ought to turn away from it as speedily as possible. Having failed to realize the mind of Christ, we ought, with all speed, to place ourselves on the one foundation which he himself has placed, and begin "to walk worthily of the calling wherewith" we are called.

Thus far we have attempted to discover the mind of our Lord and of the Holy Spirit, as he spoke through the apostles, concerning divisions among the children of God. Sectarianism, we have seen, is a sin. But are sectarianism and denominationalism synonymous? I think not. An inquiry into the genesis of our great Protestant denominations will show that they are so many efforts which have been and are being made to realize, in experience and conduct, Christianity according to Christ. The church was in the beginning right in its faith, and in the observance of the divinely appointed ordinances, baptism and the Supper of

the Lord. But at an early period it fell away from the simplicity that is in Christ. It became corrupt alike in its creed and in its conduct. The Reformation of the sixteenth century was the beginning of a return in faith and in life to the religion of Jesus as it was at the first. The various denominations represent so many efforts to realize in our individual lives and in our associated capacities Christianity according to Christ. The fact ought to be noted that the sects condemned in the New Testament were composed of persons with their faces turned away from the Captain of our salvation. They were departing from Jesus in belief and in behavior. The denominations to-day are composed of men and women whose faces are turned toward the Master; composed of persons who hunger and thirst after righteousness; composed of persons who desire to realize in their experiences all that the Christ in his holy gospel purposes in their behalf. A wonderful difference this between sectarianism and denominationalism!

On one occasion during the personal ministry of the Son of man, John, afterward known as "the beloved," came to him with a complaint like this. He said, "Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name: and we forbade him, because he followed not us." The spirit of John at that time was essentially sectarian, and he was promptly rebuked by Jesus, who said, "Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a mighty work in my name, and be able quickly to speak evil of me." On another occasion the same spirit was manifested by John and his brother James. It was the occasion of the Master's last journey to the Holy City. "He steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem, and sent messengers before his face: and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him. And they did not receive him." Why? "Because his face was as though he were going to Jerusalem. And

when his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we bid fire to come down from heaven, and consume them? But he turned, and rebuked them." In this there was not only a manifestation of the spirit of sectarianism, but it was manifested in its most intense and unreasoning form. Sectarianism is a spirit. It may exist with denominationalism. It does; but it is not an essential part of denominationalism.

I find in the *Independent* of June 21, 1894, an article on "The Reunion of Christendom," by Percy L. Parker, in which he refers to an address delivered by Dr. Clifford in his church in Westbourne Park, London. In this discourse Dr. Clifford defines the difference between denominationalism and sectarianism substantially as follows: "Denominations were organizations for the purpose of securing the presentation of particular truths which had either been hidden or misrepresented. Sectarianism is exclusiveness. Such a spirit is contrary to the spirit of Christ." These words of Dr. Clifford present my thought.

The Protestant denominations, as has been remarked, have their faces turned toward the Son of God. I think that we can all say, with Paul: "Brethren, I count not myself yet to have apprehended: but one thing I do, forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." And what is true of us as individuals is quite true of the aggregations of imperfect but aspiring men massed together as denominations. Thus our denominations, as I conceive, originated. This is their aim and their attitude. It is well that we should note carefully the distinction between sectarianism and denominationalism. It is quite probable that denominationalism, more or less marked, will continue in the church of Christ to the end of time. But is it not pos-

sible to exorcise the sect spirit? I believe that it is, and for this I pray.

Another distinction which it is important to note is the difference between Christian unity and church union. There is not a word in the New Testament, that I have been able to discover, on the subject of church union; but there are many words on the subject of Christian unity, or the unity of those who believe in Christ. Jesus prayed for the unity of believers; he prayed only inferentially, if at all, for church union. Do we not err, therefore, when in our attempted solution of the confessedly difficult problem we place emphasis on church organization and order? We have in the New Testament the model of unity to which we should aspire; and from that model we can learn but little—very little—on these topics which to some of us seem to be subjects of prime importance.

Dr. Shields, in his book on "The Historic Episcopate," says (p. 3), referring to the church as it was "in the first century," that "in that one Catholic Apostolic Church we have an example, a model of church unity, not only as consistent with Christian unity, but as expressing and maintaining it." Looking at this model, we learn but little on the subject of organization. The life of the church was benevolent. The poor were cared for. The gospel was preached to those dead in sin. The organization of the church which is "a model of church unity" was simply congregational. The character of the unity "in that one Catholic Apostolic Church" was a simple and hearty devotion to the Son of God.

Dr. Henry M. Field well says, in his paper, the *Evangelist*, for March 15, 1894, speaking on the text, "They were all with one accord in one place": "How came they there? They needed no compulsion nor persuasion. It was not a pressure from without, but the attraction within.

They were drawn, not driven. It was because there was one love in every heart that they rushed together as brothers rush into each other's arms.

"That is the whole story. One overmastering devotion molded all hearts into one. This was not the power of *a man*. Here and there at intervals in the ages there had been men whose genius gave them a peculiar fascination over their fellows, so that they seemed to have a natural power of command that others must obey. But the love of the disciples for their Master cannot be explained by any intellectual superiority, nor even by moral greatness. It was the wonderful Personality of a Being who had appeared among men, and suffered and died and ascended to heaven. He was no longer among his disciples, but the impression of his life was so increased by his death that he was even more in their minds and hearts than when he was yet with them. While he was living those of his own household had their jealousies and rivalries and petty ambitions; but all these were hushed when they sat with him at the table for the last time. And now, as they came together, he seemed to be in the midst of them; they caught his eye; they heard his voice asking, 'Will ye go away?' The spell of his mighty presence was on them still."

It is clear that the unity of "that one Catholic Apostolic Church," which, as Professor Shields says, furnishes "an example, a model of church unity," was Christian unity, that is, unity on Christ, in Christ, under Christ, in obedience to Christ, in fellowship with Christ; a unity of which the man Christ Jesus was the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the center and the circumference. I see no more in it than this, but this is more than we have yet attained unto.

If we will only permit him, the Master, in a single sentence, will solve this problem for us. He said, "And I, if

I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself." If men are drawn toward Christ they are necessarily drawn toward one another. The more intimate their connection with the Lord Jesus the more closely they come into fellowship. Alexander Campbell said, in 1837, that "it is the image of the Christ the Christian looks for and loves, and this does not consist in being exact in a few items, but in general devotion to the whole truth as far as known." ("Millennial Harbinger," 1837, p. 412.)

The practical solution of the problem now before us is to be found, in the first place, in a more intimate fellowship on the part of individual believers with the Lord Jesus. Having attained this, the form of our organization for worship and work will take care of itself. What I insist upon is, that we shall take our stand close to the Teacher, and looking up into his face receive from his lips right doctrine, and drinking in his spirit learn to order our lives according to the perfect pattern which he himself furnished. This is the first thing to do.

Permit me again to quote Professor Shields. He says, in "The Historic Episcopate" (p. 8): "Absolute uniformity is not possible either in the world of nature or of grace. According to the chosen metaphors of Scripture, the church is one vine, but with different branches; one body, but with various members; one building, but of composite structure. In political society we see the greatest variety of classes, parties, and opinions: aristocratic, democratic, republican, socialist, populist; no one of them absorbing or exterminating the rest. As little in religious society may we hope to find all Christians at once becoming Baptists or Congregationalists or Methodists or Presbyterians or Episcopalians or Romanists." But can we not, for the sake of the cause which cost the Son of God his life, agree that we will cease to be Baptists, Methodists, Congre-

gationalists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Romanists, and that we will be always and everywhere simply Christians? This was sufficient for Paul. It satisfied the early disciples. Ought this not to be sufficient for us?

Let us again hear Professor Shields. He says: "Much less could they be made alike by any civil or ecclesiastical process. The experiment of enforced uniformity has been tried for several hundred years in Episcopal England and Presbyterian Scotland, with only a brood of nonconforming sects growing up around both establishments. The same lesson is taught us here by the conflict of usage with rubrics, by the disuse of directories, and by the rise of heresy under the strictest creeds and confessions. All experience shows that a rigid uniformity in doctrine and ritual could only breed dissent and schism, and issue in renewed failure."

Dr. Parkhurst well says, in a sermon delivered in the Madison Square Presbyterian Church, New York, March 4, 1894, concerning the disciples who "were abiding with such perfection of accord on the eve of Pentecost," that "individual tastes, particular ways of looking at things, distinctive modes of apprehending Christ, and characteristic methods of interpreting his words, were felt to be so far off the main line of concern that they had no effect to divide or disintegrate. The relations of Christian fellowship were founded in that which was distinctly and essentially personal, and with that personal basis nothing of a foreign nature was allowed to interfere or to intermix. Of course they did not all look at things in the same way, and of course they could not all express themselves in the same way, but that was not a fact that touched upon the accord with which they continued to labor, wait, and pray together. There was to them just one engrossing reality, and that was their individual vital relation to Jesus Christ; and so

engrossing was that that no other consideration was able to count or signify.

“There was no suggestion of having one church for the gifted disciples and another for the unschooled ; one for the rich and another for the impecunious ; one for the Peters who could put their loyalty to Jesus in one form of confession, and another for the Thomases who found it a little difficult to phrase their loyalty to Jesus in quite the Petrine form of declaration. It was with them all purely a matter of personal fellowship, founded exclusively in the common commitment of themselves to their risen and ascended Lord.”

It must be apparent that, as I see the problem of union among believers, it is essential in order to its solution that the divine Man, Jesus of Nazareth, shall be made the center of authority in all things appertaining to our spiritual life. In all things the Christ should have the preëminence. This is the starting-point. He, and he alone, is to be heard in all that relates to doctrine and deed.

It appears to me that believers ought to be able to unite on the primitive creed, the primitive ordinances, and the primitive life. If any inquires, What do you mean by the primitive creed, the primitive ordinances, and the primitive life? I reply :

By the primitive creed is meant a belief in the heart that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, and the only and all-sufficient Saviour of men. This was the creed of the apostolic church. This creed received the sanction of our Lord Jesus. All evangelical believers can subscribe to it. It is simple, clear, definite, comprehensive. It declares the nature and the official character of the author and the finisher of the faith in words with which the Head of the body which is the church is entirely satisfied. As to nature it declares that Jesus is the Son of God. As to his official

character it declares that he is the Christ, that is to say, the Anointed. Jesus was anointed, as Simon Peter affirmed at the house of Cornelius, with the Holy Spirit and with power. In Nazareth, in the synagogue, he claimed this anointing. He is our anointed Prophet, Priest, and King. As Prophet he has authority to teach; as Priest it is his prerogative to act as mediator between God and man; as King it is his right to rule in and to reign over men. To subscribe to this primitive creed intelligently is to surrender intellect, heart, will, and life to Jesus.

By the primitive ordinances is meant baptism and the Supper of the Lord. If you ask me to define baptism I say in the beginning it was an immersion in water of believers in Christ, in obedience to our Lord's command, and into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. It was such a surrender, open, formal, to him who possesses all authority in heaven and in earth, as carried with it, by the word of the Lord, an assurance of acceptance with God; and so in the New Testament obedience to the command "Be baptized" is connected with "shall be saved." It is said to be, when preceded by genuine repentance, "for the remission of sins." It is not a regenerating ordinance. Persons who under the ministry of the apostles were baptized were so far regenerated by the Word and Spirit of God that their intellects were convinced concerning the claims of the Messiah, their hearts were stirred by the relation which he assumed to sustain toward men, their wills were subdued by his dominating love, and they were willing to give themselves to him in an everlasting covenant. So, precisely, baptism ought to be regarded and used to-day: not as a regenerating ordinance, as it was not in the beginning, but as a command to which obedience is rendered from the heart, and in which the person says, "Here, Lord, I give myself to thee." There is no dispute

about this being baptism. On this ground we are out of the region of controversy.

It is scarcely necessary to attempt a definition of the Lord's Supper. This is a feast of love. It is for those whose hearts are drawn toward the Christ by his infinite love, manifested toward them in his life, but especially in his atoning death. The Lord's Supper is to be observed by the use of bread and the fruit of the vine, with the use of the words of institution employed in the beginning by the Master of the feast. It is a sweet and solemn memorial service, dear to every truly Christian heart.

These seem to be the only ordinances which belonged to the Christian communities in the beginning, and so far as I know they are the only ordinances to which the Christ requires now that we shall give devout attention.

By the primitive life is meant a life patterned after the life of Him "who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth"; a life patterned after the example furnished by Him who was "tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin"; a life after the pattern presented by the Man of Nazareth, who, having been anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power, "went about doing good." It is not a life lived according to inflexible rules, in which there is a "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not" at every step. The rule of the Christian life may be expressed in one word—"love." Love toward God and love toward man, expressing itself in word and deed, is the love to which I refer.

There are probably objections in the minds of some to this simple basis of union. The first, doubtless, will be that "this is well as far as it goes, but what have you to say," says some one, "concerning organization?" In reply I have to say simply this: that the life generated and nurtured as above indicated may be trusted to assume a form

that will be most befitting. We are not far enough along in the study of the problem of union to enter upon a serious discussion, so it appears to me, of these comparatively unimportant matters.

A second objection will, it is probable, relate to what I have said on the subject of baptism. Upon this point I wish to speak very deliberately, with a judicial fairness, and with unswerving loyalty to Jesus my Lord. The subject of baptism may be treated in one of three ways:

1. It may be discarded altogether. The passages of the New Testament which speak of baptism may, practically, be expunged. This we dare not do. A solemn and awful curse is pronounced on the man who takes from the Word of the Lord.

2. We may treat baptism as a thing indifferent. We may say, in effect, to inquirers, "You may be baptized or not, as you prefer. True, our Lord commanded penitent believers to be baptized, but that makes no difference. It is a matter of no importance." But this course we cannot take with the New Testament open before our eyes. Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of the Lord Jesus, said, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins." The same ambassador for Christ, on another occasion, said, "Baptism doth also now save us." The devout Ananias said to believing, penitent Saul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Whatever may be the exact meaning of these words it is certain that fidelity to the Son of God is not compatible with a careless, not to say contemptuous, treatment of this ordinance of Jesus Christ. The utterances of the creeds of Christendom are in harmony with this idea of the dignity and importance of baptism. The Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church

says, for instance, that it is "a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance."

3. Or we may seek to understand the mind of Christ concerning baptism, and in faith and humility conform to his expressed will. The immersion of penitent, believing souls in water, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, is recognized by all evangelical Christians as valid baptism. This practice is not now, and never has been, in debate. Affusion is in dispute. The baptism of infants is now, and has been from the beginning, a subject of controversy. The Disciples, then, on this subject occupy a position outside the field of controversy, and at the same time maintain their allegiance to the Lord Jesus.

Excuse me for speaking at so great a length. I do not see how I could have presented "The Reunion of Christendom as it Appears to a Disciple" in briefer space than I have employed on this occasion.

If any should think that I have spoken too plainly, especially on the matter of baptism—that I have almost exhibited the spirit of the polemic or the dogmatist in what I have just uttered—I beg to remind you that in the early part of this address I said, "I have accepted the invitation to speak upon this occasion with the understanding that our utterances are to be characterized by the utmost candor." I have simply spoken as an honest man to honest men. So far from a desire to maintain stubbornly the positions set forth in this address, particularly on the subject of the basis of union, I wish to be distinctly understood that what has here been said is tentative. I will be more than pleased to surrender the position I now occupy, and to a frank expression of which you have just listened, when I see that another is more in harmony with the mind of our blessed Lord as expressed in the New Testament. The problem

before us has not yet been solved, neither by Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Disciples, nor any other. We are respectively contributing what we can to its solution. Doubtless many things are to be learned before we "grow up in all things into him, which is the Head, even Christ." It is simply certain that before we realize in our experience the answer of our Lord's prayer for unity much remains to be said.

May the God of all goodness so use the words spoken in this conference that the cause of unity among believers may be promoted, the turning of the world to Christ be hastened, and the name of our Father be glorified among men ! Amen.

XII

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM AS IT APPEARS
TO A FOREIGN MISSIONARY

REV. GILBERT REID,

Missionary to the Higher Classes of China.

XII

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM AS IT APPEARS TO A FOREIGN MISSIONARY

It is with extreme regret that our discussions here on the reunion of Christendom are to be deprived of the presence of the dean of the Cambridge Episcopal Divinity School, one whose ability to discuss the question from an Episcopal point of view is fully recognized by this gathering. As an old college friend, and as one who has studied the question for years from amid the demands of the missionary work in China, I gladly accept this opportunity to argue for the reunion of Christendom on the basis of episcopacy, or, more strictly, the Historic Episcopate. Though a minister of the Presbyterian Church, it will be my purpose, in arguing for theories, to be true to facts and just to the views of others.

In the reunion of Christendom there are many who simply seek and desire a union which is spiritual and internal, without form or organization. Others go a step forward and desire a union that is external as well as internal, organic as well as spiritual, an embodiment as well as a feeling. In this class there are those who simply believe that the only form of union is an agreement on the book, each Christian alike accepting the Holy Scriptures as authority and teacher; and this was the first proposition of agreement in church union as proposed in 1888 by the Lambeth Conference of one hundred and forty-five Pan-Anglican bishops. Others in this class seek for an agreement not only on the

book, but on the creeds expressing the main doctrines of that book; and so the Lambeth Conference makes for its second proposition the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as the doctrinal basis of agreement. Some might desire an agreement on other doctrines and a fuller creed, but the Episcopal body is content in its scheme for union with these two creeds, at least so far as any doctrinal expression is concerned. Going one step farther, many Christians desire an agreement not only on the book and the creed, but on the sacred rites to be observed; and so this same conference proposes as its third point of organic agreement the two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper. The Roman Catholics might desire more sacraments, but these two are here proposed as the number to be first agreed upon. Finally, there is with many a desire to agree not only on the book, the creed, and the rites, but on the organization; and so the fourth proposition of the Lambeth Conference is the Historic Episcopate. It is merely a question as to how much shall be required in the proposed agreement. Some desire even more agreement and others less; but these four are the clear, logical, consistent, and even generous propositions of agreement—"a basis," as they call it, "on which approach may be, by God's blessing, made toward home reunion," and, we would add, toward the reunion of all Christendom.

In the discussions which have followed since 1888 it is the fourth essential—the Historic Episcopate—which, in the language of Bishop Huntington, is "the crux" in the declaration. Therefore, in the present paper, we will limit ourselves to the point of agreement on which there is most disagreement. Agreeing, all of us, on the necessity of spiritual union, and agreeing, most of us, on the other features of the spiritual embodiment—the one organic visible church—it remains to see if we cannot also agree on the form of

the church as represented, not by the Presbyterian Church or the Congregational churches or even the Episcopal Church, but by what is called, though needing explanation, the Historic Episcopate. Those who laugh at the proposition are generally those who, not only by preconception, but by preadoption, adhere to some other ecclesiastical form, and so much so that if others will not yield to them then the present divisions of Christendom must be preferred to the proposed unification. It is organizations which rival and clash with each other that cause the division, rather than any individual unwillingness to cultivate socially and emotionally a broad and indefinite kind of fellowship. Therefore any union which deals only with the individual, and not with individuals combined in a society; which considers merely "the kingdom of God within you," and not the actual, visible, tangible organization, can never secure the reunion of Christendom in just that place where there is most disunion, namely, in the diverse, competing organizations known as denominations. The proposition of the Anglican communion is real church union, not by all other denominations joining the Episcopal Church, but by all of them together agreeing to accept, first of all, the episcopate, and then the episcopate which is historic.

History is the key-word to Christian doctrine, and so equally to the Christian ministry and the Christian church. Anything not based on facts, on history, is not needed to-day amid the uncertainty, the vagueness, and the doubts which permeate all our social and religious life. The only truth which has won through all the ages the admiration and loyal service of mankind has been not so much the truth of speculation and dogma as the truth of history, the truth of actual facts.

Here, then, is our reason for defending in the cause of union the Historic Episcopate. It is something historical

and real, rather than something merely speculative. The only thing to be sure of is the actual facts, the true history. Therefore most of our examination must deal with the history: first the facts and then the theory; first true history and then true ecclesiastics.

In Christendom at the present time the episcopate exists in a portion of the Protestant churches, in the Latin Church, and in eight Oriental churches. It is as a system in overwhelming majority, while less than four hundred years ago it was the only church system in existence. Trace the line back for eighteen centuries, and throughout all this time, under varying conditions, the only church system steadfastly maintained has been the episcopate; while at the outset of this long period, at the close of the second century, it was in strong and growing power. Even if we should fail to find it before, it yet has the only worthy claim of all the ecclesiastical systems to be termed historic.

As various questions of biblical criticism, such as genuineness, authenticity, and canonicity, depend on the testimony of the fathers, so we may equally rely on their testimony for the actual facts concerning the organization of the early church, though we are by no means bound to accept their personal opinions on this or any other question. Though the episcopacy of their day may afterward have been modified and expanded, yet the existence of the principle of episcopacy is all that concerns us in the present discussion.

The evidence at the close of the second century centers around three names, representing different sections of the church. Tertullian of Carthage, about 200 A.D., clearly distinguishes between the bishop and presbyter, and demands that all heretical teachers should show that "their first bishop had for his ordainer and predecessor some one of the apostles or of the apostolic men"; and he adds, "For in this way do the apostolic churches reckon their origin."

Clement of Alexandria, about 190 A.D., though dealing mainly with other questions, yet says: "The Apostle John, when he settled at Ephesus, went about the neighboring regions ordaining bishops." Superior to these two is the testimony of Irenæus, about 180 A.D. He was a disciple of Polycarp; was born and reared in Asia Minor; he taught in Rome and became bishop in Gaul. "We are," he says, "in a position to reckon up those who were by the apostles instituted bishops in the churches, and the successions of these men to our own times." As Bishop Lightfoot, in his exhaustive essay on "The Christian Ministry," has said: "Episcopacy is so inseparably interwoven with all the traditions and beliefs of men like Irenæus and Tertullian that they betray no knowledge of a time when it was not;" and as Professor George Salmond has said: "From the absence of opposing evidence this may be concluded with certainty: that there never had been any violent or abrupt change in the form of church government."

Worthy of being associated with this trio of eminent witnesses are three names of a still earlier period. Hegesippus, who died about the time Irenæus wrote, and really is the father of church history, gives a valuable testimony at the middle of the second century. As quoted by Eusebius, he mentions a visit to Corinth and having intercourse with Primus, the bishop of that church, and later on a visit to Rome, when Anicetus was the bishop. He also states that he had prepared a list of the Roman bishops up to his own time, and that in the church at Jerusalem James the bishop had been succeeded by Symeon the bishop; and in all these cases he evidently uses the term "bishop" only in the strict sense.

Polycarp, who was martyred about 155 A.D., was a teacher of Irenæus between 133 and 140 A.D.; was a personal friend of Ignatius and a disciple of the Apostle

John; was born about 69 A.D., near the close of the life of St. Paul; and wrote a letter about 115 A.D. to the church at Philippi, in which he makes a noticeable distinction: "Polycarp and the presbyters with him." He likewise went to Rome to specially arrange with Anicetus the bishop concerning the paschal controversy. On the one side Tertullian and Irenæus, and on the other Ignatius, mention him as bishop of Smyrna, and so the church was accustomed to speak of him. If such were not the rightful appellation it is presumable that such a devout Christian would have disclaimed it, and that in his letter to the Philippians he would have refrained from distinguishing himself from his presbyters. To quote again from Bishop Lightfoot: "As Polycarp survived the middle of the second century, dying at a very advanced age, the possibility of error on this point seems to be excluded; and, indeed, all historical evidence must be thrown aside as worthless if testimony so strong can be disregarded."

The third name which we have selected is Ignatius, a bishop of Antioch, a martyr to the faith probably about 115 A.D., and who wrote during the beginning of the second century. The genuineness of his Epistles, as contained in the shorter Greek recension, is now accepted by the great preponderance of scholars; and the great work of Bishop Lightfoot on Ignatius in 1885 may be regarded, in the language of Dr. Philip Schaff, as "a full and final settlement of the Ignatian problem." A denial of their genuineness is stated by another Presbyterian, Professor Benjamin Warfield, of Princeton Seminary, as "unreasonable in the present state of the evidence." In these letters he makes mention of Polycarp as bishop at Smyrna and Onesimus as bishop at Ephesus, and also of "the bishops settled in the farthest parts of the world." He exalts the dignity and authority of the bishop as superior to those of presbyters

and deacons, speaking of "the presbyters fitted to the bishop as the strings are to the harp." In pleading for episcopacy it is not so much as something that is new as something that is taken for granted, though needing a broader application.

Moving backward a little farther, we come to the close of the apostolic age, at the end of the first century. This period, as affording any direct evidence on this ecclesiastical problem, may well be called an "historical blank." Using a figure suggested by Professor Salmond, this portion of church history may be represented as a tunnel, dim and uncertain, while at either end there shines a good and clear light, which by a true scientific process may be made to flash through the darkness of the tunnel, and so reveal one regular and unbroken course of ecclesiastical development. To understand this period aright it is necessary to make a few specifications:

First, the apostolate lasted until the close of the first century in the person of the Apostle John, and, at least in Asia Minor, he is the connecting-link between the earlier apostles and the subsequent bishops.

Secondly, if in the writings of Ignatius, at the beginning of the second century, episcopacy is taken for granted, then reasonably it must have existed for a few decades before, and, in fact, before the death of the Apostle John. The first time we hear of a particular thing is not necessarily the first time of its existence.

Thirdly, there is substantial evidence from subsequent writers, as those already cited, that during this period, in certain places at least, there existed bishops, as superior in certain respects to presbyters, and that some of these had been set apart by the Apostle John. However undefined as yet was the bishop's office, or however limited was the application of the episcopal principle, the episco-

pate during this period must still be regarded as historic. Dr. Hatch, in his Bampton Lectures, acknowledges that the recorded facts "show that in a large majority of cases a bishop, presbyters, and deacons existed for every community"; and Professor Samuel M. Hopkins, a Presbyterian instructor in Auburn Theological Seminary, says: "When the fact is once fairly appreciated that all the believers in a place, large or small, made up the church of that place, and that for one church (no matter whether consisting of one congregation or many) there must be but one bishop, the whole matter becomes perfectly plain." The episcopacy of that period looks much like modern Presbyterianism, if not merely in every church, but in every community, *one* man directed all the religious affairs.

Fourthly, the fact that certain churches were lacking in the supervision of a higher order or office called bishops only proves that the episcopate as a distinct and regular form was not universal, and that the young and extending church was not yet thoroughly equipped or fully organized, but was still in a state of transition. Twenty or thirty years in an organization is hardly sufficient to reach maturity. Even to-day certain persons, though believing in the episcopal system, may be so situated as for the time being to be without either episcopal or presbyterial oversight; and yet this hardly tends to prove the absence of episcopacy as a fact of history. There was a time when the Episcopal Church of America was deprived of the immediate and local oversight of the bishops; but the church none the less was episcopal in theory and aspiration, and still maintained a connection with the regular Historic Episcopate of the mother-country. Though unable to show how widely the episcopal principle extended at the close of the first century, we yet should not deny the predominance of the principle, still less its existence *in toto*.

Fifthly, not only did it require time to organize the growing and persecuted churches, scattered throughout Asia, Africa, and Europe, and to ordain in the chief centers superintending bishops, but it also required time to establish a definite and harmonious terminology. If, in the writings of the apostles, the terms for bishop and presbyter, though different in origin and suggesting different ideas, had yet been used interchangeably of the same persons, it can hardly be expected that in twenty or thirty years the term "bishop" could everywhere have been elevated into a distinct usage with largely a new meaning. The Epistles of Barnabas and Clement of Rome, the "Shepherd" of Hermas, "The Teaching of the Apostles," and the books of the canon, did not distinguish clearly between the terms "bishop" and "presbyter," but we should not construe this into a proof that practically all bishops and presbyters had the same duties, power, and authority. A precise term was not yet fully established, but the fact of a general oversight of and superiority to the presbyterate seems from the evidence to have always existed somewhere in the church. Clement of Rome, in the Epistle to the church at Corinth, assumes the substantial identity of bishops and presbyters, and yet Irenæus and other writers represent him as a bishop at Rome in the later usage of that word. So Hermas makes mention of only presbyters in the church at Rome, or of bishops in probably the same sense, and yet he represents Clement as having a special oversight in relation to foreign churches. The struggle was not so much to gain recognition and authority for an order or rule in some respects superior to the body of presbyters, as in elevating and limiting the term "episcopus" to that order or rule. Every bishop, whatever the meaning included in the term, may have been a presbyter, but not, as the commentator Hilary afterward said, every presbyter a bishop, "for he is bishop

who is first among the presbyters." So Jerome also, of the fourth century, while speaking of bishops and presbyters in the apostolic times as practically the same in kind, yet adds that "gradually all the responsibility was deferred to a single person."

Sixthly, the principle of episcopacy—the fact of an oversight superior to that of the presbyters, but not necessarily independent thereof—should be carefully distinguished from all theories intended to explain the nature of that episcopacy, its origin, and its growth. Of the particular theory there may be dispute, but of the general principle there is abundant evidence. The theory of Rothe, that a special council was called after the fall of Jerusalem to establish the regulations of the future episcopacy, is interesting, but not incontrovertible; and yet the very existence of such a theory, so elaborately wrought out by a non-Episcopalian, indicates a substratum of truth requiring explanation. The theory advocated by Mosheim and Neander, Bishop Lightfoot and Dean Stanley, Dr. Hatch, Professor Roswell D. Hitchcock, and others, that "the episcopate was created out of the presbytery," has much in its favor, and gives forth a light to one side of the question; but to complete the explanation and make clearer the prevalence of episcopacy, another "circumstantial evidence" should be duly noted. The episcopal principle was not merely embodied in a particular member of the presbyterate, such as its senior, president, or other prominent person, but also for a while, and originally, in men outside of the presbyterate, such as apostles, prophets, and teachers—a theory ably advocated in the *Expositor* by Professors Harnack, Sanday, and Gore, and especially by the latter in a valuable work, "The Ministry of the Christian Church." In "The Teaching of the Apostles," which represents the transitional state of the last thirty years of

the first century, the position of preëminence and general direction seems to be accorded this class of apostolic men, while at the same time concerning the local ministry—called bishops and deacons—it is said: “They, too, perform for you the service of the prophets and teachers; therefore neglect them not, for they are your honored ones together with the prophets and teachers.” So Clement of Rome lays special stress on the fact that the presbyters and deacons had been first set apart by the apostles with the intent of a perpetual line of succession; and he also makes mention of others after the apostolic age not appointed by the apostles, but by “other men of distinction,” thus indicating a class in some sense superior to the presbyters and deacons, substantially the bishops of a later age. While the bishops of the primitive church were elevated from the presbyterate—as all bishops were once presbyters—yet in principle, in unity, oversight, and continuity, they were more naturally the successors of an apostolate, including not merely the original twelve apostles, but also their special delegates and those men known as prophets and teachers. If there was no connection whatever between bishops in the strict sense of the term and the apostles, it seems unaccountable, as Dean Milman has shown in his “History of Christianity,” that in the various scattered churches there came to be a spontaneous, pacific, and general “submission to the authority of one religious chief magistrate.” Dr. Schaff, in the new edition of his “History of the Christian Church,” fairly sums up the question: “The only satisfactory conclusion seems to be that the episcopate proceeded, both in the descending and ascending scale, from the apostolate and the original presbyterate conjointly, as a contraction of the former and an expansion of the latter.”

What now can we find in the apostolic or New Testament period? Must the episcopate cease to be historic as

soon as it draws nigh to Christ and the apostles? Must the principle that has predominated in the church for at least eighteen hundred years be absent from the church during the fifty or sixty years of her beginning? To answer these questions it seems to us only necessary to note the distinctions already drawn and to apply the principle, though not the precise terminology, that has been shown to be historic through all these centuries. As Rev. Mr. Sadler, in his "Church Doctrine—Bible Truth," has said, "The dispute is from beginning to end a matter of things, not of words;" and if of things, we may add, the dispute is more than half settled at the outset. "Supposing," as the same author says, "that in every case the name 'bishop' is synonymous with 'elder,' you still have the fact that these men are throughout the New Testament assumed to be under the control of the apostle and of his vicar or delegate." In the New Testament we find that local churches, with local duties and authority, were organized; and so far there is illustrated an element of independency. Likewise it was the aim as soon as possible to establish in these local churches a board of presbyters or elders, also at times called bishops, possessed of special duties and power; and so far there is illustrated the principle of presbyterianism. Beyond these two important features there likewise existed a body of men known as the apostolate, charged with the instruction, guidance, stimulus, organization, and supervision of these various local churches; and so far there is illustrated the principle of episcopacy. In the bishop of the New Testament we find the essence of presbyterianism, not of episcopacy; but in the apostles and prophets, with their delegates and companions, we find certainly not presbyterianism or independency, but episcopacy. As a matter of history, there was at that time something more and higher than the power and office of the presbyters and deacons,

and to be true to history we must recognize and appreciate it, if not in the letter, at least in the spirit. Finding the episcopal principle to completion in one body of men, it is hardly reasonable to insist that such a body of men should always be called bishops, and nothing else. If the essence existed at all, it is sufficient for our argument; and if it existed to perfection—as in the apostolate—then our argument is established beyond all contradiction. It is not that the apostleship has been a permanent institution, but that the episcopate has, it being only the continuation of particular elements originally belonging to the apostleship. “It is to be said,” says Professor Salmond, “that it does not appear from the New Testament that the presbyters were at any time the supreme authority in the church;” and, as Dr. Richard Hooker has aptly expressed it, “In some things every presbyter, in some things only bishops, in some things neither the one nor the other, are the apostles’ successors.”

For these views a few proofs may be briefly stated. When a successor to one of the Twelve was to be chosen, it was quoted, “His bishopric let another take.” Whatever the precise work of this office, there may reasonably be implied, as the facts would guarantee, that oversight—episcopacy—was one function of the twelve apostles. Hence after the ascension of Christ it is recorded: “Then the Twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, We will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the Word.” In fact, the high authority of the chosen Twelve is probably no cause of dispute, but is acknowledged by all. The references needed are concerning others outside the Twelve, but possessing, like them, a general ministry superior to that of the local presbyters.

In the church of Jerusalem mention is made of the “brethren,” of the “elders,” and also of one superior to

all and recognized by all—James, the Lord's brother. At the first general council held at Jerusalem he it was who presided and gave his sentence along with the apostles and Paul and Barnabas. In the decree, "The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting," James, Paul, and Barnabas seemed to be classed among the "apostles" as distinct from the "elders" or presbyters. If we adopt the view now generally supported, that this James was not one of the Twelve, then we have a bishop in the strict sense, and one who was thus called by Hegesippus and others in the following century.

The Apostle to the Gentiles—also outside the Twelve—not only appointed worthy presbyters in every church to exercise a local oversight, but he regarded that "the care of all the churches" rested preëminently with himself. As his life drew near to a close he realized the importance of his trust, and therefore addressed special instructions on the government of the church to Timothy and Titus, and committed to them, at least for a time, a special authority in the churches of Ephesus and Crete. The instructions were addressed neither to the local churches nor the local presbyters, but to particular persons higher than the presbyters, and the direct representatives, in this higher sense, of the Apostle himself. "O Timothy," he says, "keep that which is committed to thy trust;" "Lay hands suddenly on no man;" "Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses." And to Titus he says: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee;" "These things speak, and exhort, and rebuke with all authority." In fact, these men "were delegated by St. Paul," as Dr. Jacob says, "to perform for him what we might call episcopal functions in ordaining, superintending, reproofing, or

encouraging the ministers of these churches, as well as endeavoring to promote the general well-being of the Christian communities there." They, like the apostles and their other companions, were not of necessity to be permanently located, as are the bishops of to-day; but this only illustrates the capacity of episcopacy for modification. The essence of episcopacy is not the size of a diocese or the fact of a permanent residence, but merely the principle of a higher oversight and authority, and, as some would say, that principle deduced directly from the apostles. The commission of all the companions of Paul "inherited not," as Professor Warfield has said, "in any local organization, not even in the church at large, but in the Apostle; and their center of authority was wherever he was." All this certainly looks more like an original episcopacy than deducing an episcopacy from merely a presbytery, evolved from above as well as from below.

Associated with the regular apostles in the general ministry, and generally classed with what is termed the apostolate, are also prophets and teachers, men who exercised much, if not more, of the same authority and supervision that bishops ultimately came to possess. The duties and powers of these men were so important that two chapters in one Epistle particularly relate to them. As Professor Gore has said: "The relation of presbyters and deacons to the diocesan bishop was not fundamentally different from their earlier relation to the 'apostolic man' or prophet, the Timothy or Titus, when he was present." For reasons plain to God, if not to man, there were for a time men possessed of extraordinary gifts from the Holy Ghost; and while it was not essential that this extraordinary power should remain, it was essential to the edification of the church that the real soul of this power should exist, at least in an ordinary degree. The word of wisdom

and the word of knowledge, the gifts of healing and the gifts of tongues, have always been needed, though not necessarily granted in the same degree as in the earliest days. The presbyters, therefore, were to be men apt to teach, able by sound doctrine to exhort and convince, and were to be summoned to the bedside of the sick. And it also soon became necessary that, in addition to the local element, the element of general supervision, authority, guidance, and instruction, as found to an extraordinary degree among the apostles and prophets, should be carefully perpetuated, though in an ordinary degree, by passing first into the hands of the immediate delegates of the apostles, and then in a few years into the hands of those who were called distinctively bishops. The extraordinary ceased and the ordinary began; but certain elements have always existed, and to many have seemed both wise, important, and expedient.

Thus it is that the church, and likewise the Christian ministry, is built "upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." In the early labors of these men there was given, so far as we know, no complete system of iron-clad rules to guide the church of the future, but only certain essential principles, which were left to germinate amid the varied conditions of coming ages. One of these principles, undying through all these centuries, permeated with sound logic and a broad catholicity, a scriptural vitality and the growing force of a veritable history, is the principle of episcopacy, one in its essence, but possessed of a commendable elasticity and capable of various modifications. Indeed, the episcopate in its essence has been historic for as long a period as the Christian church—a worthy, though not the only, basis for organic union.

The proposition, therefore, to unite on an episcopate,

not invented for the sake of convenience in these modern days, but one which is historic, and in essence and as a principle not only in historic continuity, but in historic continuity with our divine Lord and his apostles, is a proposition not merely reasonable and deserving respectful consideration, but coming to us to-day with all the weight of universal adaptation, and supported by great minds, such as no other proposition has yet been honored with.

The proposition first of all is the voice of the conservative Established Church of England and the growing and active Episcopal Church of the United States, of British America, and of the British colonies. It rests not in the private opinion of one individual, but comes to us with all the commanding force of formal action and of an organized body of high representative and official men. Any system of organic union that practically excludes the Episcopal churches must be viewed with more or less of distrust, while a system that not only includes them, but is supported by them, may reasonably be accepted as something that is desirable and beneficial.

The Historic Episcopate, moreover, is not pressed with any disdainful, repellent, or inflexible spirit, but with the advance of fraternal kindness and in terms that are liberal and concessive. While the essence of the Historic Episcopate is maintained, the fourth article of the Declaration refers to it as "locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his church." The constituted authorities of the Anglican communion are also requested "to make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with representatives of other Christian communions in the English-speaking races, in order to consider what steps can be taken, either toward corporate reunion or toward such

relations as may prepare the way for fuller organic unity hereafter." No particular form of the Historic Episcopate is insisted on; neither is it claimed that all other communions must be absorbed into the Established Church of England or the Protestant Episcopal Church of America; but it is merely earnestly desired that "brotherly conference" should be begun, and the aim expressed is either a "corporate reunion" or a "fuller organic unity hereafter." If such a result should ever be consummated it seems plain that the new organism would differ in certain respects from the existing communions, be they Anglican or Presbyterian, Methodist or Baptist, Congregational or Lutheran, and yet would adopt that feature of the Anglican Church called the Historic Episcopate, "locally adapted" "to the varying needs." Countless disputed questions, such as liturgy and establishment, sacerdotalism and sacramentarianism, are not necessarily included in such an essential, and neither are they intolerantly excluded therefrom. Not a dead uniformity, but a practical living unity—this, and this only, is organic union.

The breadth allowed in the reunion of various communions is already exemplified in the breadth of the Anglican Church as at present constituted. In the bosom of the one church different and even antagonistic views are held; but the unity of the church is not destroyed if toleration and charity, mutual respect and mutual helpfulness, are still maintained. Not even is a particular theory of the episcopate required—only that it be taken as historic.

Professor Briggs, in speaking of the four resolutions, says: "These four terms proposed by the Anglican bishops are entirely satisfactory, provided they mean nothing more than their face value. If I understand them aright, they are not to be interpreted in the special sense of any particular party in the Anglican communion, but are to be taken

in that sense that is common to all these parties in the Church of England and in the American Episcopal Church." In another place he adds these words: "It is certain that if the English bishops had offered these terms to the Westminster divines, there would have been no separation." In the seventeenth century a strong spirit of union existed, and concessions were made by such men as Archbishops Cranmer, Lee, Abbot, and Usher; but from a variety of reasons the majority of the bishops were opposed, and union was delayed, and separation took place. To-day the case is again renewed, and let us hope with better success. Dean Perowne states the case in a late address: "I take the ground of our Reformers, I take the ground of our great Anglican divines, and I affirm that episcopacy is of the *bene esse*, but not of the *esse*, of a church. I believe it to be the best form of government, but I dare not say that without it there is neither church nor sacrament. I believe its origin may be traced back to apostolic times. I do not see that it is of divine command."

The Historic Episcopate, as thus capable of various modifications, is supported by the commanding and venerable witness of over nineteen centuries of steady continuity and growing expansion. No other ecclesiastical system, however possessed of commendable characteristics, can present such an historical reason for world-wide acceptance. It existed in the apostolate, endowed with extraordinary gifts, possessed of an undeniable authority, and exercising the widest supervision; but defining as yet no limit to each man's territory, and confined to no one locality, but each man moving to and fro in the church at large as the Spirit seemed to direct. Then, by an inevitable transition, the high and wide bishopric of the apostles, and the undefined control and guidance of the prophets and evangelists, narrowed for a few decades into the episcopacy of a parochial

bishop or congregational bishop—all, indeed, designated still as presbyters, but one in particular possessed of the general oversight either of a church or a city. As Professor W. Sanday has said: "Every town of any size had its bishop; and if there were several churches they were served by the clergy whom the bishop kept about him. The whole position of the bishop was very similar to that of the incumbent of the parish church in one of our smaller towns." Later on, with the growth of the church and by the force of events, the more limited episcopacy expanded into that of a diocesan bishop, indicating, indeed, a greater control than that of the bishops of the transitional period, but less than that of the "apostles and prophets" of the foundation period. This form of episcopacy has continued until the present, though likewise presenting in itself various modifications. The Established Church of England and the Episcopal Church of America alike possess in regular order the Historic Episcopate; but the system of the two churches is differently constituted. The one is an establishment of the state; the other, like every other form of religion, is separate from the state. The one culminates in the throne and the Archbishop of Canterbury, while in the other there is nothing higher than the bishops. In the one the bishops are largely independent of the laity—unless as a part of the government—but in the other there is a triennial General Convention, composed of two houses—the House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies—and every question decided or bishop elected is by the majority of both clergy and laity. Speaking in general, "the diocesan system as it now exists is," in the language of Dr. Hatch, "the effect of a series of historical circumstances. It is impossible to defend every part of it as being primitive, nor is it necessary to do so. It is sufficient to show that it is the result of successive

readaptations of the church's framework to the needs of the times."

The Historic Episcopate, furthermore, has already been adopted for the sake of union. The different parties of the Church of England to-day would long since have split into different branches if the system of control had not been episcopal. Jerome, to whom non-Episcopalians so often appeal, speaking of the rise of the particular class called bishops, says: "When afterward one presbyter was elected, that he might be placed over the rest, this was done as a remedy against schism, that each man might not drag to himself and thus break up the church of Christ;" and again, in even stronger language, he says: "The well-being of the church depends upon the dignity of the bishop; for if some extraordinary power were not conceded to him by general consent there would be as many schisms in the church as there were presbyters." So to Ignatius "the chief value of episcopacy" was, in the language of Bishop Lightfoot, as "a visible center of unity in the congregation." The destruction of Jerusalem, the growing hostility of heathenism and the Roman rulers, and the appearance of dissension, schism, and heresy, compelled all the churches to seek for a unifying basis and a compact organization, and to find them, moreover, in the principle of episcopacy, which had already existed in the catholic oversight, broad spirit, and comprehensive organization of the Apostle Paul, the venerable John, the brave Peter, and their faithful compeers. At first the union was merely local, but as the church grew the episcopal jurisdiction necessarily expanded into the broader diocesan form, with its vital idea of a church that is catholic and one. As Dr. Jacob has said, "The establishment of episcopacy saved the church."

The Historic Episcopate, thus supported and thus presented, is now before the churches of Great Britain and

America. The attitude toward the proposal of the Anglican communion seems to be less favorable in England and Wales than in the United States and Canada. If the root of the difficulty should be examined it would be found to be in many cases a prejudice of individuals rather than of a system; a disagreement concerning endowment, titles, and patronage rather than of episcopacy; and the unpleasant remembrance of past wars, tyranny, and suffering rather than the glad expectancy of forces consolidated, ranks reunited, "made perfect in one." In all the various communions of Protestantism—so lamentably dissevered and so far from the spirit of the Master's prayer—there are practically only three church polities: Independency, Presbyterianism, and Episcopacy. It is harder for all the existing denominations to unite than for the three polities to unite, but in neither case is the difficulty insuperable. Considering merely the three polities it seems to us that the polity most easy of acceptance by all, and best fitted for all, is the episcopal polity. In matters of polity it is easier to add on than take off. For the Episcopalian to discard the order of bishops would mean a relinquishment of one of his principles; a principle, moreover, historic in line from the time of the apostles, and for many a century accepted by the universal church. On the other hand, for the Independent or Presbyterian to accept the order of bishops would not necessarily ignore the independency of the one or the presbyterianism of the other. The Independent in theory is further removed from the Episcopalian than is the Presbyterian, but in practice and in heart there is still a bond of union. If to be independent means total separation from all others and the recognition of no power beyond the local church, then it is useless to talk of union that is organic and visible. If, however, there is felt a duty or desirability to more fully unite, whether in the

form of association, conference, committee, or union, then there is something more than mere Independency, and which could easily be transferred to the consolidating and supervising body of bishops; a body, moreover, which would still respect the rights and utility of a local church. As to the Presbyterian, what in reality is he but an Episcopalian of a short time of the primitive church? The pastor of a church is surrounded by a body of elders or presbyters, and though equal in certain particulars he is plainly the recognized head, guide, and superior. He is, in fact, a congregational bishop, and were it not for the multitude of sects would also, in certain cases, be a parochial bishop. If in the Episcopal system there are three orders in the ministry, in the Presbyterian there are three orders of officers. "The ordinary and perpetual officers of the church," says the Presbyterian Form of Government, "are bishops or pastors, and the representatives of the people, usually styled ruling elders and deacons." In fact, the essence of presbyterianism and episcopacy is the same. Why, then, should the congregational episcopacy be exchanged for the diocesan? modern presbyterianism for modern episcopacy? First, because in adopting the latter the former would still be allowed so far as the pastor or teaching presbyter is concerned, and might also be allowed, if deemed necessary, in the case of the ruling presbyters or elders; secondly, because the limited or presbyterian form of episcopacy existed only for a short time in the primitive church, but was quickly expanded into the diocesan form, whether large or small, and thus the better illustrating the episcopal authority of the apostolate and the better adapted to the needs of the growing church; thirdly, because the diocesan episcopacy being originally adopted in the extending church for the greater union, harmony, and solidity of the one church, it may reasonably

be again adopted for the same end; and fourthly, as the presbyters find it advisable to establish a power superior to themselves as individual office-bearers, by means of a Presbytery, Synod, and General Assembly, so this higher power can easily be concentrated in a certain order called distinctively bishops. Concerning those who adopt for one reason or another the episcopal system, but separated from the Historic Episcopate, it is only requisite that terms of agreement should be so made that the regular episcopate may be secured by the irregular, and not the regular discarded for the sake of recognizing the irregular. In certain cases, as with the Moravians and the Lutheran Church of Scandinavia, the regular historical connection may already be found to be satisfactory.

Any system of union among the Protestant churches should also aim to assimilate to, rather than recede from, a possible reunion or friendly coöperation with Latin, Greek, and Oriental churches. In all these the Historic Episcopate is an essential element, and the Historic Episcopate of a one reformed church would be a natural means of fraternal approach. The schism, however we attach the blame thereof, is wide and deep; but the true reformer is not he who intensifies that schism, but he who seeks to heal it by even the most insignificant endeavor. In the line of church polity, episcopacy must be the end, as it was the beginning. A system that can show such unity, strength, and continuity, and at the same time such variety and adaptation, is surely a fitting system for a wider organic reunion of the one church of Christ. We may all agree to go back together to Christ and the apostles, and to recite anew, "I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church."

An episcopate thus adapted to all the countries and races of the earth, aiming at some of the perfection of universal adaptation belonging to Christianity, and never

forgetting that inner fellowship of love which the divine Spirit can alone produce; an episcopate adapted to the Occident and the Orient, to the Semitic and Aryan, to the Mongolian and Slavonic, to the Latin and Hellenic, to the Celtic and Teutonic; adapted to all forms of political organization—the monarchy, oligarchy, democracy, and theocracy; adapted alike to the mighty Roman empire, stretching from the Euphrates to the rolling waves of the Atlantic, and to the little state struggling for independence; to the colony and to the islands of the sea; adapted to every age of the church—to the apostolic of the first century, the primitive parochial of the second, the diocesan of the third, the metropolitan of the fourth, the patriarchal of the fifth, the papal of the middle ages, and to well-nigh all these forms and phases in modern times: surely such an episcopate, adapted, as the Lambeth Declaration reads, “to the ranging needs of the nations and peoples,” is complete and inspiring in its essential worth—a living factor to-day and a safe criterion for the future; a desirable method and a powerful aid for the reunion of Christendom.

*... and the value of the
... can be estimated
...
... to the ...
... of the ...*

A SELECTION FROM

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY'S

NEW YORK, 112 FIFTH AVENUE
CHICAGO, 148 & 150 MADISON STREET
TORONTO, 140 & 142 YONGE STREET

CATALOGUE

Commentaries.



Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Bible. *New Large Type Edition.* 6 volumes, boxed, large 8vo, cloth.....\$15.00
Half-morocco..... 18.00
For further description send for specimen pages and circulars.

It is surprising that in this labor-saving and time-saving age the ever popular Matthew Henry's Commentary has not before been issued in convenient volumes. Two features of this new edition calls for *special* attention: First, the moderate size of the volumes; second, the large size of the type (larger than in any previous edition). Other features are the excellent printing and substantial binding.

"There is nothing to be compared with old MATTHEW HENRY'S COMMENTARY for pungent and practical applications of the teachings of the text."—*The Sunday School Times.*

Jamieson, Faussett and Brown's Popular Commentary on the Old and New Testament. Critical, Practical, and Explanatory. 4 volumes, boxed, 8vo, cloth..... 8.00
Half-morocco 10.00
A New Edition, containing the complete unabridged notes in clear type on good paper. With copious index, numerous illustrations and maps, and dictionary compiled from Dr. Smith's standard work.

"The BEST condensed Commentary on the whole Bible. It is the cream of the commentaries carefully collected by three eminent scholars. Its critical introduction to each book of Scripture, its eminently practical notes, its numerous pictorial illustrations, commend it strongly to the Sunday School worker and to the clergyman. Then it is such a marvel of cheapness."—*Rev. J. H. Vincent, D.D.*

C. H. M. Notes on the Pentateuch. Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy (2 vols.). 16mo, cloth, each 75c.; 6 vols., boxed..... 4.50

"Under God they have blessed me more than any books outside of the Bible itself that I have ever read, and have led me to a love of the Bible that is proving an unailing source of profit."—*Maj. D. W. Whittle.*

The Annotated Paragraph Bible. *New and Revised Edition.* A Bible and a Commentary combined, 4to, half-morocco, 7.00

Gnomon of the New Testament. By John Albert Bengel. Edited by Blackley and Hawes, and with an introduction by Prof. R. F. Weidner, D.D. With numerous notes, showing the results of modern criticism and exegesis. 3 volumes, boxed, 12mo, cloth..... 6.00

Pocket Commentary. Compiled from Henry, Scott, and others. 16mo, cloth, boxed..... 1.50
Half-leather, boxed 2.50

Notes on the Four Gospels. By Rev. Alfred Barnes. 2 vols., 16mo, cloth..... 1.60

*** See also Spurgeon, *Introductory Studies, and Text Books.*

Christian Evidences, etc.



Many Infallible Proofs. The Evidences of Christianity. By Rev. A. T. Pierson, D.D. 12mo, paper, net 35c.; cloth.....\$1.00

"Only a man of wide and of broad sympathies, and one who had himself come up out of a conflict with doubts, could have so completely covered the whole battlefield of unbelief, meeting the doubter at every point with a candor that captivates, and a logic that conquers."—*The Morning Star*.

None Like It. A Plea for the Old Sword. By Rev. Joseph Parker, D.D., author of "The People's Bible." 12mo, cloth 1.25
A defense of the inspiration and authority of the Bible.

"The spirit of the work is as sweet as its blows are sturdy. This volume is one of the ablest on its side and is sound in its principles."—*The Congregationalist*.

I Believe in God the Father Almighty. By Rev. John Henry Barrows, D.D. 16mo, cloth, gilt top..... 1.00

"This is a bright and strong series of four addresses by a bright and strong man. They are rich in illustration, full of pith, and right to the point."—*The Independent*.

A Lawyer's Examination of the Bible. By H. H. Russell, 12mo, cloth..... 1.00

"The case of the Bible is presented in such a way as to satisfy the demands of the intellect as well as the heart."—*The N. Y. Observer*.

Attonement: The Fundamental Fact of Christianity. By Rev. Newman Hall, D.D. 12mo, cloth..... .75

"This valuable little volume will do much to assist in their study of this important subject those who may not have access to more elaborate works or leisure for the study of them. It is a book which cannot have too large a circulation."—*Christian Work*.

Unsettled Questions Touching the Foundations of Christianity.

By J. M. P. Otts, D.D. 12mo, cloth..... 1.00

"The author recognizes the fact that young men are sometimes harassed with doubts and questions, and he does his best to dispel the first and to answer the last. The simplicity and force of his reasoning will do all this for many inquiring minds."—*The N. Y. Observer*.

The Highest Critics vs. The Higher Critics. By Rev. L. W. Munhall, M.A. 12mo, cloth..... 1.00

"The appearance of this volume is timely. The style is plain and pointed, and the argument critical and cumulative. We commend it to all."—*The Religious Telescope*.

The Evidences of Christianity. By William Paley, D.D. Edited by Canon Birks. Introduction, Notes, and Supplement. 12mo, cloth..... 1.20

Ten Reasons Why I Believe the Bible is the Word of God. By Rev. R. A. Torrey. 16mo, paper..... .15

* * * See also *Brookes, By-Paths, and Living Papers*.

Addresses, Sermons, and Essays.



- Essential Christianity.** By Rev. Hugh Price Hughes. 12mo, cloth,.....\$1.25
Fully sustains the reputation of this famous London preacher.
- Ten Minute Sermons.** By Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, D.D. 12mo, cloth, gilt top..... 1.50
Brilliant sermonettes by the editor of "The Expositor's Bible"
- Three Gates on a Side, and Other Sermons.** By Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst. 12mo, cloth, gilt top..... 1.25
"Dr. Parkhurst is certainly a preacher of unusual power, and a thinker of marked originality."—*The Churchman.*
- The Ideal of Humanity** in the Old Times and New. By Prof. John Stuart Blackie, author of "On Self Culture." 12mo, cloth 1.00
"Fresh, forcible and practical. In close and helpful touch with everyday life."—*The Congregationalist.*
- Sermons by the Rev. John McNeill.** Vols. I., II. and III., each containing 26 Sermons. 12mo, cloth, each..... 1.50
"The Rev. John McNeill has a firm hold of Gospel truth, a clear mind, and a peculiar and graphic method of expressing sound convictions."—*Rev. John Hall, D.D.*
- Twelve Sermons** by the late Eugene Bersier, D.D., of l'Eglise de l'Etoile, Paris. Translated by Mrs. Alexander Waugh. With portrait. 12mo, cloth..... 1.25
"We have read these sermons with very great delight. Bersier was a preacher of eloquence, force, and profit."—*The Independent.*
- Princeton Sermons.** Chiefly by Professors in Princeton Theological Seminary. 12mo, cloth..... 1.50
The contributors are President Patten, and Professors Green, Hodge, Warfield, Aiken, Murray, and Davis.
"Scholarly, vigorous, and practical."—*The Congregationalist.*
"Coin from the royal mint of the King of Heaven."—*The N. Y. Observer.*
- Pacific Coast Pulpit.** Sermons by Representative Preachers on the Pacific Coast. With 17 portraits. 12mo, cloth..... 2.00
- Divine Balustrades, and other Sermons.** By Rev. R. S. MacArthur, D.D. 12mo, cloth..... 1.25
"Marked by mental precision, and an atmosphere of spirituality that is decidedly refreshing."—*The Golden Rule.*
- Sermons.** By Rev. John A. Boardus, D.D. 12mo, cloth..... 1.00
- Baccalaureate and Other Addresses.** By Rev. E. A. Tanner, D.D., late President of Illinois College. 12mo, cloth..... 1.50
- *.* See also *Moody, Meyer, Herron, Stalker, and Spurgeon.*

Living Papers.



"Well made, well bound, of handy size, and with marginal titles, they are admirably adapted, not only for continuous reading, but for reference. The topics discussed include nearly every vexed question of the day."—THE EVANGELIST.

Living Papers on Present Day Themes. On Subjects of Christian Evidence, Doctrine and Morals. 10 vols., 12mo, cloth, each..... \$1.00
The set, boxed..... 10.00

An authorized American reprint of a most remarkable collection of sixty papers by the ablest writers, among whom are the distinguished authorities mentioned in connection with the single volumes named below. Complete list of authors and subjects on application.

The Argument for Christianity. Being Vol. XI, "Living Papers," By Principal Cairns, Prof. Blaikie and Rev. Drs. Kaufman, Lewis, Chapman, and Slater. 12mo, cloth..... 1.00

SPECIAL VOLUMES.

Containing papers selected from the "Living Papers" Series.

The Non-Christian Religions of the Age. By Sir W. Muir, Drs. Legge, Murray Mitchell, and H. B. Reynolds. 12mo, cloth... 1.00

Christ the Central Evidence of Christianity, and other Papers. By Principal Cairns. 12mo, cloth.. 1.00

The Higher Criticism. By the Dean of Canterbury, Dean Howson, Principal Wace, and Professors Bruce and Godet. 12mo, cloth..... 1.00

Man in Relation to the Bible and Christianity. By Prebendary Row, Canon Rawlinson, Professors Macalister, W. G. Blaikie, Radford Thomson, F. Pfaff, S. R. Pattison, Sir William Dawson and Rev. W. S. Lewis. 12mo, cloth..... 1.40

The Non-Christian Philosophies of the Age. By Professors Blaikie, Radford Thomson, Porter and Iverach, and Rev. W. F. Wilkinson. 12mo, cloth..... 1.40

Biographies.



The Life of Catherine Booth, the Mother of the Salvation Army. By F. de L. Booth-Tucker. With 19 full-page plates and many other illustrations. 2 vols., 1340 pages, royal 8vo, cloth, boxednet, \$3.50

"This excellent woman did more to save erring souls than any other person in this century."—*The New York Times*.

A Memoir of Adolph Saphir, D. D. By Rev. Gavin Carlyle, M.A. With photogravure portrait. Large 8vo, cloth, gilt top 2.25

"The volume is very interesting, and by it, being dead, Dr. Saphir will speak for the highest and noblest conceptions of the work of the ministry."—*The Christian Inquirer*.

The Bells of Is; or, Voices of Human Need and Sorrow. Echoes from my early pastorates. By Rev. F. B. Meyer, B.A. 12mo, cloth 75

"It is inspiring to read these accounts related in Mr. Meyer's inimitable style, and infused with a spirit of such abounding faith and trust."—*Christian Work*.

The Chronicles of the Sid; or, The Life and Travels of Adelia Gates. By Adela E. Orpen. With many illustrations. 8vo, cloth 1.50

"A refreshingly cheerful book. . . . A woman of original and interesting character."—*The Outlook*.

Charles H. Spurgeon. *Second Edition.* By Rev. J. J. Ellis, a graduate of the Pastor's College. With portrait. 12mo, cloth, 1.00

"This is a very entertaining biography of the great London preacher and makes very delightful reading."—*The N. Y. Observer*.

John Wesley. By Rev. J. J. Ellis. With portrait. 12mo, cloth 1.00

"Well written, and shows a just appreciation on the part of the author of the genius of the great spiritual reformer."—*The Methodist Recorder*.

Memoir and Remains of Rev. Robert Murray M'Cheyne. By Andrew A. Bonar, D.D. 12mo, cloth 1.50

Nineteen Beautiful Years; or, Sketches of a Girl's Life. By Frances E. Willard. With preface by John G. Whittier, and portrait. *New and Revised Edition.* 12mo, cloth 75

Mary Mortimer, A True Teacher. A memoir. By Minerva Brace Norton. With portrait. 8vo, cloth net, 1.50

Eliza Chappell Porter. A memoir. By Mary H. Porter. 8vo, cloth net, 1.75

Samuel Chapman Armstrong. Founders Day Address, Hampton Institute, 1894. By Robert C. Ogden. 12mo, half-cloth, .35

"In the death of Gen. Armstrong the negro race lost a faithful friend, and Christianity one of its best exemplars."—*The Philadelphia Call*.

"World's Benefactors" Series. Lives of Livingstone, Spurgeon, Stanley, Nightingale, Wycliffe and Luther, Faraday, and Gladstone. 7 vols., illustrated. 12mo, cloth, each 75

*** See also *Missions and Missionary Biographies*.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01003 8679