# THE CRISIS OF THE CHURCHES

# THE CRISIS OF THE CHURCHES

BY

LEIGHTON PARKS, D.D.

RECTOR OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S CHURCH
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide."
—JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1922

Printed in United States of America

Published March, 1922

TO THE MEMORY OF
MY GODFATHER
WILLIAM AUGUSTUS MUHLENBERG, D.D.
A UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN

# PREFACE

I AM indebted to my friends, the Rev. Frederic Palmer, D.D., editor of the *Harvard Theological Review*, and the Rev. Percy Gordon, my associate in St. Bartholomew's Church, for doing me the favor of reading this book in manuscript and making valuable suggestions of which I have availed myself. It is not, however, to be supposed that they are responsible for any part of this book or are necessarily in agreement with the opinions therein expressed. My thanks are also due to Miss Helen K. Fullarton for reading the proof.

St. Paul exhorted his readers to "speak the truth in love," and it is to be assumed that he endeavored to follow that rule in all his epistles, but evidently he did not always succeed in avoiding offense. It will not be strange then, if although I have tried in the following pages to speak the truth in love, I too should give offense to some whom I would not willingly wound. Moreover, I fear that some such may be found in that room of the Household of Faith in which it was my happy lot to be born. But I would ask them to consider that statements of facts to which attention is called can easily be verified by reference to the authorities which are open to all, and that for this reason I have not cumbered the pages with unnecessary foot-notes; and that the opinions herein expressed are honest convictions, the result of many years of study and thought. These opinions may be, as I believe they are, right; in which case I beg that they will be considered dispassionately and not condemned offhand because they lead to conclusions which may not be congenial with certain theories of the church which the reader may have accepted on authority without careful examination.

On the other hand, they may be erroneous; in which case I shall rejoice to be set right; but this should not be done by an appeal to authority, but by sound reasons.

Whether my readers agree with me or not, I am sure they will feel that the questions here raised are worthy of the serious consideration of Christian men. Not, then, in the spirit of controversy, but in the hope that we may find a way out of the difficulties which beset the church in this day of crisis, I submit this work to the judgment of religious men and women.

L. P.

All Saints' Day,
1921.

# CONTENTS

# INTRODUCTION

It will be generally admitted, even by the most optimistic, that we have come to a crisis in the history of civilization. The word crisis is used in two different senses; sometimes it means no more than that a turning-point has been reached, as when, in speaking of a disease, it is said that the crisis has or has not been passed. But the original meaning of the word has a deeper significance than that; it means also a judgment. This is what not a few religious men believe the present crisis of the world to be. They believe that it is the revelation of God's estimate of our civilization—the condemnation of that materialistic conception of life which first poisoned our philosophy, then our theory of government, and, finally, affected all society, leading men and women to believe that a man's life does consist in the abundance of the things which he possesses till there was nothing left but to cry: "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

That the crisis of the world should produce a repercussion on the church was inevitable, but that the church may fail even if Western civilization goes down in ruin will be said by some to be unthinkable. "Have we not the promise of Christ that 'the gates of hell shall not prevail'? And does not that mean that the church shall stand till the end of time?"

Whether those are the words of Christ himself, or the expression of that exuberant hope of immortal youth which filled the breast of the church in the early days, we need not now consider. Even though the words were spoken by Jesus, the inference may be quite different from what we have assumed it to be. The church may remain if the

churches fail. And that means that the church of Christ will not be lost even if every church now known to us were to disappear. It is significant that in the vision of the ideal life, which he calls the city of God, the seer "saw no temple there." But even if the words of the gospel be taken in the traditional sense, it should be remembered that this promise of Christ, like all the promises of God, is conditional. The promise to the Christian church is no more solemn than the promise to Israel. Israel failed. Why may not the Christian church—at least in any form with which we are familiar—also fail?

It might, then, be well before considering the present crisis of the churches to recall other crises through which the church has passed. The story of the first is embodied in the Book of Jonah, which, because it begins with the incredible story of the swallowing of a man by a great fish and his return to active life after a three days' entombment in its belly, has become the favorite subject of the scoffer, but a more intelligent study of that ancient parable might lead to the conclusion that it is not only one of the most precious books of the Old Testament but also has a meaning for the modern church.

Had the introduction to the Book of Jonah been written by a Greek it would appeal to the modern mind as the Hebrew story cannot do. One of the Greek myths is much like the Biblical story. When Arion incurred the wrath of Apollo he was cast into the sea by the frightened sailors, but instead of being swallowed by a great fish, he was saved by the grateful dolphin, which, charmed by the music of his lyre, hovered about the ship, and then joyfully carried the musician on his back to the safety of the land.

This is so evidently a myth that the modern mind has no difficulty in receiving it and finding in it a poetical illustration of the providence which is wider than the influence of any particular god. But no Hebrew could have

written such a story. In the first place, the Hebrews were not a seafaring people like the Greeks. To them the sea was always a thing of terror. The last of all the Hebrew Biblical writers finds comfort in the thought that in the ideal life "there shall be no more sea." But there was a deeper reason than that: the Hebrew mind, if not devoid of humor, at least knew nothing of the playfulness of the Greek temperament. Humor took the form of irony. Life was as serious to the Hebrew as to his modern representative, the Puritan. The eternal God determined all things in heaven and earth and in the sea. Jonah, like Arion, is cast into the sea, but no playful dolphin may rescue the man who is fleeing from Jehovah. If he is to be saved, it must be by him whom he seeks to escape. The "great fish" which swallows the prophet had been prepared by God. To the Greek the myth was a joyful revelation; to the Hebrew it was a solemn warning.

The problem of religion in America is complicated by the fact that the American temperament has much of the Greek frivolity, and yet its religion is permeated by the solemn atmosphere of the Hebrew. The result of this is seen in the different ways in which men react to such a story as that of Jonah and the "whale." To the irreverent it is a subject of mockery; to the deeply religious it is complicated by the fact that it seems to have received the sanction of the Divine Teacher, but to-day we should be in a position to study the book with a clearer understanding.

The book itself is easily understood if we turn to it with open mind and ask ourselves what it was the writer wished to say. He had in mind to do what Bunyan did in "The Pilgrim's Progress." He was writing a great allegory. If the reader believes the story of Christian's fight with the dragon—and who does not?—then he will believe in the same way that Jonah was swallowed by the "whale."

If only we could read the story as a great allegory, as it was intended to be read, and was certainly so understood

by the contemporaries of the writer, we should find that it has a much-needed lesson for the churches to-day.

To us the story of the prophet swallowed by the whale seems incongruous and absurd, but to the men who first read the book it was most apposite, for they knew that the experience of Jonah in the fictitious writing was a great parable of Israel's experience in the world-wide convulsion of the days when the Assyrian Empire conquered the world.

One of the results of the unhappily named "higher criticism"* has been to show us when, and so why, this book of an unknown author was written. It was after the return from the captivity, perhaps about the year 350 B. C., when Greece was preparing for her great invasion of the East, which was destined to affect the whole course of history, that an unknown writer had such an inspiration of the needs of the world and such a vision of Israel's mission, that the book known to us as "The Prophecy of Jonah" was given to the world.

That Israel should have returned from its bitter experience filled with horror at the wickedness of the world is not strange; that men filled with the spirit of the Puritan, as were Ezra and Nehemiah, should feel that the safety of the chosen people depended upon their isolation, we can well understand. But it was not alone the people who had held them in captivity whose influence they dreaded; there were people near at hand whom they despised and hated. The Samaritans had played an unworthy part on

* Higher criticism is a name we owe to the Germans. It has aroused the resentment of the ignorant because it seems to imply a certain superiority on the part of the critic. But it refers only to the subject of critical study. The study of the text was called the "lower" criticism, and the study of the book as a whole—its authorship, the time when it was written, and the object of the writer—was called the "higher" criticism. Certainly a harmless distinction! But how much bitterness and ignorant zeal might have been spared if by chance the one had been called the "textual" and the other the "literary" examination of Scriptures!

the return of their brethren and sown the seeds of that contempt which was all the more bitter because the rival religion aped the manners of the true worshippers of Jehovah.

But there was one servant of God who saw that this spirit must lead to the destruction of Israel, and that the true meaning of the experience of the exile was to be found by those who had learned that in "every nation he that reverences and serves God is accepted by him." Our writer was not the only one to learn this great truth. The unknown prophet, whom we call Isaiah, had had a vision of a God of the whole earth. Malachi was about to say —not as we read it in the authorized version, but—"From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name *is* great among the heathen, and in every place incense *is being* offered unto my name, even a pure offering, for my name is now great among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts." How was Israel, hard and bitter and self-satisfied, to be made to feel that its true mission was to make known the way of the Lord among all people? How was the religion of Israel to be changed from a racial to a universal religion? How was the world to be evangelized? The writer, like a still Greater Prophet, turned from the language of the schools and used the parable. He wrote an allegory which has endured through all these centuries and will again influence the world when men learn that it is a parable and not a history.

If Israel rested content with the revelation to the fathers and felt no responsibility for the world, it would surely perish. This was his message, and the Book of Jonah was the form it took. The writer took for his hero the prophet Jonah. Why he chose this little-known figure will be evident to all who take the trouble to make themselves familiar with not alone the history of Israel as it is recorded in the Scriptures but also with the traditions which have lingered to our day. Jonah was a great national hero. Tra-

dition* said that he was the "child" whom the prophet Elijah, at the time of the great famine, raised to life. He, said the popular story, was the unnamed "servant" who fled with Elijah as far as Beersheba, when the wrath of Jezebel sought the prophet's life. He was the "messenger" whom Elisha sent to anoint Jehu king, which led to the revolution and the downfall of the dynasty of Ahab. He, thought our author, was a fitting hero for the parable which he hoped might change the course of Hebrew history.

But there was a deeper reason still why Jonah should have been the hero of the tale; it was necessary for the dramatic construction of the story that the hero should represent a theology which Israel had long outgrown. Every student of the Bible knows that Israel at the beginning conceived of God as a tribal God, whose name was Jehovah. This God dwelt on Mount Sinai. Thither Moses went to receive the Tables of Stone. To this same mountain Elijah went to renew his faith in the God of Israel. Great as was the power of Jehovah, it was confined to the Promised Land. His writs did not run in Moab or in Philistia. It was not until the days of the great prophets that God began to be thought of as the God of the whole earth.

The primitive theology had been outgrown through the influence of the great prophets and the experiences in the captivity. Yet, if the story was to have verisimilitude, it required for its hero one who still held to the old theology. For—and here lies the irony of the writer—it was not to be supposed that one who believed that he who is the God of the whole earth could be content to have his true worshippers indifferent to that larger world in which he dwelt! If God be the God of the whole earth, and Israel acts as if it had no duty outside the Promised Land, what would be the fate of Israel? This is what the story of Jonah sets out to tell. It was because Jonah did not believe that God

* See Stanley's "History of the Jewish Church," lecture XXXIII.

was the God of the whole earth, but only of the sacred land of Israel, that when the unwelcome word of the Lord came to him, saying, "Arise, go to Nineveh," "he rose up to flee unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord."

Thus far there is nothing in the allegory which seems inconsistent with human experience. But now follows the story which is not only incredible but, to the modern mind, grotesque. Therefore, many a reader closes the story at this point and will read no more, and so one of the most instructive and dramatic books of the Old Testament is closed to him. Yet, I venture to think, the great lesson of the allegory was never more needed than to-day.

Why did the prophet insert such a grotesque incident into his story? Why could not the Greek dolphin have served his purpose? Of course the first answer is that he never dreamed that his parable would be read by any save his contemporaries! He could not foresee that a day would come when the reverence of a people for his writing would be so great that they would suppose that he was writing history and would expect them to accept his fantastic tale as if it were the truth of a veritable voyage on the Mediterranean Sea! Yet that is what has come to pass.

But the story was not written for Christians, nor for Greeks nor for Americans—full of imagination, indeed, yet singularly lacking in the poetic sense. We are essentially prosaic in our most religious moods. The book was written for the contemporaries of the prophet, as we have said, for men whose fathers had known what it meant for a whole nation to be engulfed in the tidal wave of the Babylonian invasion. The hero of the story had not shared this experience, for he lived before the rise of Babylon as a world-power. He belonged to the Northern kingdom on which the Assyrian "had come down like a wolf on the fold." It was Nineveh which had destroyed the people of God, because they had failed to preach to it the righteous-

ness of God which had been revealed to them. What figure should he use to represent the awful fate of the Northern kingdom? The prophet Jeremiah had spoken of Nebuchadnezzar as a dragon; he had said, speaking of the fall of Judea: "The king of Babylon hath devoured me . . . he hath swallowed me up like a dragon . . . he hath cast me out."

This, I guess, is the seed from which our writer's story grew. Indeed, it would be more appropriate as applied to Nineveh than to Babylon, for the word Nineveh comes from the root *Nish*, which means fish. This was the great fish that swallowed Israel. The people who first read this story had the key to the parable which we have lost. They knew that the experience of Jonah was a parable of the experience of both Israel and Judea. The great monster empires of the ancient world had swallowed the people of God because they had fled from his presence. And now, by the mercy of God, the monster had cast them forth and they were given a new opportunity to serve God by preaching his righteousness to the world. Would they obey the voice of God, or would they refuse? This was the question the writer had in mind to bring before his people.

It is an old story, but it is one which has a meaning for the churches to-day. Indeed, I believe that it is the one question to which an answer must be found if the church is not to meet the fate of Judaism. We have had a solemn warning. Men are saying: "Why did not the church save the world from the desolating war which threatened to destroy the civilization of the world?" It is a question to which an answer must be given, and it ought not to be difficult to find the answer. The churches were impotent because they had not used their influence to convert the world. They were content to rest in such a modification of the individual and family life as they had accomplished. But that the spiritualization of the industrial and political

life of the nations and the relation of the nations to one another were also the task of the church was far from their thought. The churches allied to the state were bound to speak the things which the state demanded. The American churches, free from the control of the state, might have had a message to the world, but they were satisfied with influencing the individual and were exhausting their energies in sectarian propaganda, and would long ago have perished had it not been that the Christian spirit was kept alive by missions to the heathen. Who can doubt that had the Christian world shown to Japan an example of Christian brotherhood, the whole course of the world might have been changed? If all the Christian men and women in the world could have united their energies, there can be no doubt that the war could have been prevented. I do not mean by some sudden effort in the year 1914. That was too late. But if after the Reformation all the Reformed churches had determined that they would no longer be dominated by the spirit of the world, as they determined they would no longer be dominated by the papacy, there can be no doubt that the world would be a different place from what it is to-day.

But the church has been impotent because it lost the meaning of the kingdom of God and identified salvation with individual escape from the torture of a hell which is to be experienced after death, and supposed that the important work for each church was to propagate its own peculiar doctrines. Because of this the Protestant churches have been impotent to influence the world except to a small degree.

The churches have been like the hero of our story. They have fled from the presence of the Lord. That is, they have not acted as if they believed that the Lord is present in the affairs of the world but is confined to the sacred soil of the ecclesiastical life. As a result of this heresy the churches have been swallowed by the world.

There is a passage in a recent book by Santayana which deserves our serious consideration. The liberal, on reading this passage, will, I think, be justified in saying that the author is confused as to the true meaning of "authority," and will not be prepared to admit that the picture which he draws of the Protestant churches in the nineteenth century is a complete portrait of Christian life in America at that time. Nevertheless, if we read the passage with serious hearts, I think we shall be compelled to admit that the churches had substituted efficiency for holiness, and as a result had been dominated by the spirit of the world. "The Churches, a little ashamed of their past, began to court the good opinion of so excellent a world. . . . They were far, very far, from . . . preaching contempt for it. . . . Irreligion, dissoluteness, and pessimism—supposed naturally to go together—could never prosper; they were incompatible with efficiency. That was the supreme test. 'Be Christians,' I once heard a president of —— College cry to his assembled pupils, 'be Christians and you will be successful.' Religion was indispensable and sacred, when not carried too far; but theology might well be unnecessary. Why distract this world with talk of another? Enough for the day was the good thereof. Religion should be disentangled as much as possible from history and authority and metaphysics, and made to rest honestly on one's fine feelings, on one's indomitable optimism and trust in life."*

The churches have been swallowed by the world and now, by the mercy of God, after the dreadful experience, are given, as the prophet was, a new opportunity to redeem themselves. These are the conditions which constitute what we have called the crisis of the churches, and I venture to suggest that the churches to-day are in the same position as was Jonah after his deliverance from the perils of the great deep. The experience of Jonah in the

* "Character and Opinion in the United States," George Santayana.

maw of the great fish is the first act in our drama. But the deeper and permanent value is found in the tragedy which follows.

The mercy of God, which gave to the rebellious prophet another opportunity after his first failure, may be said to have been shown also to us. The churches certainly failed in meeting the crisis which culminated in the Great War, but there is still work for them to do, and, having been delivered after the first failure, there is now opening before them a new opportunity. They may now redeem themselves, or, like this unhappy servant of Jehovah, fail again; but if they do, they will repeat the tragedy of the Jewish Church. This is the warning of the second part of our parable.

Jonah went to Nineveh because he dared not again refuse. He delivered the message, and the result was far different from what he had expected. He had hoped that an immediate destruction would follow his preaching. But behold, the city heard and hearkened. He sat on the mound outside the city and waited for the fire from heaven to fall. He heard the sound of mourning, he saw the beasts led from the field to take part in the expiation. And he gloried in the thought that it was too late.*

I do not think it unjust to say that this represented the feeling of many who call themselves Christians as they contemplated the possibility of the resurrection of Germany from the grave of the Hohenzollerns. We have heard not a few say that they wished the war had continued till the invading armies had done in Germany all that the Germans had done in Belgium.

It may be said that one essential element has been overlooked: "The people of Nineveh repented. If the Germans had repented, we should have been the first to forgive them." I believe that those who speak thus are deceiving themselves. They "would forgive if repentance

* See Stanley's lectures on the Jewish Church.

were evident"? Possibly. But they would have been sorry to have repentance precede suffering! The man who wrote the Book of Jonah knew the human heart better than many a man who knows much of which the ancient writer was ignorant. When he depicted Jonah sitting in sullen expectation for the destruction of the city, grieving at the sound of repentance, he was doing what many a man who calls himself a Christian is doing to-day. Each is interested, not in the salvation of life, but in the fulfilment of his own prophecy!

Again, I would call attention to the artistry of the story. The writer has followed the path of human experience as faithfully as the broad feet of Bunyan trod the well-known paths of England. Jonah is a modern figure —because he is the revelation of the human heart.

Waiting for destruction to fall on those we hate is a wearisome business. Jonah found it so. He knew the evil the great Assyrian Empire had brought upon the world, the blood it had shed, the tears it had caused to flow, the homes it had broken up, and so the cries that went up from the king on his throne and the peasant in the field were as music in his ears. Yet the destruction tarried. At last it is borne in upon him that his prophecy has failed. God is to be merciful to those who deserved no mercy. Meanwhile the hot Assyrian sun beats down upon his unprotected head and he is full of misery.

The Hebrew knew nothing of what we call secondary causes. Whatever happened was the direct action of God. As God had prepared the great wind and the great fish, so now it is God who causes a miraculous gourd to spring up and Jonah is comforted by its refreshing shade. In his secure retreat he again waits for the fulfilment of the prophecy which he had feared was to fail. But at last there can be no further ground for hope. The sounds of mourning have turned into hymns of joy, and he is compelled to admit that the wicked city is to escape the doom

it merited. And in bitterness of heart he lies down to sleep. And now God sends a worm which gnaws the root of the gourd and the hot wind of the desert blows upon it and it withers away. And Jonah is filled with anger against God. Then the voice of God comes to him, as it had come to his master Elijah on Horeb, saying: "Dost thou well to be angry for the gourd?" And he answers in the bitterness of his soul: "I do well to be angry even unto death."

To some this seems an impotent conclusion. "What next?" they say. But it is the proper ending of a great tragedy. As in Hamlet, "the rest is silence." But the meaning is clear. This is the end of the prophetic spirit which loves its own shelter more than the "six score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle." "But who are such?" it may be asked. They are the religious sectarians, all who identify the goodness of God with the little system which they have found helpful and comforting. It may be a great church which numbers its millions in many lands, or it may be a little sect of only a few score. But the important matter is not which particular body it seems to us is most to be condemned for this spirit; the important thing to remember is that it is a spirit from which none of the churches is entirely free. I do not intend to imply that there is conscious hatred on the part of one church to another, but only that the logic of their theory leads to a scepticism of God's goodness outside the company to which they belong.

No doubt the story has its lesson for the individual, but it is primarily a parable of the church. It was addressed to the Jewish Church, which had been swallowed up by the great dragons of the Assyrian and Babylonian Empires, but, by the mercy of God, had now been cast forth. A new opportunity had been given to do the will of God in making his way known among the Gentiles, but instead

of that the Jews were filled with bitterness as they learned that God was interested in the heathen and that his mercy was "wider than the wideness of the sea." Their feeling hardened into the Pharisaism which at last slew a Greater than Jonah, because he told them that the Good Samaritan, however faulty his theology, was nearer to God than the orthodox priest and Levite.

Yet this tragedy of Israel might have been averted had the priests listened to one who was more like Jesus in his spirit than even the "greater" prophets. His word needed no scribe to interpret it. It was as plain as the word of Jesus. "You are looking," Jesus said, "only to the past. You forget the present and have no eyes for the future. You are on the threshold of a great revelation—just as Jonah was—and if you fail to see the signs of the times and to do the work to which God has called you, your church and nation, which have been your joy and comfort, will be destroyed as was the gourd of Jonah, and your end, like his, will be full of bitterness." And it was so. The Book of Jonah is the prophecy of the fall of Israel—the foretelling of the fate of the church of God!

If that be all the book has to tell us, it can have only an historical interest. And that, after all, has small value if it does not teach us how best to meet the problems of our own day. If, however, this same spirit against which our parable is a protest was carried over into the early Christian church, we may find that it has persisted longer than we should at first sight be inclined to think. We have only to open the New Testament at random to find how persistent this spirit has been.

When the disciples had learned what Jesus had done for them, it was inevitable that they should be tempted to look with suspicion, if not with contempt, on those who had failed to see his glory. Thus we are told that on one occasion they came to Jesus and complacently remarked that they had seen others "casting out devils in his name,

but because they followed not us, we forbade them." They were evidently astonished that this exclusive spirit did not meet with Jesus' approval. Later still, when the disciples were left without the guidance of the Master's presence, they followed the tradition of their fathers and looked with contempt on the Gentiles, as "common and unclean." If the account in the Acts is a true representation of history and not, as some have supposed, an attempt to harmonize the differences which came near disrupting the church, then it was to Peter the church was indebted for the first attempt to rise to a higher plane and recognize that God's mercy is as wide as humanity itself. However that may be, it is evident that early in the history of the church the same crisis as that which Jonah had failed to meet was presented to the disciples. It was Paul who finally won the victory—over Peter, the Prince of the Church. Even if Peter had begun well, he was unable to continue in his well-doing. Now the rock the apostolic church came near breaking upon, no age of the church has quite escaped. In every age there has been a crisis, and the church has been called upon to decide whether its "gourd" was more valuable than humanity itself.

This is the danger which the churches of our day are called upon to meet. For our church—and it makes no difference by what name we call it—is for each of us the "gourd" which protects us and is our comfort. He must indeed be a thankless soul who is not grateful for what it has done for him. Its dogmas protect from the direct rays of the sun of truth which we are unable to bear. Its encircling walls shield from the hot wind of the world. We are grateful for it. We thank God that we are in it. But, through its open door, we look upon the great world and say to ourselves: "Can God be interested in that great world as he is in us? Can there be anything in this wicked world that is pleasing to God?" Not unnaturally, in our indignation at wickedness and our joy of the tabernacle,

we are tempted to say: "No. All those who are outside the shelter of this protecting leaf are outside the mercy of God. If they would know of the goodness of the Lord, they must enter into our habitation. Till they do that God can have nothing to do with them, because they have nothing to do with him." That, I believe, is the danger of the whole church.

We look at the heathen world and cannot deny that there is much in it that is admirable. There are rules of morality that we should do well to know and obey. There is a simplicity and gentleness in the relation of man to man which put to shame our civilized struggle for existence. Then, nearer at home, we find that some of those whose lives are the most earnest and the sweetest are far from the communion of any of the churches. We recognize that year by year the boys and girls, trained in our Sunday-schools, come home from school and college having lost all interest in the church. It would seem as if the result must be fatal to a worthy life, but, as a matter of fact, many of them, as teachers and doctors and social workers, are an example to us all. What are we to say to these things? Have we been mistaken in supposing that the church has helped us? Is it possible that it has finished its work, and that henceforth the great institution which converted the Roman Empire and brought the barbarian invaders of Europe to the discipleship of Christ is about to disappear? And if so, what is to take its place? While it is well for us to consider the facts, we cannot rest content with such a suggestion.

What the churches must learn to-day is that the spirit of Jesus is not confined to the organization. There are multitudes of earnest men and women who have lost all interest in the church but are following Jesus—many of them ignorant of the fact that it is he who is their companion. "Did not our hearts burn within us while he talked with us on the way?" They do not know all that

they might know of him, but they are living in his spirit of sacrifice. One is teaching, and another is healing, and a third is leaving father and mother and devoting the strength of life to making the conditions of life easier and nobler for the poor. They ignore the churches and the churches ignore them. Thus both are losing what each through co-operation might learn.

The facts of the spiritual life are before us. They are manifest in the lives of the heathen; they are evident in the conversation of those who have no association with the churches; and above all, they are to be seen in the lives of those who are members of every one of the churches. These are facts. But too often the ecclesiastical mind prefers to begin with a theory and say: "No church which has not a 'valid' ministry, or which has abandoned the primitive form of administering baptism, or is unable to point to the exact day and hour when its members were converted, can have the spirit of Christ." Of course, then there can be no end to the controversy.

Now, all Christians do believe that the fruits of the spirit can be found only where Christ is present; all are ready to say, "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his"; but too often the corollary that "If any man have the spirit of Christ he is his" is overlooked. St. Paul, who was a great expert in the human soul, says: "The fruits of the spirit are manifest, which are these, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, meekness. Against such there is no law." May we not add: "Against such there is no argument"?

If these be the facts—and they cannot be controverted —might it not be well for us to ask ourselves, not what is the theory to which we are bound, but what are the facts of life, and what is our duty in relation to them? It used to be said by some good men that the people outside the communion of the church to which they belonged were outside the "covenanted mercies of God." They did not

ask themselves what those words meant; they simply used a formula which explains nothing. That time has now gone by, but we are not clear as to what we ought to say and do. It is that confusion which is one of the causes of the impotence of the churches.

I venture to suggest that what we ought to say to ourselves is that we are thinking of our churches as Jonah thought of his gourd. It has been our refuge and protection, but all along God has been providing other refuges for those who are not under the shadow of our "gourd." For, if we do not say that willingly, we may be driven to it by bitter experience, and though we escape the anger which poisoned the heart of the prophet, we shall continue to be perplexed until we begin to doubt if there be any refuge for the soul of man.

There is another fact which has been impressed upon us by the experience of recent years, and that is that the wind of the world is blowing upon our "gourd" and the worm of criticism is gnawing at its root. These considerations should lead us to ask if our experience may not be the same as Jonah's? It may be that God will destroy our refuge if we do not use it for the good of mankind instead of as a refuge for ourselves. Not a few are deeply concerned; they see that their church is not to their children what it has been to them, and they are filled with despair and believe the evil is in their children instead of in themselves. They do not, indeed, say with the prophet, "I do well to be angry even unto death," but failing to see the signs of the times, they have no great expectation of better things. They cannot believe that

> "Our little systems have their day,
> They have their day and cease to be,
> . . . . . .
> And thou, O God, art more than they."

To admit that God fulfils himself in many ways seems equivalent to saying that he never has fulfilled himself in

any way. It seems to them that there can be but one way of God's manifestation of the truth, even that way which is consonant with a theory which they had learned to identify with revelation itself. Some, like the great Cardinal Newman, or like a recent learned and good bishop of the Episcopal Church, believing that their own "gourd," which had been their comfort and protection, is about to wither away, seek for another "gourd" whose roots, they think, strike deeper and whose branches evidently spread wider, and there, they think, they shall be at peace. It may be so; but it will be because they are able to rest in something less than the revelation of God's goodness in their own day. Others, like Newman's brother, or like Samuel Butler, finding the church, as it had been represented to them, to be no dwelling-place for the growing soul, turn from all the churches with disgust and mock at those who do not follow them.

This ancient parable has a word to us to-day. It would tell us that we too are on the eve of a great revelation—the revelation of the goodness of God throughout the whole earth, and that the duty of the church is to bear witness to that truth by which alone the world can be saved.

No doubt there are good men and women who will say: "Supposing this to be true, what is the conclusion of the whole matter? If this exposition of the parable of Jonah be true, then it follows that there is no real difference between heathendom and Christendom, between those who know Jesus as their Saviour and those who know him not; no difference between the church which has held to the ancient order and preserved the faith once delivered to the saints and a sect which has sprung up like a mushroom and has no root that will abide. All that will be left is an invertebrate religious sentimentality, without law or order or definite teaching—that is, without authority."

Before considering these objections in detail, would it not be well to ask ourselves whether the interpretation of

the parable here given is or is not in accordance with the mind of Christ? One has only to open the gospels to see. When the religious teachers of the day gathered about Jesus and saw the mighty works which he did, they could not deny the facts. Therefore they advanced a theory; they said: "He does these things by the power of Beelzebub." But Jesus said: "To attribute any good work to any agency save the spirit of God is to be in danger of the sin against the Holy Ghost." If the facts would not fit their theory, and they did not, then the theory must be changed. Theory is man's interpretation of fact. It is necessarily fallible, but facts are the immutable acts of God. If the fruits of the spirit manifested in all the churches are not the result of the presence of God, then no one of us has valid ground for his belief that he himself is in communion with God.

There are multitudes of Christians who do not face the facts of spiritual experience, and therefore do not feel the force of this inexorable logic. They hold tenaciously to theories which they have inherited, and while they do not go so far, at least in the Protestant churches, as to deny that God's mercy is being manifested in other churches than their own, they are suspicious, unsympathetic, and sometimes even contemptuous of those who do not follow them. Is not this a modern form of the sin against the Holy Ghost? If the facts were faced, might not the spiritual unity which all good men declare they desire be found by following a new path? It is to indicate the new way of Christian unity that this book has been written.

# CHAPTER I

## THE CRISIS OF CIVILIZATION

THE crisis of the world may be thought of as political, economic, or social. But, however we look at it, it is so dreadful that not a few serious-minded men are asking themselves if Western civilization is about to fail. To some this may seem a futile, foolish, perhaps morbid question. But when we recall what history has taught us—that civilizations great and wonderful have passed away and left almost no record—why should we conclude that the present civilization which we think so glorious should be immortal? The story of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire is one of the classics of English literature, and is no doubt familiar to all. It may not, however, be out of place to recall certain of the salient facts which ought to impress the student of the present history of the world. These are the causes which, it is generally admitted, led to the decay of the splendor of Rome: first, increasing luxury, which sapped the Stoic virtues. Second, the prevalence of divorce, which undermined the family. Every student of Plutarch knows that the family was the noblest product of Roman civilization. Indeed, we may say that it was like the Trojan Palladium; when it fell, the fall of the city was inevitable. Third, taxation, so heavy that industry was throttled and men, in despair, declared that it was not worth while to save. Fourth, the civil wars, which cut down the flower of Roman manhood. Fifth, the dilution of citizenship by the inclusion of slaves and barbarians, who felt no thrill of glory when the story of the Eternal City was sung.

These are the facts which impressed the mind of Gibbon, but there were deeper reasons than this observant historian

perceived. Froude has sunk the probe of criticism deeper into the wounds of the empire. "It was an age of material progress and material civilization; an age of civil liberty and intellectual culture; an age of pamphlets and epigrams, of salons and of dinner-parties, of senatorial majorities and electoral corruption. The highest offices of the state were open in theory to the meanest citizen; they were confined, in fact, to those who had the longest purses, or the most ready use of the tongue on popular platforms. . . . The struggles between plebeians and patricians for equality of privilege were over, and a new division had been formed between the party of property and a party who desired a change in the structure of society. . . . The rich were extravagant, for life had ceased to have practical interest, except for its material pleasures; the occupation of the higher classes was to obtain money without labor, and to spend it in idle enjoyment. Patriotism survived on the lips, but patriotism meant the ascendency of the party which would maintain the existing order of things, or would overthrow it for a more equal distribution of the good things which alone were valued. Religion, once the foundation of the laws and rules of personal conduct, had subsided into opinion. The educated, in their hearts, disbelieved it. Temples were still built with increasing splendor; the established forms were scrupulously observed. Public men spoke conventionally of Providence, that they might throw on their opponents the odium of impiety; but of genuine belief that life had any serious meaning, there was none remaining beyond the circle of the silent, patient, ignorant multitude. . . . The Romans ceased to believe, and in losing their faith they became as steel becomes when it is demagnetized: the spiritual quality was gone out of them, and the high society of Rome itself became a society of powerful animals with an enormous appetite for pleasure. Wealth poured in more and more, and luxury grew more unbounded. Pal-

aces sprang up in the city, castles in the country, villas at pleasant places by the sea, and parks, and fish-pounds, and game preserves, and gardens, and vast retinues of servants. When natural pleasures had been indulged in to satiety, pleasures which were against nature were imported from the East to stimulate the exhausted appetite. To make money—money by any means, lawful or unlawful—became the universal passion."*

Are the like signs—vulgarizing luxury, divorce leading to the dissolution of the family, taxation blocking the wheels of industry, destruction of young, vigorous, promising life by the slaughter of war, a lowering of the standard of citizenship by the inclusion of the ignorant, the imbecile, and the vicious in the electorate, the rule of the "boss" in our state and municipal politics, the love of money, and the loss of faith—characteristic of our day and land? If they be, what shall we say of them? Whether we say, as some do, that they are merely superficial, or believe, as many thoughtful men and women do believe, that they are symptoms of a deep-seated disease, he, I think, must be a heedless man who does not admit that there is at least danger that our civilization may perish as other civilizations have perished, although to the men of old such a thing seemed as impossible as it does to the careless to-day. "They were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, and the flood came."

* See "Cæsar, a Sketch," James Anthony Froude, pp. 6–7, 18–19. Ferrero, in "The Ruin of Ancient Civilization and the Triumph of Christianity," says that while the facts above named are to be counted causes of the fall of Rome, the fundamental cause was a spiritual one —the loss of authority—and believes that the present crisis of the world is due to the same cause.

Undoubtedly there is truth in this, but all that it seems to prove is that the various external authorities in which the world has tried to rest have been found inadequate. The peace of the world cannot be gained through the re-establishment of any of those discredited authorities; a more august authority must be found, the authority of the spirit speaking through the universal conscience of Christian men. See "The Seat of Authority in Religion," James Martineau, pp. 67–68.

There are not a few thoughtful men who will say: "While of course there is danger, there is no cause for panic. The times at present are out of joint, but there will be time for the restoration of the world as it was ten years ago, and then it will be found that things will go on much as they did before. We do not deny that many present facts are disquieting, but the dark picture drawn by those who recall the fate of Rome is not justified. There are foundations of modern civilization which have been laid since the fall of Rome, and on these our civilization firmly rests."

When we inquire what these foundations are, we are told that first of all there is "capital." "The fluidity of capital is a comparatively modern discovery. The great wealth accumulated after a century of intensive industrialism, and the fluidity of capital, which flows from one part of the world to another by a law as sure as that which regulates the winds, something which Rome never knew, is a sure foundation on which Western civilization is built. It cannot fall while that rock remains." This may be true, but when we hear, not alarmists, but serious-minded men in England to-day asking if it be not possible that England shall be bankrupt, it should give us pause. If it should come to pass that England, for mere self-preservation, should be obliged to repudiate her great debt—and that, as I say, is seriously feared by some to-day—who does not know that France must follow, and Italy follow France? In such case, the fluidity of capital, which we thought was our safeguard, may prove to be a liability rather than an asset. It has been a witness to the interlocking of all national interests; but if one were to fail, they would all go down like a row of card houses. Then what becomes of our capital? Wealth is not bullion; it is credit. If credit be shaken, then the foundation will be shaken. Europe will fail. "But," it may be said, "America would remain." For how long? With our best customers ruined, with repudiation of the great debts owed to

this country, and with the same poison working in this country which destroyed Europe, how long could America stand alone as the guardian of Western civilization?

It may be said: "This is but a part of the story. All that has been suggested might happen, and still we should not be ruined even if we were temporarily embarrassed. There are immense riches in this land which have not yet been brought to the surface and placed in the hands of man." I do not know how great those riches are, nor does any one. It is quite possible that we have overestimated the amount of coal and iron and oil upon which the industrial life of the nation is dependent. But however that may be, it must be remembered that we have been thinking of latent, not actual, wealth, and that latent, to become actual, wealth requires unflagging industry. But Russia has shown us the possibility of a great people either refusing or being unable to work, and in consequence sinking into appalling poverty in a few years. Now if England, France, and Italy were bankrupt, and Russia were unable or refused to work, and Germany decided that it was unprofitable to work for the benefit of her conquerors, where would be our wealth, which we supposed would support us until the world could be restored to its ancient glory? Again we may turn eyes of hope to America. But if the working men—mechanics and farmers—are convinced that they are not receiving a fair share of the result of combined capital and labor—and that they are so convinced there can be little doubt—we may anticipate an industrial revolution in this land which will at least temporarily paralyze our industrial activities and still further reduce our accumulated wealth.

But the optimist will not easily let us go. Such an experienced statesman and interesting philosopher as Mr. Arthur Balfour has lately called attention to the fact that in all these discussions of the fate of the Roman Empire, "science" has been overlooked. It is this, he says, that

differentiates our days from those which preceded the incursion of the barbarians. It might seem impertinent to differ from such a distinguished man, but I think even the most modest of us would be justified in saying that this sounds more like the optimism of the nineteenth century when it was expected that science was about to bring in the millennium without effort on the part of man, than the realism of the twentieth century with which we are now called upon to deal. For great as have been the blessings of science—in the hand of the physician it has soothed pain, it has made the crooked straight, it has prolonged the span of human life, it has enlarged our mental horizon and shown the "rock from which man was hewn and the pit from which he was digged"—what has it been in the hands of the "men who delight in war"? What in the hands of those—the social maniacs—whom we call anarchists? What salvation did it bring to Germany, "princess among the nations"? Is science a blessing? It depends upon the *character* of the men who handle it. But it can be confined to no class or no character. Indirectly it may do a work which was not to have been expected. The romance of war arose in the days when war consisted in the meeting face to face of two enemies, and courage, strength, and skill determined the issue. But every historian of the Middle Ages has called attention to the great revolution brought about by the invention of gunpowder, which placed the peasant on a level with the mailed warrior. What is that compared with the revolution which this generation has seen? Where is the romance of being blown to pieces by a shell cast into the air by an adversary miles from the seat of battle? I talked not long ago with a man in a convalescent home—a Canadian soldier. I asked him how long he had been in the trenches before he was wounded. He replied: "I was not there over three minutes. I had trained in camp for a year and then was sent to the trenches. I asked a man where I was to stand and then

it was all over. The next thing I knew I was in a hospital, and a doctor from Chicago had cut a piece out of my skull." I asked him if he had recovered. "I am well enough," he said, "but sometimes I fall unconscious." Poor wretch! He did not know that epilepsy was before him and that his mind would soon be gone. He was "only there three minutes"! Where is the romance in such slaughter as that? But it may be he will not die in vain. It may be that his fate and that of thousands like him will help to rid us from the delusion that war is a glorious thing, instead of being, as it really is, the denial of humanity. But that which calls for our immediate attention is that in a new war the destructive means will be less mechanical than chemical, and that the object will be not so much the defeat of an enemy in the field as the destruction of the peoples—helpless old men, tender women, and innocent children. Now if that hell is to be let loose upon the earth, why should we suppose that our civilization can endure? *

But the internal symptoms of decay are not the only signs of the times which we are called upon to consider. Rome was not built in a day and Rome did not fall in a day. Long before the flood came it was recognized by thoughtful men that while the walls had been well built and were still strong, nevertheless there were serious cracks in the masonry; the foundations were showing signs of weakness and the walls bulging out. There were spasmodic efforts made from time to time to repair the breaches, but they were met with scepticism or indifference. Even so, they would probably have lasted for centuries longer than they did had there been no external pressure upon them. That external pressure came in what we call the incursions of the barbarians. When that great mass was

* See the lecture by General Bliss on "Disarmament" in "What Really Happened at Paris. The Story of the Peace Conference." By American Delegates. Edited by Edward Mandell House.

hurled upon them, the walls of the Eternal City fell with a crash, the echo of which is heard round the world to-day.

But, it may be asked, "Why recall the well-known story? Is it suggested that there is an analogy between the fifth and twentieth centuries? Is there fear of a new barbarian incursion?" If we say "Yes," no doubt it will seem to not a few to be too fantastic to deserve the attention of sane men. Yet, why should it seem fantastic? Why should it seem incredible? Probably because we do not recognize that there is to-day any enemy of Western civilization. Yet that is what Asia is.

For a thousand years the wars of Europe and America have been civil wars—that is, conflicts between men sharing a more or less common ideal and derived from a common stock. But we forget that for almost a millennium previous the wars had been between Asia and Europe. Have we forgotten how, under the leadership first of Persia, then of Arabia, and then led by the Saracens, and lastly by the fierce Osmanli, Asia came so near to conquering Europe and preventing the building of this civilization which we think so enduring that we cannot to-day read the story of the battle of the Loire or of the siege of Vienna without a quickening of the pulse and a thrill of atavistic fear? Europe conquered. Its faith, its industry, and its science enabled it to overcome Asia, so that for centuries Asia has been a negligible factor in the world's history. Why, then, should it be supposed that it can now become a menace? Our Saviour, speaking to the men of his day and foretelling the fall of Jerusalem, did not rest his prediction upon the evidences of internal decay alone; he pointed to the dark cloud of Rome, and announced a great law of history: "Wherever the carcass is, there will the vultures be gathered together." If the life, the spirit, the *faith* die out of Western civilization, it will become a carcass, and, by a law of history, the vultures will gather together.

I would not add one grain to the suspicion already too

great in certain parts of this country, of the Oriental peoples; but we Christians have no right to ask that they should not take advantage of the opportunity that may come to them to avenge an ancient grudge. For what has Europe, in its diplomatic and economic activities, backed up by army and navy, done during all the time that it has had Asia beneath its feet? The shameful story can be read, from the "Opium War" to the suppression of the Boxer rebellion. And that history has made a profound impression. Asia has learned that the greatness of the leading nations of Europe and America has been built upon the foundation of the oppression of weaker people. If, then, the opportunity comes, and we in turn are weak, by what right shall we ask them to refrain from doing what we have done? Should we not receive the answer that Shylock gave when begged not to take advantage of the disasters of his debtor?

"If you wrong us, shall we not revenge? If we are like you in the rest, we will resemble you in that. If a Jew wrong a Christian, what is his humility? Revenge. If a Christian wrong a Jew, what should his sufferance be by Christian example? Why, revenge. The villainy you teach me I will execute, and it shall go hard but I will better the instruction."

What wrongs have not India, China, Japan to revenge? "Even so," it may be said, "they have not the power." Why have they not the power? We may soon no longer have the wealth on which we depended. They have the men; they have all that science has armed us with. I think, if we have read history aright, we shall be obliged to say: "All they need is a leader. Let a great leader arise—either an individual or a nation—as was the case of old, and there will be no reason why Asia should not arise in her might and destroy that in which we trust.* If

* "In this new era we have the assertion of the full independence of the Indian mind. The educated Indian now regards himself as full-grown man, the equal in every respect of the cultivated European,

Europe and America are dismembered or weakened, then the law of the carcass and the vultures will reign."

Nor if we turn from the general to the particular, does the outlook become more encouraging. Who can consider the potential power of Russia and fail to be impressed by the awful danger that lurks in that desperate people? There are not a few thoughtful men who believe that the reign of terror in Russia will be followed by the rise of an imperialistic leader, as was the case in France, and that inflamed by the faith in the rights of the proletariat, as France was by the faith in the "rights of man," they will sweep over Europe. But, as "history does not repeat itself," it may be that the leader will be found, not in an individual but in a nation. Such a nation may well be Japan. There is before her the example of England, a little island, ruling a great colonial empire. There is the example of Germany—and it must not be forgotten that the influence of German imperialism has been great in Japan. It might, indeed, seem at first as if the fate of Germany might prove a warning. But no one knows better than Japan how near Germany came to winning the late war. The statesmen of Japan may well say to themselves that the luck is not likely to run again so disastrously against a player who places his stake on the number which has just lost. If China can be dominated, Russia led, India and Persia incited to revolt, and the great Mohammedan peoples consolidated, as the Turks were

not to be set aside as an Asiatic, or as a member of a dark race. He claims the right of thinking his own thoughts; and he is quite prepared to burn what he has hitherto adored and to create a new heaven and a new earth. This adult self-confidence was immeasurably strengthened by the victory of Japan over Russia. Every Asiatic felt himself recreated by that great event. To all Asiatic lands it was a crisis in race-history, the moment when the age-old flood of European aggression was turned back. The exultation which every Indian felt over the victory lifted the national spirit to its height and gave a new note of strength to the period."—"Modern Religious Movements in India," by J. N. Farquhar, pp. 354–355.

never able to consolidate them, might not the East liberate itself and conquer the world?

But if this suggestion seem too fantastic—though it is no more fantastic than what this generation has seen—can we say that a conflict between the United States and Japan is impossible? Should that come, there is one thing that, I think, may be confidently prophesied, and that is, that in all the churches there will be heard voices declaring that this is a new crusade. We shall be told that the war came because Japan closed the "open door" to China; or that the people of the Pacific coast would not consent to have their pure "Nordic" blood contaminated by an Asiatic strain. In this there will be some truth. But if before the conflict comes, and we still have time to consider the question dispassionately, we should tell the fundamental truth, which is that such a war would be the inevitable result of the conflict between the imperialistic designs of Japan and the imperialistic designs of the United States in the Pacific, it might be that an adjustment might be made. The churches should be preparing to speak with authority before the storm breaks. For the churches are responsible in no small degree for the present tension. Few voices were raised in the churches against the imperialistic experiment of the United States which followed the Spanish War. No one of the churches failed more lamentably than the Episcopal Church, which, influenced by the example of England, hailed, by the mouth of some of its most influential bishops, "the glorious mission of America to bear its share of the 'white man's burden.'" Such men, if war comes again, will be as truly, even though unintentionally, responsible as were the leaders of the Lutheran Church in Germany who failed to protest against Bismarck's policy of "blood and iron" for the real outbreak of the World War.

I have spoken of those who make light of the signs of the times as "optimists," for such they like to call them-

selves; but he only is a true optimist who faces the facts of life, estimates at their true value the dangers of the present, and yet has faith enough to believe that out of evil God will bring good. It is the latter only who can properly be called an optimist, though to the thoughtless he will seem to be a Cassandra or a Jeremiah. On the other hand, there will be found those who say that the outlook is so discouraging as to be hopeless. But it has been well said, "Truth is never discouraging." The difficulties are indeed great, but so should be our faith. "When the Son of Man cometh will he find faith on the earth?" That should be for us, as it was for Jesus, the one important question. Underneath the irreconcilable ideals of East and West is a spiritual one. The fatalism of the East counts the life of the individual as the small dust in the balance. What spiritual power have we with which to meet the fatalism of the East? That is the fundamental question and leads to a consideration of the mission and the task of the churches.

It is true we have great hopes; nevertheless, the dangers have not passed. So while we should rejoice, and do rejoice, at the dawn of a better day, we must listen to St. Paul's stirring words: "The day is at hand, *therefore* put off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light." The dangers of which we have been thinking may not be so imminent as has been assumed, but they have not disappeared. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." How much more must it be said to be the price of salvation, whether personal or universal!

## CHAPTER II

## THE MISSION OF THE CHURCHES

HAVE the churches remembered their primary mission? The church was ordained to be a missionary society. Every one of the churches has such a society. But can it be denied that it is rather as an adjunct than as a manifestation of the essential work of the churches? How many we know in all the churches who state plainly that they have no interest in foreign missions. This may mean no more, and I believe does mean no more, than that people are indifferent to many of the missionary activities of the churches. But can it be denied that in all the churches the great work of the conversion of the world has been preached rather as a work of supererogation than as the primary work of the church of Christ? Until the spirit of missions is revived, there can be no expectation that the churches can meet the crisis of the world.

Again let us turn to the history of Rome. As a result of the barbarian invasion, the ancient civilization fell. How much of it was lost we shall probably never know. That everything was not lost was due to the Christian church. But why the church was spared when so much else was lost has not, I think, been sufficiently considered. Why was it that those fierce men who knew nothing of the "glory that was Greece" nor "the grandeur that was Rome" spared the church? Every one knows the familiar story of the great pope, Leo I, going out to meet the conqueror, and that the barbarian yielded to the bishop. Doubtless, as Gibbon says, "the pressing eloquence of Leo, his majestic aspect, and sacerdotal robes excited the veneration of Attila for the spiritual father of the Christians." But these would have effected but a momentary check had

they not been supplemented by the fear and veneration of the army which he led. Attila was a Hun, but the Ostro-Goths and many others in the barbarian herd were nominally Christian, and it is to them that the salvation of the church in that critical hour is due. Had it been a heathen flood that poured over Europe the church would have perished as did so much else. But centuries before, while the legions were still holding the banks of the Rhine and of the Danube, while the camps of Rome were still upon the Hellespont, "holding the fort," Christian men climbed the mountains of the Balkans, crossed the plains of Hungary, penetrated the forests of Bohemia, and journeyed as far as the shores of the Baltic, preaching Jesus Christ.* Therefore, when the dam broke and the waters of the Rhine and the Danube and the Black Sea poured in over Asia Minor, Illyricum, Italy, Spain, and France, the church and the church alone rode like the ark on the waves of this troublesome world. The barbarians saw in the lives of the saintly women and heroic men the culmination of a faith of which they had already heard and which they in a measure had learned to obey. They saw in the faces of little children a light that had begun to dawn in the dark forests of their former homes, and they knelt to kiss the feet of the Infant Jesus and bowed down before the cross. They were not awed by any bishop; they were not "converted" by any organization; they recognized their spiritual kin in the Christians of Europe and spared them. They had been converted not by the Catholic Church; they had heard the gospel from those whom that church had cast out.†

The lesson should not be hard to learn. If before the

* Some of the early missionaries were captives. Their conquerors little guessed that in scattering them through Central Europe they were preparing for their own submission to the captives' Lord. "Captivity was again carried captive."

† The Arians.

new barbaric invasion of Western civilization breaks through the barriers that army and navy protect, the churches were to send out their messengers into all lands, the same miracle might be worked again in our day, and the faith of Christ might be saved.

The crisis of the world should lead to a revolution in foreign missions. If Christian men were seriously to ask themselves what is their duty in the presence of the possibility of a new barbaric invasion, they might be led to feel that it is the missionaries rather than armies and navies upon which our hope depends. I believe that the Danish Mission at Serampore, and the Zenana Mission of American women in India; the Yale Mission, and St. John's College, and St. Agnes School in China; St. Paul's College and Hospital in Japan and Robert College in Constantinople—to mention but a few of those agencies which in modern ways are doing the same work which the men of old did, and so saved the church when the Roman Empire fell—are doing more for the safety of Western civilization than all the armies and navies of the world combined.* For, while the West has shown its power to triumph over the weak, which will lead to revenge, the messengers of peace—certainly some of them—have had the courage to say that we are ashamed of the misuse of our power and have sent them to reveal what it is that we really value.

The first thing that we value is the beautiful life of Jesus; but his death is more beautiful still. The heathen may

* That the English government of India since the repeal of the charter of the East India Company has been a blessing to India will be denied only by those who are so obsessed by the theory of "self-determination" that they have not paused to consider what "self" implies. The modern religious movement among the natives of India would have been impossible without the strong arm of the government which protected religious freedom, and the rise of Nationalism would have been impossible without the previous training of the natives by English officials. But it must not be forgotten that one of the greatest blessings was the freedom granted the missionaries to preach the gospel, which the East India Company had not permitted.

not be able to see that as it is set forth by St. Paul, or, perhaps we should say, as it has been popularly expounded, but they would feel its attractiveness as it is revealed by St. John. There they would see that what we value above all things is not the spirit of conquest, but the spirit of self-sacrificing love. "The Cross of Christ," it has been finely said, "touched the common heart of humanity. It awakened a new sense of brotherhood in all men of all classes and nationalities, so that henceforth in their deeper interests they were one." * The same effect would be produced to-day. That is why the ministrations of the physician have made so deep an impression upon the heathen, while they have seemed indifferent to the doctrines of the preacher. A highly educated Japanese, not a Christian, told me that it was almost impossible for the Japanese to believe in disinterested love, and could not understand the Christian attitude. But he admitted that it was beautiful. What Christian man who has felt the constraining love of Christ, or what man who knows anything of the history of the church, can doubt that all men would feel the attraction of self-sacrificing love, and so that in this day Christ, "lifted up," would draw men unto him? Therein lies our hope.

But hope is increased by a quickening of the imagination. How little there is in the ordinary mission report to touch the imagination! Too often we feel its pettiness. May that not be due in part to the fact that our only means of knowing of the work the churches are doing in the uttermost parts of the earth is the denominational paper which reports what its own ministers and workers are doing with no hint that others are doing the same? If there were one great missionary journal which kept the people at home informed of what all the churches were doing, there would be a revival of interest as the result of the larger aspect of the work which would in that way be

* "The Fourth Gospel," E. F. Scott.

recorded. I have listened to many reports from returned missionaries, but I confess I have never had my imagination so quickened as by the account of the late Mr. Duncan of his life among the Metlakatla Indians. He went out alone and had the support of no "society," and was opposed by the bishop of his own church. Yet that man, single-handed, converted a savage tribe of cannibals into an industrious, pious, Christian people. They knew nothing of "orders" and little of "sacraments," * but they knew the love of God which passeth knowledge, and they tried to serve the Lord Jesus. If we could have before us the record of all that is being done by the many churches, I believe there would come a hope for the conversion of the world which we cannot have while we are "looking every one to his own things" and not regarding the "things of others."

There are two objections frequently urged against foreign missions: one is from the church members, and the other is from those who have slight interest in the church, whether at home or abroad. Let us consider each of them.

"The heathen," we are told, "are confused by our denominational differences." It is not our differences of form of administration which confuse them. They are familiar with these differences in the religions which they know among their own people. It is our want of mutual love which shocks them. If a group of men and women setting out from England or Germany or Scandinavia or America have in their own homes felt the importance of

* Mr. Duncan baptized, but he would not administer the communion because he was convinced that men who had just emerged from cannibalism would not be made to understand what "spiritual feeding" means. An interesting parallel is found in the story of Ulphilas, the great apostle to the Goths. In his translation of the Old Testament he omitted the Four Books of Kings (as in that day they were named) as unfitted to such a turbulent and bloodthirsty people. See Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. XXXVII.

certain aspects of truth, it is only to be expected that they will work best by emphasizing those aspects of truth. Of course, if they go so far as to teach the heathen that those aspects are the only ones which constitute a true disciple of Jesus, they are unfaithful to their trust. But why should it be supposed that all Chinese or Japanese will be responsive to but one form of worship or doctrine? Such a theory seems to partake of the mistake which it is said the Chinese doctors made when the first missionary physicians went to China. When they tried to convince the Chinese that the various organs of the human body are not placed where the ancient tradition of the Chinese asserted they were, they refused to believe they could be mistaken. The Chinese would not allow an autopsy to be performed upon one of their countrymen, so that for a long time no progress could be made. At last an American cadaver was obtained and a demonstration of the facts presented to the Chinese. But it was answered that while no doubt the facts were as the autopsy showed in the body of an American, the case was different with the Chinese! How does this anatomical heresy differ from our ecclesiastical heresy which denies the spiritual unity of the race? The notion that there are not embryonic Presbyterians and Methodists and Baptists and Episcopalians in Asia as well as in Europe is as absurd as to assert that there are in foreign lands no differences of stature among the inhabitants. Some years ago a young Japanese friend told me that one of his greatest difficulties in first coming to America was to distinguish one person from another. "They all looked alike." When he was told that Americans found the same difficulty in distinguishing Japanese from one another, he was astonished.

The church was ordained to preach the gospel in "the tongue wherein men were born," whether that tongue be the tongue of Luther or Calvin or Wesley or any other of the great teachers of the church. There is but one gospel,

but the form which it will take will be determined by the differences of men's spiritual temperaments. If that truth were recognized, the churches would find it possible to co-operate in missionary activities. There is work enough for all. Let each church make disciples, and then it will be of slight consequence what the subspecies may be to which they shall later be assigned. If the churches would agree to divide the field and from time to time meet in brotherly conference to tell of the wonderful things God had wrought, they would be filled with new courage to reconsecrate themselves to the work of the spirit and the churches at home would feel the power of a new hope. In this way they could testify to the essential unity of Christ's church and accomplish more than can be now foreseen in the conversion of the world to Christ.

Turn now to the consideration of the objections frequently urged by those who have no real interest in the church, but declare that all the energy and wealth spent in the attempt to make the world Christian are but lost labor, and that it would be better to divert them to the need at home. "How hopeless is the task! When we think of the millions in India, the swarms of life in China, the self-satisfaction of the Japanese, why should we suppose they will listen to our message? The East is not receptive to Western ideals. It is satisfied with its own religion." How belated all this sounds! The East is very receptive to Western ideals. If it were not so, would these same men be so much interested in the "open door" in China? Western clothes, inventions, books, science, are eagerly sought in all parts of the East to-day. Why should it be supposed that they would not be glad to receive the best we have if we made the same effort to introduce it as we make to introduce our manufactured goods?

The men who assert that the East is satisfied with its religion show ignorance of the facts. The East is not satisfied with its religions. The state of affairs in Asia to-day

is strikingly like that of Europe in the time of Paul. The old gods are being deserted. The educated people in every land scoff at them. The poor and ignorant, the peasants, still do sacrifice to them from time to time, because of superstitious fear. "Who can tell? There may be gods and they may have power to destroy the harvest or sicken the cattle or take the lives of the children. It is best to keep in with them." Nevertheless, the contact between the West and the East has produced a deep scepticism, and the gods are losing their power and men are turning sadly away from their worship. The scepticism which we have produced calls on us to bring in a living faith. If we do not, then the experiences of Asia will be like that of the man in the parable who deserted his house, went out into the waste places, and then, weary of wandering, turned homeward. The house was swept and garnished. Everything familiar had gone. Who could endure such loneliness in the midst of this mysterious universe? "He went out and took to himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and the last state of the man was worse than the first." So may it well be with a nation dissatisfied with its ancient religion. Man is "incurably religious"; if when these people returned to their house of religion they found it not empty but filled with the spirit of Jesus, would they not welcome him? There are profound questions, both ethical and philosophical, which must be adjusted—just as there were in the Roman Empire when the gospel was first preached. But those must wait. The immediate need is to convince the world that God is with it. Let any man who is sceptical of the present influence of Christ in heathendom read "Modern Religious Movements in India," * and he may learn what the parable of the leaven means. There is no record of "conversions," but rather the record of the various religious movements which have arisen as the result of the example of

* J. N. Farquhar.

missionary activities which are profoundly affecting the life of India much in the same way as the preaching of the gospel affected Europe. There is not only imitation; there is also hostility. And the latter is showing itself in an attempt to revive the ancient worship, just as Julian the Apostate tried to revive the dying paganism of his day. But that attempt, as well as this, is a sign of the decline of the power of the old religions. The student of Christian history will see that in India, as in Europe, no revival of the ancient cult can be permanent because there are in it inherent weaknesses which can be cured only by the acknowledgment of Jesus as Lord and Master.

We have heard many stirring sermons on the "man from Macedonia" and his cry, "Come over and help us," but have we realized that the great apostle's decision to pass from Asia meant also a change of method? When Paul and Barnabas preached in Lycaonia they were preaching to idolaters, who "brought oxen and garlands to do sacrifice," but when Paul passed over to Greece, while he still met idolaters, he also met "philosophers" and learned that the message must now be given in a different way.

The early missionaries went forth to preach to idolaters, to the "heathen in their blindness, bowing down to wood and stone." But there has come a great change in the heathen world as the result of the contact between East and West. There are thousands of educated men, and some women, in India, China, and Japan, who have been influenced by the lives of Christian missionaries, who have been educated in the universities of Europe and America, who cannot be called idolaters, but theists, and yet do not know what the worship of God as spirit really means. The message of the church must now be carried to them. The old complaint, that converts were made only among the "coolies," has no longer force.

How is that message to be given? Many of the men, destined to be the leaders of the people, are filled with the

scientific spirit of the West. They will not accept a part of the gospel, the tradition with which we are familiar, and which we are able to use as the temporary husk of the kernel of truth. They must be approached in a new way —though, indeed, it is the old way in which Jesus trained the first disciples. "Tell us plainly," said some of the men to whom he preached, "if thou be the Christ." But he did not tell them "plainly"; he pointed to certain facts, "the works that he did in his father's name," and left them to draw their own conclusions. In other words, he followed what we now call the scientific method, from the known to the unknown. This is what the church must now do. "The mist of centuries has cleared away, and once more we behold the Man, the Teacher, the Friend, the Hero, the Revealer of the more Excellent Way, and we feel that in Jesus we have the pledge and proof that humanity is capable of realizing its ideal. Orthodox religious teachers have been so anxiously occupied in safeguarding the Divinity of Christ that they have almost forgotten the Humanity. I would urge them to make sure of the Humanity and the Divinity will make sure of itself." * The East for centuries has meditated on the mystery of the Godhead, but now, by its contact with the West, it has awakened to a new sense of the power of man. If the modern missionary can show what we mean when we speak of man, he will also show what we mean by God. For all that we know about God has come through the man Christ Jesus. But in our efforts to deliver that message, we must approach the heathen from their point of view, not from ours.

When Paul preached on Mars Hill he did not quote the Hebrew prophets but the Greek poets. He tried to show that in Jesus the ideal of Greece was fulfilled. The church to-day need not make the mistake of Marcion and repudi-

* "Jesus, Human and Divine," J. F. Bethune-Baker in *The Modern Churchman*, Sept., 1921.

ate the Old Testament as if it had no value, but it cannot be expected that it can have the same preparatory value in India, China, and Japan that it had for the Jews or even for Christians brought up to reverence it as the inerrant word of God. There are treasures of spiritual literature in the heathen world which bear witness to the kinship between God and man which is the foundation of the revelation of Jesus. It is to those the missionary must turn to show that the discipleship of Jesus does not mean that they are to deny that God has spoken to their fathers. The church must learn from the Theosophist. "The Theosophical Society," says one who speaks with authority on the religious condition of India, "is first of all sympathetic to all religions. It has assumed a generous attitude, the attitude of appreciation and friendship. Nor is that all. The society . . . invites men and women to come and enjoy the rich feast which Oriental religions offer to the student. . . . They have usually filled men's heads with froth instead of knowledge. Yet the fact remains that they have attempted to do in a wrong way what the Church of Christ ought to have done in the right way. This is unquestionably the first attraction which Theosophy presents to the outsider; and it is the attraction which has drawn to it the great majority of the more intellectual men who at one time or another have belonged to it." *

No obscurantist theology will appeal to educated men in heathendom any more than it appeals to educated men in Christendom. But a gospel which is not confused by myths, but is the declaration of the man in whom we see God, is the need and the hope of the world to-day as it has ever been. When the church recognizes that this is the work it is called upon to do, there will be a revival of the spirit of missions and a revival of the hope and power of the church.

* "Modern Religious Movements in India," J. N. Farquhar, pp. 286–287.

From the third to the fifth century the church was engaged in interpreting the gospel in terms of Greek philosophy. Ecclesiastical historians would lead us to suppose that this was the only work that the church was doing, just as secular historians have led to the belief that the history of the world is the history of courts and armies. We are coming to learn that the history of the people has still to be written. Multitudes of men and women of whom the world was not worthy were being converted while the great councils were formulating the creeds. This philosophic work of the church was interrupted by the barbarian incursion, and, as a result, we have concluded that the work was completed. As a matter of fact, it was interrupted, and now, after the darkness of the Dark Ages, and the confusion of mediævalism, when the great teachers of the church did no more than attempt to adjust the "deposit of faith" to the teachings of Aristotle, and later the reformers were trying to put the old wine into the new bottles of the sixteenth century, a new conception of the universe and of man had taken possession of men's thoughts. That new conception has penetrated the heathen world, and, as a consequence, there has arisen a problem with which the early missionaries were not called upon to deal.

The position of the churches to-day differs from that of the church of the second century in one important particular which must affect its work. The Roman Empire at first protected the church—partly, no doubt, because of indifference. Then it persecuted, and at last succumbed. But the relation of the churches to the state to-day is not that of a foreign body to an external government; it is the relation of a part of the community to its own servant, yet the need of the influence of the churches upon the government is as great to-day as ever, though it must be exercised in a different way.

This brings us face to face with a question which we do

not like to consider: Is modern civilization worth saving, and, if so, is it any part of the church's work to save it? Tolstoy firmly believed that it was necessary to destroy modern civilization because it was anti-Christ. He ignored the whole history of the church and insisted that the Sermon on the Mount was the revelation of the new law of human society. That the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount cannot be the law of society is evident. Shall, then, society be destroyed, or shall we abandon the Christian law? That seems to be the dilemma from which there is no escape. One horn of the dilemma is taken by those whom it is the fashion to speak of as "parlor anarchists." The other has been seized by the Soviet government in Russia. The escape is to be found not by ignoring either horn of the dilemma, but by a synthesis which will enable us to rise above the controversy by a better understanding of the problem. This, I believe, is being done by those who have studied the words of our Saviour more carefully than had been done in the past. They have come to the conclusion that the Sermon on the Mount is not to be taken as a new law which should be enforced in all circumstances and applied to groups of men. They believe it is the setting forth of an ideal which the individual must endeavor to reach in his own life and gradually impart to all men, who then will endeavor to realize the ideal in every relation of life. The exhortation to turn the other cheek when smitten on the first is probably an example of that same ironic humor which expressed itself in the figure of the camel and the eye of the needle.*

Suppose, then, with this thought of our Saviour's teaching we approach our problem, not desiring to lower the ideal, but in the hope of finding a way in which the ideal might be made more effective than it is at present, and ask: What do we mean by civilization? If we mean the

* See "Jesus in the Experience of Men," T. R. Glover.

statecraft which the war has discredited, the materialistic conception of life which has vulgarized society, the ugly industrialism which has covered the fields with smoking factories and the cities of festering slums, the fierce struggle between capital and labor, a godless education, the commercialized wars for the exploitation of the backward peoples, then, indeed, Christian men may say that they have no desire to save it, that it can be no work of the church to serve it. But if we look on these things which we condemn as blots and blemishes, indeed, but no essential element of civilized life, and define civilization as a system of life which should lead to reverence of law, which strives to organize government for the protection of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which would enrich life by beauty and make it sweeter and healthier and more prosperous; in other words, if the ideal be a commonwealth, which can be established and maintained only by the abolition of dynasties and special privileges, then we have in mind an ideal which prophets and kings have desired to see and have not seen, but which those who follow Jesus believe he would have rejoiced to see, which John the Divine saw in his vision of the City of God "coming down out of heaven like a bride adorned for her husband."

Such a hope is worthy of a Christian man; such a work it is the mission of the church to accomplish, and so conceived it becomes an inspiration. It does not lead us to think that the heathen are to be converted in order that they may be taken out of the world, but rather that they may play their part in the world as brethren and heirs of the promise. But when they ask for an example of what we mean by a nobler social life than they have enjoyed, can we say that it is to be found in Western civilization as it exists to-day? We know that we cannot. We know that the great obstacle to the conversion of the world to Christ is the example of the so-called Christian nations.

Therefore, the conversion of the world demands the spiritualization of civilization, and, we believe, there is no organization except the Christian church which lives for that purpose. If this be true, then it follows that the church has an intimate interest in and responsibility for the political, social, industrial, and educational life of the community, as well as for the individuals who have already entered into its communion.

To treat of these subjects in detail would require the writing of another book and a knowledge to which I lay no claim. But there are certain things which the churches and the churches alone can do, to which attention may properly be called.

## CHAPTER III

### THE TASK OF THE CHURCHES

To speak of the task of the churches as something different from the mission of the churches may seem to some a distinction without a difference. But I do not so understand it. The difference may be compared to that between "strategy" and "tactics." The former, which is allied to the root "scatter," deals with those problems which arise when the army has taken the field, while the latter is concerned with the preliminary training which fits the army for the campaign. In the same way, we speak of the mission of the church as its work in the scattered parts of the world, and of its task as the work which must be done at home.

The first question which the churches should ask themselves is one that the heathen insist upon our answering: Who are we to represent Jesus? Do not the words of the Psalmist apply to the Christian nations? "Unto the ungodly said God: Why dost thou preach my laws, and takest my covenant in thy mouth; whereas thou hatest to be reformed: and hast cast my words behind thee? When thou sawest a thief, thou consentedst unto him: and hast been partaker with the adulterers. . . . These things hast thou done, and I held my tongue, and thou thoughtest wickedly, that I am even such a one as thyself: but I will reprove thee, and set before thee the things that thou hast done. O consider this, ye that forget God: lest I pluck you away, and there be none to deliver you. . . . To him that ordereth his conversation right, will I show the salvation of God." *

* Psalm 50 : 16–23, Prayer-Book version.

Can it be claimed that this country has ordered its "conversation," that is, its life, right, so that it can claim to be an example to the world? We have only to consider what must be familiar to all to answer that question.

When we admit to ourselves that with all our boasting of "triumphant democracy," the great cities of the land, yes, and towns and villages as well, are not enjoying "government of the people, for the people, by the people," but of, and by, and for, the bosses, we may be led to ask ourselves whether the church is in any way responsible. When we boast of the security we enjoy under the Constitution of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, we might remember the desperate state of the negro in this land. Is the burning of widows on the pyre of their husbands, sometimes, we are assured, with their own consent, worse than the burning of negroes, not infrequently on the mere suspicion of crime—a proof of the brotherhood proclaimed by Jesus? Is polygamy a greater social evil than facile divorce? Are the feuds between the *tongs* in China worse than the ruthless war between capital and labor in all the great industrial centres of this land? Is the preaching of a debased form of patriotism, which expresses itself in the immoral dictum, "My country, right or wrong," never heard from Christian pulpits? Have the churches used their influence to lessen the excessive armaments which are crushing the world with the weight of taxation, or are they leaving it to the diplomats—the "professional politicians"—whose statecraft brought on the World War? Such questions as these are being asked by serious-minded men in India, China, and Japan, as well as in Europe and America. We may think that they are put in a way that implies that Western civilization is nothing less than organized hypocrisy, and so turn from them as not worthy of the consideration of respectable men. But we may not so easily escape. The same questions are being asked in all the colleges, and are disquieting to those

who believe that they are living in the best of all possible worlds. They are especially disquieting to those who believe that there can be a return to the economic and political conditions with which they were familiar before the Great War.

There is one question with which the Christian nations are called upon to deal before they can carry the gospel of human brotherhood to the nations, and that is the relation of so-called Christian nations to one another. An attempt was made soon after the armistice to deal with this question, and the result was the Treaty of Versailles and the Covenant of the League of Nations. We need not beat again the old straw of the controversy to which these led. The problem which Christian men must solve, and which the politicians can never solve, is how a Christian internationalism can grow out of our national patriotism without destroying the root of patriotism. In order to solve that problem it is not necessary to adopt the theories of the Third Internationale, but it is necessary to recognize the truth which lies in the protest of the Soviet government against "capitalism."

The churches and the churches alone can accomplish this work because, while the churches are composed of men and women who are also citizens, the churches can lead them on to higher ground than the politician can reach. The churches have it in their power to create a righteous public opinion which will profoundly affect the course of public events. (I say public *opinion*, not public emotion, though the two are often confused.) In order to do that, it is necessary to reconsider the meaning of patriotism. There was not a country of Europe which was not poisoned by the same virus which led to the downfall of Germany —nor has this country been altogether free from the same evil. The chauvinism which expressed its fierce emotion in the cry "Deutschland über alles," rather than Germany *for* all, if the people happened to speak German, has been

heard in every tongue and in every land. Is it not time to ask ourselves for what purpose this emotion of patriotism has been used? The Soviets declare that it is excited by the capitalists to further their own selfish purpose. Echoes of that were heard in this land when at last America decided to enter into the Great War. Not a few declared that this war, like all wars, was a capitalistic war. The men of property who knew what war would mean to the capitalists, by the destruction of property, the ruin of customers, the unsettling of credit, and the shaking of the delicate instrument of exchange, were not unnaturally indignant at such a charge. But now that the fighting has ceased, should we not seriously consider if there be not more truth in the charge than we were at that time ready to acknowledge? Voltaire said that as the wars of the Old World had been caused by religious hatred and dynastic ambitions, so the wars of the future would be economic. Is not that true? From the "Opium War" in China to the Great War of the world, has not the real cause been economic? The late war was not a capitalistic war in the sense that the capitalists expected personal gain from it, but was it not a capitalistic war in the sense that it was capital invested in the uttermost parts of the earth—Africa, for example—which the capitalist wished to protect, which utilized the pure sentiment of patriotism? The danger has not ceased. There is coal and iron in Siberia which all the great industrial nations need. Which shall have the monopoly of this rich and undeveloped country, and how can that be insured except by war? The "proletariat" of the world is declaring that it will no longer be used for exploitation. This conflict between "interests" may lead to revolution in Europe and America. What can the churches do? They can begin to reveal a nobler patriotism which conceives of national greatness in terms of world-wide service. They can preach with power the forgotten message of Jesus, that "A man's life consist-

eth not in the abundance of the things which he possesses"; they can dare to set themselves against the degradation of the pure emotion of patriotism and inspire it to be the means of a nobler international fellowship which will lead to the abolition of war.

This will be no easy task, and it cannot be accomplished in a day, nor in a generation. But if it be not begun without delay, the world as we know it will perish.

The churches will find themselves opposed by a pagan heresy which is having a profound influence. That heresy expresses itself in some such way as this: "All this talk about universal peace is futile because war is inevitable. You cannot abolish war, because you cannot change human nature." If this be true, and war is inevitable, then the destruction of Western civilization is inevitable. It is true that war cannot be abolished without a change in human nature. But that statement, so far from discouraging, should be a challenge to the churches, and remind them that a change in human nature was what Jesus came to accomplish. "Ye must be born again," was the solemn beginning of Jesus' preaching; "If any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creation," was the joyful cry of Paul when he had been baptized into the spirit of his Lord. Nothing less than to change human nature is the task of the church of the living God. Human nature does not mean that to the end of time humanity must be influenced by the same ideals and experiences with no increase of spiritual power. If that were true, there would have been no history. Man would never have descended from his arboreal habitations. But such has not been the fact. There are certain appetites and temptations which assail men and women to-day as they did of old. But let any man read the first chapter of Romans and ask himself if that is the picture of the world to-day where the gospel of Jesus has been preached. Has there been no change, not alone in the ideal but in the power to come nearer to the

ideal since Paul wrote the thirteenth chapter of Corinthians? "The greatest of all is love." How many believed that when Paul wrote? How few deny it to-day? Has that change of ideal had no influence in changing life? "Nature" means not what is but what is "becoming," what is about to be. So defined, it is true that it cannot be changed nor does any good man desire to change it. But to assert that the sins and weaknesses of this mortal nature cannot be purified is to deny the facts of life. At any rate, the issue is clearly joined. The task of the church is to "change human nature." If it cannot do that, it is of small consequence what else it does. The day was when it was "natural" to adore Tiberius Cæsar, to think of slavery as the foundation of society, to look on women as made for the lust or convenience of men, to think of children as an encumbrance rather than as the gift of God, to find joy in gladiatorial shows, to contemplate an endless hell of physical torture with equanimity, to vindicate honor by duelling, to—but why continue the catalogue?

We have heard men say that all these facts prove is, not that human nature can be changed, but simply that the fashion of wickedness changes; that the same passions which exhibited themselves in gross forms, which now disgust us, are to be seen in more refined form to-day; that there has been no essential change in the characteristics of humanity. Well, that, I suppose, is the truth which lies in the dogma of "original sin." The temptations of the flesh persist. But a habit of righteousness having been once established, those impulses to evil remain as do certain obsolete organs in the human body. Not a few of these no longer function and others are being eradicated by modern surgery. We are so exercised with the problem of intemperance that we find it difficult to believe that gluttony was one of the most debasing habits of the best society in ancient Rome. The healthy appetite for food

has not been extinguished, but gluttony is rare in civilized society. Now, has the inhibition of gluttony, which has produced a new social habit, had no effect upon the spiritual life of man? No student of psychology would assert such a thing. If the habit of war could be inhibited by the influence of a nobler conception than human nature has hitherto attained, the habit of peace would succeed and, as a result, human nature would be changed, first in its acts and then in its spirit.*

A practical way in which the churches might make their influence felt in an effort to establish peace would be in the matter of disarmament. There will be strong opposition and specious arguments to be met. Christian men in army and navy, as noble, sincere, and devout as the late Admiral Mahan, as well as greedy manufacturers of munitions, and ship-builders, employing thousands of workmen, will not be slack in advocating the continuance of what they will claim to be essential for national security. For the moment they may keep silent because they think the time unpropitious, but when the newspapers have taken up a new cause and public sentiment has begun to subside, they will again make themselves heard, in books and magazines, as well as in the lobby of Congress. Let us hope, however, that never again will they have the help of the churches. Of one thing I think we may be sure, and that is that we shall not soon again hear such sermons as we once heard from preachers on the "strong man armed." The irony of that parable is, I think, being at last appreciated. A reading of the context has shown that the "strong man," who we were assured by preachers, both clerical and lay, should be our example, is Beelzebub! "The strong man armed keepeth his palace and his goods are at peace." It did not need the Divine Teacher to convince us of that obvious fact. But

*If any one is inclined to think that this is the opinion of sentimentalists, let him read Huxley's "Romanes Lecture," 1893.

it did need One speaking with authority to tell us what it seems so difficult to learn, the inevitable fate of the strong man who trusts in his armor. "His goods are in peace, until a stronger than he shall come upon him and overcome him and *take from him all his armor* and divide his spoils." What a commentary on this is found in the fate of Germany and its Kaiser! What modern nation has so trusted in its armor, and what so grievously spoiled! That must always be the fate of such a strong man armed. His very armor in which he trusts is his undoing; it is an incentive to others to surpass him in armaments.

Is it not time for the church to "put to silence the ignorance of foolish men" who prate about the necessity for dreadnoughts and lethal gasses for national security? "Who will harm you if you do that which is right?" Perhaps some man may attempt to do so, and it may be the duty of the nation to defend itself from attack, but how much more likely is such an attack to come if it be seen that instead of doing right we are preparing to do wrong!

In these two ways, then, by the furtherance of a Christian internationalism and the disarmament of the world, can the church make its influence felt so as profoundly to affect its primary work of the evangelization of the world.

But there are questions at home which must receive the attention of the churches if the nation is to be an example to the world. To only two of these will I call attention.

Let us consider first the condition of the family in America to-day. I am aware that there are many wise men who will say that any consideration of the task of the churches should begin with the industrial problem. I am not ignorant of its importance, but I have thought it best not to deal with it here because, among other reasons, it is a political question, and would lead inevitably to a discussion of Socialism, which, being a theory of political economy, has no more place in this book than has the tariff, though the tariff, as well as the industrial struggle,

has its ethical side. Those who feel the importance of the humanizing of industry have, in my opinion, made a mistake in insisting that it can be done only by the acceptance of some particular method of government or industrial management. It can be done under any form of government and with any organization, if the truth of human brotherhood is borne in mind, and there is where the task of the churches, in this particular, should begin and end.

There are States in which, it is asserted, the number of divorces to marriages is as high as 48 per cent. This is no doubt exceptionally large; but who that knows the facts in our social life generally throughout the country can fail to see that there has come an entirely new thought of marriage? I do not deny that in some respects the new is better than the old, nor would I go to the extreme of those who would deny divorce in all circumstances. But can it be denied that many of the divorces are preventable, that in not a few of the cases brought before the courts there are fraud and collusion, perjured detectives, and many other disgusting evils which are spread broadcast by the press, and that, as a result, the ideal of the family is being destroyed?

There are many reasons which have led to this state of affairs, but the underlying one, I think, is that with the increase in the sense of individual value, there has been no corresponding sense of responsibility to the community. In the Marriage Service of the Episcopal Church there is a rubric to which attention is too seldom called: "Then . . . the Man shall give unto the Woman a Ring. And the Minister taking the Ring shall deliver it unto the Man, to put it upon the fourth finger of the Woman's left hand." That ancient rubric, which seems to have only an archaic interest, is, indeed, the witness to the difference between a civil and a religious marriage. In the eye of the law a marriage is a contract between two parties, but by the church it is conceived as a contract in which three parties

are concerned—the man and the woman and humanity. The ideal humanity is represented by the church, and the church is represented by the parson, or person of the church; the ring then must pass through his hands, and so emphasize the truth that there is a duty on the part of the married to humanity. When, then, one cries, "Have I not a right to develop my life in the way that seems to me best?" the answer should be that by marriage the liberty of the individual has been curtailed. But this is not peculiar to marriage. Every responsibility is a limitation of liberty. The man or the woman who has entered into the marriage state has thereby limited his or her liberty. This is one of the fundamental doctrines of "natural" religion. How much greater is the responsibility of the Christian! How is this to be brought home to the individual except by the united witness of the church? But at present the churches are impotent because, while each has a certain social value, they are unable to bring the united moral judgment of Christian people to bear on a particular case. The woman who declares that "a wonderful thing has come into her life," which wonderful thing is a lust for one who is not her husband, and who, in consequence, abandons husband and children, may be condemned in one church, but she soon finds a home in another and is received into "good society." The truth is, these women are many of them unconscious that there is anything improper in their conduct, because the pressure of public opinion has been relaxed. If the evil ended with the fate of the woman who has done wrong, the danger might be disregarded. But these women are carriers of disease. Young girls talk of the splendid courage of the woman who has wrecked her home as if she were a Joan of Arc, and think that she is an example to be followed.

Not a few earnest men believe that a federal law would check the evil. This might, or might not, be a help. But what a confession of impotence is it on the part of the

churches to admit that the one thing they claim they ought to be called upon to administer—marriage—they are unable to control! Let the ministers of all the churches begin to educate the young by showing the spiritual meaning of Christian marriage—that it is the sacrament of love, that is, of self-sacrifice—and marriage will be approached more in the spirit in which it should be approached—"not unadvisedly or lightly, but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God." It is too often thought of as a social exhibition. The clergy are not infrequently asked to be present at a "rehearsal." If it be thought desirable for the bridal party to go to the church and note where they are to stand in order that they may not be perplexed at the solemn moment of the service, there can be no objection, but what shall we say of a "rehearsal" at which the minister takes part, and, as I have heard, "tries his voice" and asks to be told if he can be distinctly heard when he uses this or that tone, as he thinks will be most impressive? The frivolity of ministers is not without influence in the popular opinion of marriage, which has made it more and more a social function, and less and less a solemn dedication of two lives to one another.

But more is needed than instruction before marriage and a reverent administration of the rite. The churches must exercise their commission to bind as well as to loose. Let all the churches unite in an effort to make effective the moral judgment of Christians, and treat the man or the woman—and too often it is the woman—who has broken up the family and abandoned children and entered into an adulterous connection as a "heathen and a publican," and it would not be long before there was a change in our social standards and a purer atmosphere for our children to breathe.

Turn now from the family to the schools. Our fathers established schools and colleges in this wilderness for the formation of Christian character. Can it be claimed that

this is the purpose which animates the school committees and the boards of education and trustees of colleges? It is instruction which is the aim of schools to-day. But instruction is a means to an end. If that end be not the formation of character, what is the end? Education was at one time in the hands of the church. It is not well that it should be left there to-day. But that does not mean that the church has no duty in the premises. The Roman Catholic Church feels that duty, and is establishing parochial schools at great expense, in order that the true end of education, as that church conceives it, should be attained. We do not believe that Christian character is to be identified with the ideal of any particular church, but if we do not believe that Christian character is the purpose of education, what do we believe?

This is not a Christian country, and it would not be right to use the money collected by taxation for the propagation of even the Christian faith in the public schools. But is it impossible to have some form of worship which would impress upon the thousands of children who assemble each day in our public schools that "in God they live and move and have their being"? Would any appreciable number of parents object to the reading of a passage from the Old Testament, one day in the King James version, another in the Douai, and another in the English translation of the Old Testament put forth by the Hebrews? Could we not all recite the Lord's Prayer? Are there not passages from the New Testament which all would gladly learn? This, perhaps, would be all that could be admitted to the public schools of the great cities, with their heterogeneous population; but surely there are numbers of Gentile communities in which the children who salute the flag might also salute the cross. The difficulty which confronts us in the public schools is not absent from the State colleges and universities. But many of the greatest universities in the land are built on private, Christian, Protes-

tant foundations, not a few of them primarily for the education of ministers of the gospel. Is it too much for the churches to ask that the trust funds should be administered with that in mind? In some of the universities that is explicitly acknowledged. In others it is no doubt implicit and subconscious. But, as a matter of fact, a boy may be matriculated and graduated from one of the universities endowed by Christian piety and never hear the name of Jesus nor the story of the church, unless he seeks to hear. We forget that there are thousands who are as ignorant of Jesus and his church as if they had gone to the University of Athens before Jesus was born. There are great numbers of Jewish youth in Christian colleges who know no more about Jesus than the average Protestant youth knows about Ignatius Loyola. What must be the impression made upon scholars from Japan and China and India who pass four years in one of the great universities of America and never hear a word from those in authority which would lead them to believe that they are Christian men? Have not the churches a right to ask that in the entrance examination there should be required some knowledge of the Bible—not as a literary work of art; that, perhaps, has been overdone—but as the most precious treasury of the spiritual experience of the world? Have they not a right to ask that there should be some knowledge of the life of Jesus, from those who are entering upon Christian education? Have they not a right—is it not their duty—to demand that in the allocation of trust funds for the various departments, the chapel shall be considered as important as the law school or the gymnasium? We cannot afford to let things drift. There are complaints that paganism is invading all the places of higher education, but we seem to have forgotten Paul's ironic remark: "How shall they believe if they have not *heard?*"

The whole problem of education is too large and too difficult to be solved in any offhand way. But it is a

problem which the churches should never forget nor cease to seek to solve. The fatal thing would be to accept present conditions as if they were final or inevitable.

The evangelization of the world, the Christianizing of international relations, the reign of peace, the purification of the family, and the upbuilding of Christian character by education are the first and most important tasks of the churches to-day. These are not all. There is our political life to be purified and our social life to be refined, and, above all, our industrial life to be humanized. With the exception of foreign missions and Christian education, most serious-minded men will agree that these are the things which must be done. All Christians will agree that all these things must be done, but some of them may be inclined to say that the outlook is not so threatening as it has been represented here to be, and others that even if it be, it is not the task of the churches but of humanity itself. Of the latter aspect of the subject, I shall have something to say later; for the moment let it be held in abeyance. But that the time is short in which the task must at least be begun, I firmly believe.

"Except that the Lord had shortened those days, no flesh should be saved: but for the elect's sake whom He hath chosen, he hath shortened the days." * How the solemn words, which perhaps meant little to us in the past, now flame out with dreadful significance, as did the handwriting on the wall, foretelling the fall of one of the great empires of the world! The prophet said: "Thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting." What is true of the nations is true of the churches. It is the vice of chauvinism in the churches—though we call it sectarianism —which is the cause for their weakness in this crisis of the world and of the churches. How, then, can they cure the evil from which they themselves suffer? "Physician, heal thyself," may well be said to each of them. Can any one

* Mark 13 : 20.

of the Protestant churches claim that it is equal to the stupendous task? Is any one of them alone able to change human nature? We have only to look at the conditions of the churches to-day to see how impossible it is for the miracle to be worked without repentance; that is, a change of mind on the part of Christian men in regard to the church, its mission and its task.

The time has been shortened for the elect's sake; not that the elect may continue to live as they have done in the past, "at ease in Sion," but that through the elect the way of God may be made known among men, not only spacially in the uttermost parts of the earth, but also spiritually in every relation of life. Has not the parable of Jonah a message to the modern church?

# CHAPTER IV

## SECTARIANISM

### *A.* Protestant

The word "churches" is used here as it is used in the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, to designate "the different religious denominations in these States." It does not include the Eastern nor the Roman Catholic churches. Therefore, when "sectarianism" is spoken of it is the sectarianism of the various religious denominations in this land that we are to have in mind. Whether sectarianism is confined to the Protestant churches is a question to be touched on later. At present I would call attention to the ecclesiastical condition in the towns and cities of the land, for in that way, I think, we can best discover the nature of sectarianism and its effects. I say "ecclesiastical" rather than "religious," because the two are not conterminous.

Even those of us whose homes are in one of the great cities have some acquaintance with country life. What, then, let us ask, is the condition of the churches in the average village in this country? I have one in mind which I have been led to believe from the testimony of many men is typical of most of the small towns. I do not know the exact population of the village of which I am now speaking, but I doubt if it has more than a thousand inhabitants. The old white meeting-house, "set upon a hill," was once the religious home of the entire community. But the youth has drifted to the cities or trekked to the West, and those who are left have lost the early vigor which once made the village an important factor in the life of the State. The newcomers have never felt the tradition of the

past, and the tone of the community is no longer what it once was. There is more comfort in the houses and more wealth in the community, but the ideals have changed, or, rather, the old ideals have passed away, and there have been none that can be called "ideals" to take their place.

There are now one Roman Catholic and four Protestant churches in that town. No one of them, except the Roman Catholic, had more than fifty worshippers on any Sunday morning when I was present—though two of the Protestant churches, at least, could have seated the whole church-going population. But it was not the smallness but the character of the congregation which made a distressing impression. Most of them were old people, there were a few children—and I pitied them! The young, vigorous life of the community was absent. Some had gone fishing, some were sailing, some were playing golf, and not a few simply loafed. I do not express any opinion on the religious life of the absentees; I am only calling attention to the condition of the churches.

Each minister, I soon learned, was living on a pittance a choreman would have scorned, and could with difficulty pay his weekly bills. One was not a "settled" minister, but was "hired"; coming from a near-by town on Saturday evening and returning Monday morning. One of the deacons called my attention to the economic advantage of this arrangement. I asked one of my acquaintances, a substantial man in the community, to which of the churches he went? He replied: "To none of them. I subscribe to each of them, for the only way they can live is by having oyster-suppers in the winter and a strawberry festival in summer, to which every one is expected to go, no matter to which church he belongs. The only one that amounts to a row of pins is the Catholic church."

Yet this is in the heart of New England! We need not accept my friend's judgment as final. No doubt every one of those churches is doing some good. There are old peo-

ple who have the remembrance of early teaching kept alive in their hearts; there are those in sorrow who are being comforted, and, let us hope, some who are receiving inspiration to lead a godly life. But when all has been said that can be said in favor of these churches, is it not true that they are rather of the nature of convalescent homes than vigorous agencies for the evangelization of the world and upbuilding of strong Christian character?

In the larger towns things are apparently somewhat better. But the "movies" and now Sunday baseball are making the problem of church attendance more and more difficult. Those who consider the effect of habitual "assembling of ourselves together" cannot but feel apprehensive of the future in which the young will have grown up without the influence which they feel has been most potent in their own lives.

Not a few of the younger generation who still attend church, because their parents wish them to do so, are asking for a reason for the continuance of a custom which seems to have no meaning to them. They are willing to admit that in the past the church has been a vital factor in life, but they question if there is the same need for it to-day as there was in the days when books were few and there was no other means of enlightenment. But when they are asked to suggest some other means of instructing and inspiring people, they have to admit that they do not know of any. They would retain the ethics and the ideals of Jesus, but they are sceptical of the institution which claims to be the exclusive means of keeping these alive. And yet, who does not know that the pressure of life is so strong that if there be not some day set apart for the remembrance of those truths and ideals, they are in danger of evaporating? The church is needed, but not necessarily the kind of church which sufficed in the days of old. Such churches as are found in many of the villages and towns have not the respect of the community, and cannot

speak with authority on the vital questions that men are asking to-day. They therefore cannot be called the moral guides of the people. Yet, that guidance is needed, who can doubt? "The Great White Way" of the large cities may be more dramatic in its wickedness than the sin of the small town, but the small towns are sometimes morally corrupt. Many of the degenerates found in the streets of the cities fell from grace in the small country town. Often the social life is drab and dispiriting. I am told that the vices of the rich fools who come into the country during the summer months are imitated by the youth when the visitors have gone. The day was when the cities were fed by the youth from the country, but now the country is becoming more and more dependent upon the city. The country town has lost its initiative. It was the country church which gave vitality to the village, and nothing but the church will restore it. But the power to effect such a reformation does not seem to lie in the churches as they are to-day.

When we turn to the great cities, the churches seem to be more alive. There is better music; the congregations are larger, and there is apparently more life. But there are few churches in the cities which are not larger than they need be for the congregations which worship in them —and there is another church, a block away, in the same condition. Each of these churches is a costly affair, and as a result of competition there is arising a problem which cannot fail to affect the life of the church at large, and that is the ever-increasing cost of church attendance. It is true that there are more so-called "free" churches than there were formerly, but many agree that they are not so well adapted to "family" worship as were the old "pew" churches. Not a few young married people who would be glad to attend church in the cities find themselves embarrassed to meet the constant demands which the minister must make in order to keep in good standing in his denomi-

nation. Many young married people send their children to Sunday-school, but they themselves have no regular place of worship, and say frankly that they cannot afford to have one. Possibly some serious students of the Reformation have been amused by Mr. Brooks Adams's dogmatic dictum that the early success of Protestantism was due to economic causes—it was found to be a cheaper form of religion! But there may be more in the suggestion than we care to admit; and it may come to pass, in our day, that the Roman Catholic Church will underwrite eternal life-insurance policies at a rate which will put Protestant companies out of business, unless we reduce our excessive assessments.

At any rate, it is the economic waste in the churches which has attracted the attention of some of those good men who, knowing that the elimination of waste has been the source of wealth in business, are shocked by the extravagance which is so characteristic of the churches. "Why," say these men, "cannot the churches 'get together' and pool their assets and liabilities?" This is a natural question from men who have seen the great advantage which, in spite of evident lawlessness in the past on the part of some organizations, has revolutionized our industrial life. But great as would be the advantage of some readjustment of our ecclesiastical affairs, the American people are not going to enter any religious "trust." They have lost too much individual initiative in the economic and political life to abandon what is left in the ecclesiastical. No doubt economy is a desirable thing and preventable waste should, if possible, be checked; but those who think that economy alone will be the deciding factor in the life of the churches have forgotten how idealistic Americans are, and that no matter what the price, they will have what they want. Many are convinced that their church stands for some principle which is essential to the well-being of the body of Christ. Each believes this of the

church to which he belongs, but finds it hard to believe the same of any other. There is where sectarianism lurks. Sectarianism is not separation into different groups to keep alive a vital truth which seems to have been forgotten by others, or to worship God in a way which is congenial to those who gather together; it is the spirit which denies that each of these groups is bearing witness to a forgotten or unacknowledged truth which the whole body must receive before the work of the particular group will have been finished. The Puritan spirit which has permeated all the churches finds its charter in the inspired hymn of Simeon: "We being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, may serve Him without fear."

It is the recognition of this truth which must be the first step taken by Christian people before there can be any effective unity. When that step has been taken, I believe that it will be found that some of the churches have finished their work and might well be consolidated with some one of the others. How it is to be decided which of these churches shall give up its separate existence is a question to be dealt with later. For the present it is only necessary to say that it will be that church whose truth has been received by the other churches. What should be insisted upon at the moment is only that the churches are called upon to face the facts of life, and that one of these facts is that the Protestant churches are losing influence.

I have talked on this subject with serious-minded people who, though they lament it, are convinced that the future religious life of this country will be found in the Roman Catholic Church, because they think that it is the only church which is not a sect. I do not believe they are right, but I do think that we are not justified in dismissing the suggestion as if there were no danger to Protestantism, or as if it were not true that the source of that danger is the deadly sin of schism.

If we look to the country districts, which were once the strongholds of Protestantism, we may be surprised to find the gains which the Roman Catholic Church has made in recent years. It is commonly supposed that this is due entirely to immigration. But that is a mistake. I have in mind one New England township, where twenty years ago there were seven Baptist churches. It is a scattered community, and as there are but two "settlements," probably two churches were needed. But seven! And those varieties of one particular church! With the arrival of the summer visitors in that community, there arose a demand, first for an Episcopal church, to enable the people in the "cottages" to have the service with which they were familiar, and which their children could follow; then came a demand for a Roman Catholic church, to minister to the Irish and French servants and the "help" at the hotel, and possibly to one or two Catholic families among the "cottage" folk. The money needed was soon subscribed —almost entirely by Protestants. A cynic may suggest that this was due less to care for the religious welfare of the servants than to the knowledge that if there were no Catholic church there would soon be no servants; but I believe that a more generous and truer statement would be that this money was largely given by those who felt that members of the Roman Catholic faith had a right to the ministration of the rites and sacraments of their church even though they were too poor to pay for them—and that, therefore, the money of Protestants was given. It was supposed that the Catholic church would be closed during the winter months, as are the Episcopal church and the hotel. But so far from that, four of the Baptist churches have been closed, and the Catholic church is ministering to a congregation smaller, it is true, in the winter than in the summer, but still larger than can be found in any of the Protestant churches in that community. How has that come about? By the conversion of

the "natives"? Not of one, so far as I know. But not a few nice Irish and French girls, who came as waitresses and maids, married the young men of the village, and, of course, their children—of those there are not a few—are being brought up in the faith of the mother, partly because the father had no faith of any sort. I do not think we ought to begrudge the smile with which I suspect the good priest who built that church with Protestant money made his report to his bishop. Now the same thing is going on in every part of the country.

When we turn to the large cities we find that hundreds of children of Protestant parents are taken charge of by Roman Catholic orphan asylums and foundling hospitals; some are receiving them from the courts because the children are left without a natural protector. These are but rivulets, it is true, but when we add to those the large influx of immigrants, we cannot fail to be impressed by the rapid growth of the Catholic Church. Well, he whom Gibbon liked to refer to as the "philosopher" may ask: "Is this a thing to regret? If Protestantism has failed to appeal to the people and hold them in allegiance, why should it be thought a misfortune that the Roman Catholic Church, which started the race in this country so heavily handicapped, should now win the prize? Is it not due to the self-denying activity of priests and people? Is it not due to the fact that she has spoken with no uncertain sound? If Protestantism has failed, would you rather have this country become Catholic or pagan?" Of course there can be but one answer to that question which a religious man could give. The celebrated and eloquent Father Vaughan is reported to have said in Montreal in 1910 that Catholics will control the United States. "From what I hear of conditions in the United States, the Catholics will soon control that country through force of numbers. Christian fecundity is fighting sterile paganism, and the battle for the possession of the world will soon be nar-

rowed to the Catholic Church and the destructive forces of agnosticism. Protestantism is disappearing."

We do not believe that Protestantism is disappearing. But it is certainly true that if it should disappear or lose its power, the Roman Catholic Church would triumph over paganism. If indeed that is the alternative, I do not think we should delay to return to the bosom of the mother church from which we have wandered. But before taking that desperate step—which a few take every year, but which the American people in general have as yet shown no intention of taking—it might be well for us seriously to consider just what this would mean. And in so doing, I hope it will be believed that I am far from wishing to stir up religious hatred or to belittle the many services to the cause of true religion which the Roman Catholic Church has rendered in this land. We owe a great debt to the Roman Catholic Church. Were it to withdraw from the great cities, crime would increase by geometrical progression. It is the religious arm of the police. It stands for law and order in the community. There are self-denying priests in that communion who put to shame the self-indulgence of some of our Protestant ministers; there are saintly nuns and Sisters of Charity who are following in the footsteps of our Saviour; there are multitudes of earnest and devout communicants who are living beautiful lives, understanding little, it may be, of the dogmas of the church, but content to leave them to those who, they have been taught to believe, do know. It seems to them no more necessary for the laity to know what the priest is administering than it is for the patient in the hospital to know what the Latin prescription of the doctor means. Both are doing good and they trust them. All this we should rejoice in, but it does not follow that we should imitate their example and place our souls in the keeping of the priest.

But we cannot afford to drift. We must look facts in

the face and act. What would happen if the Protestant conception of religion were to perish from the earth? Suppose the whole nation were given over to secularism, there can be no doubt that the disintegration of manners, which all refined people regret, would be followed by a disintegration of morals. But if that were to follow, then would come the dreadful famine foretold by the prophet: "Not a famine for bread nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord." * What would be the next step? Man is "incurably religious," and if our children lose the religion which they have inherited they will have to have some religion. What will that be? There can be no such thing as a "new" religion. Whatever it may be called, it will have its roots in some religion which has been found helpful in the past. But our whole Western civilization is built upon the religion of Jesus. Some form of that will be the only possible one. But if Protestantism be discarded, the only form left will be the Roman Catholic. If we take history as our guide, we may forecast the future with a certain confidence. We know what happened after the Reformation. At first it looked as if all Europe would adopt the Reformed religion, but in less than a hundred years that made no further conquests and lost much that it had gained. We know how the "Counter-Reformation" came about—first, by a reformation in the morals of the Catholic clergy, which was largely due to the influence of Protestantism, and, secondly, through the organization of the company of Jesuits, who through the education of children and the secret power of the confessional insinuated themselves into the secret life of the community. It may be said: "This is ancient history." Well, there is a modern instance which is even more instructive. In the last twenty years the increase in the membership in the Roman Catholic Church in Germany has been great. In the very lands where Luther preached,

* Amos 8 : 2.

thousands of Protestants, in the last twenty years, have returned to the Roman Catholic fold. Why? Because, though they clung to the Protestant doctrine of individual freedom, they had lost the corresponding sense of personal responsibility, and when they lost that sense of personal responsibility and turned the church over to the state, the state gave them in return just what it thought was beneficial to them as members of the state. But the soul of man cried out for the living God; Protestantism was unable to supply the religious need of the people, and the Roman Catholic Church came in and supplied it.

Is that to be the history of this country in the next century? It is quite within the bounds of possibility.

# CHAPTER V

## SECTARIANISM

### *B.* Catholic

In the preceding chapter an attempt was made to analyze the meaning of sectarianism as it appears in the Protestant churches. We believe that the increase in the power of the Roman Catholic Church in American life is largely due to the weakness of the Protestant churches, and that unless that weakness can be overcome by some genuine religious co-operation among the Protestant churches—the result of true spiritual unity—the Roman Catholic Church may dominate the religious life of this country. This danger not a few men foresee. Some believe that it can be prevented by the denunciation of the Roman Catholic Church on the part of Protestant bigots; others, that what is needed is a political party bound together by a secret understanding that no Catholic shall be elected to public office. Indeed, it is an open secret that in certain of the States where the Protestant feeling is strong, no man can be elected to public office who is not approved by one of the strong Protestant churches, just as in other States it is almost impossible for a man to attain certain offices without the approval of the Roman Catholic Church.

The spirit of Christ should prevent this; no denunciation of a church which, when its shortcomings and faults have been admitted, is trying to bring people to the discipleship of Christ can be justified. It will only serve to consolidate the Roman Catholic Church and prevent the many people in it who are dissatisfied with the autocracy of the priests from asserting their innate American

independence. While it is true that the Roman Catholic Church claims something like 16,000,000 members, what would not its membership be had it been able to retain the children to the third and fourth generations? The disintegration in the Roman Catholic Church as a result of breathing the American atmosphere of independence is as notable a sign of the times as is the increase in its membership by immigration and what Father Vaughan calls "Christian fecundity." But alas, these Catholics who have lapsed are of small value to the community. A few (perhaps more than is generally known) enter each year into the communion of one of the Protestant churches, but most of them revert to paganism and not a few of them take to crime. A more conciliatory spirit and a juster appreciation of the merits and value of the Catholic Church might be the means of saving many of them from such a fate.

The history of this country ought to show us the futility of political organizations on a racial or sectarian basis. If the Roman Catholic Church is not to become the dominant religious influence in this country, it can only be by the manifestation of such inspiring religious life in the Protestant brotherhood as will appeal to the imagination and win the allegiance of earnest religious men.

With these thoughts in mind, let us turn now to a consideration of the sectarian spirit as it appears in the Roman Catholic Church.

The Roman Catholic Church as it is known to most of us, and justly honored for its devout spirit, is the church as revealed in the lives of those who have been trained by it in England and Ireland and in the United States—that is, in countries where the influence of Protestantism is strong. What it is outside that influence we may see in Central and South America, in Spain and in Italy before the overthrow of the temporal power of the pope. If the knowledge of God and of Jesus which has come to us

through the preaching of the word of God in the Protestant churches were to be lost, then the Roman Catholic Church would revert to its mediæval form, and the hands of the clock of time would be turned back and the work of the Reformation would have to be done anew. Let any man whose imagination is equal to the task picture to himself what the religious life of this nation would be dominated by the mediæval church. The secrets of the family would be poured into the ears of the priest; the minds of the young poisoned by the suggestion of evil through the confessional; every department of life under the direction of the priest; and the "mind," of which we are so proud, told that it has nothing to do but to obey. The people would be kept in a state of perpetual pupilage, and when that had been attained there would follow the political supervision of the life of the nation, as is the case in Quebec to-day. Again I say that this may seem fantastic, but consider what the state of the case is to-day wherever Protestantism has not to be reckoned with.

This republic was founded by religious people and on a religious basis. The very spirit of that religion was the freedom of the individual and a deep and awful sense of personal responsibility. Now the Roman Catholic Church has an entirely different theory of the religious life. There are three ways in which, as a political organization, it is showing its influence in the life of the country. In the first place, the education of the youth of the land was the first care of the fathers of this country, and the establishment of the public schools has been the one means that we have had for preventing the severing of the people into classes and for making a true democracy. That those schools are open to criticism no serious-minded person can doubt, but with all their faults they are the one great democratic influence in this land, and would by the priests of the Roman Catholic Church be put out of existence in favor of the parochial schools. Efforts have been made in

some of the States to divide the taxes for education *pro rata* among the different churches. The public schools are spoken of as "godless." Who does not know that it is the Roman Catholic Church which prevents any religious teaching not supervised by its priests in the schools?

In the second place, the great problem of this country for many years—and it is going to be greater in the years to come—has been immigration. In the beginning it was so necessary to have large immigration for the economic needs of the country that we paid little attention to either the intellectual or moral condition of those who came in. Now in order that those people may be assimilated and made a part of the country, the English language, spoken and written, is of chief importance. But the archbishop of St. Louis,* calling attention to this vast immigration, which, as he says, is largely Roman Catholic and is destined to be still more so in days to come, insists that these people should be kept in the racial atmosphere in which they have heretofore lived and encouraged to speak their own language; in other words, he would perpetuate in this country all those racial differences which have made Europe what it is to-day. The result—it is not asserted that this is the purpose—but the result would be that all over this country there would be communities of people absolutely under the direction of the priests, as are the people of the province of Quebec. But that would have a repercussion in Europe. We have seen in the last few years an attempt made to stir up ill will between this country and England over the Irish question. That Ireland has not in the past had a "fair deal" from England a large number of Americans are convinced. But when it was seen that this was to be made a *casus belli*, the sympathies of America were chilled. It was seen that the priests of the Roman Catholic Church, most of whom are of Irish blood, were using their influence to prevent the co-operation of England and

* "Rome's Idea of Americanization," *The Torch*, Feb. 15, 1921.

the United States; when we were told that it had been England's purpose for centuries to substitute Protestantism for Catholicism in Ireland, men began to ask themselves if there were not more than a desire to revenge an ancient wrong in this agitation. It is a significant fact that England is the only important country in Europe in which an established church is still tolerated. In every other country of importance the Roman Catholic Church has been disestablished because it was found to be the enemy of democracy, while in Protestant England the church is still a power in the life of the nation. If, then, these two great Protestant countries—England and America—could be divided, the political ideals which they hold in common might be made ineffective and in that way the triumph of a discredited political theory of the domination of the state by the Vatican might be enabled to gain some of the ground which it had lost. But as long as the English-speaking peoples can act together, there will be a continuous progress in those ideals which are the essence of Protestantism, viz., spiritual freedom accompanied by a deep sense of personal responsibility. If then the Roman Catholic Church, which has made the wrongs of Ireland a cause for stirring up bad blood between England and the United States, were able to capitalize all the causes of discontent among the peoples who have come to this country from Europe, the problem of Americanization would be greatly confused. It is not too much to say that if the Roman Catholic had dominion in this country, the republic of Adams, Hamilton, and Jefferson would fail.

We have no right to find fault with the Roman Catholic Church for its theory of political life; it is to be assumed that the priests are convinced that unless the country is dominated by the church, the morality of the people is endangered; but we are justified in saying that it is un-American. Its success depends upon keeping the people in a state of perpetual pupilage. It is a policy which arises

not out of the needs of the community but is dictated by an Italian pope. Should it succeed—and with immigration and (if I were not misunderstood, I would add) with women's suffrage it may succeed—then the republic is doomed.

But if there could be co-operation among Protestants to secure that which our fathers bequeathed to us, it would be found that many devout Roman Catholics would unite with us in the endeavor to perpetuate the liberty which is as dear to some of them as it is to us. That this is not idle speculation is shown by the fact that when an attempt was made a few years ago, in the city of Boston, to distribute the school fund on a sectarian basis, it was defeated by a decisive majority, notwithstanding that Boston is now a Roman Catholic city. A Protestant fellowship which would create an atmosphere of true democracy would be welcome to not a few of our Roman Catholic fellow citizens.

Such considerations will have but little effect upon those who feel that the glory of the "ages of faith" as shown in the splendor of Gothic architecture and the "visible unity" of the church would be the cure for the "philistine" Protestant attitude to art and the sectarianism which has torn the body of Christ. But they are mistaken in two respects: first, they are identifying mediævalism with the beautiful, and, secondly, are assuming that outward conformity is to be identified with spiritual unity.

The mediæval mind revealed a form of extravagant intellectualism which is akin to insanity. It was essentially monastic, and had the church been able permanently to dominate the world, the result would have been neither beautiful nor wise. But

> "Stone walls do not a prison make,
> Nor iron bars a cage."

Neither the mind nor the body of men and women could be permanently immured in a cloister. There swept over

the arid religious life of Europe in the Middle Ages a great wave of emotionalism.* It took many forms, the best known being the mission of St. Francis. To him came the "still small voice" of nature, a veritable benediction to men who had been driven well-nigh frantic by the fear of hell. The troubadours began to sing the joys of human love; the Crusaders brought from the East both science and art; modern literature began to speak in a language "understanded" by the people. To the church this seemed a second barbaric invasion. It could not convert it, as it had the former, so it compromised. The terror of God and of the avenging Christ was tempered by the presentation for devotion of the ever-pitiful Mother of God. Human love was turned to the love of the ideal woman, and science and art were employed to build and enrich shrines of beauty, not for the worship of the "one true God and Jesus Christ whom he had sent," but for the adoration of Mary, "ever Virgin, the Eternal Woman." † This was the inevitable reaction from monasticism. The towers and *flèches* of these wonders of art are what we see, but the spiritual foundations on which they were built we do not see. We forget that the vast sums given for these glorious buildings were given by those who hoped in this way to placate the God whom they feared, not to adore the Father whom they loved.

The cathedrals are the last monuments of the ages of faith. Art and science soon emancipated themselves from the domination of the church, and then châteaux for the life of the family—alas, too often for the enjoyment of lust—and splendid municipal buildings, fit symbols of the new feeling of the glory of the civil life, engaged the energy of architect and builder. These were some of the causes which later produced what we call the Renaissance. To this the Catholic Church succumbed. Nothing but a sec-

* See "The Mediæval Mind," H. O. Taylor, vol. I, pp. 349–350.
† See "Mont St. Michel and Chartres," Henry Adams.

ond revolution, which we call the Reformation, saved the world from the debauchery of sensuality to which the Renaissance, uninspired by the religion of Jesus, to which the church had succumbed, was tending. Leo X, one of the most cultivated gentlemen of Europe, was as truly a pagan as Alcibiades, yet he was the vicar of Christ; Benvenuto Cellini was a "communicant in good standing"!*

This second revolution the church lacked the spiritual power to convert. Consequently it fell back upon the only weapon left, which was persecution, a spirit which reached its culmination in the Inquisition. But persecution is the distinctive mark of sectarianism. Any company of men who believe that they have an exclusive monopoly of the truth of God will be driven by an inexorable logic to persecute those who oppose themselves to that truth. That does not mean that they are necessarily devoid of the spirit of kindliness—Torquemada may have been as gentle in his personal feelings as any modern humanitarian; just as doubtless many of the German soldiers whose ruthlessness shocked the world, were gentle and considerate in their family lives. But when any man believes that he is the official of an institution to which God has committed the guidance of the world, and that without that guidance the world must perish, he will feel justified in the employ-

*The Anglican was the only church in the sixteenth century which seemed to understand the spiritual significance of the Renaissance. The Roman Church was impotent to deal with it, because its highest ideal of religion was expressed in the asceticism of the monastic life; but the Elizabethan era showed that England had received the message of the Renaissance. The joy of living inspired the Sea Rovers with the spirit of adventure. The beauty of life shines through all the poetry of that day, especially in that of Spenser and Shakespeare. But the King James translation of the Bible shows the literary influence of the Renaissance, and the compilation of the Book of Common Prayer is the embodiment of the new thought of religion expressed not in asceticism but in the fulness of life. Here is where the Renaissance, that in many respects was a pagan revival, was also a recognition of the truth that Christ had come to give life abundantly.

ment of any means which will save the world. The German would have saved it from lawlessness to Kultur; the mediævalist would have saved it from an endless hell of torture. The greater the salvation promised, the less will be the horror of the means used to insure salvation; the greater will seem the justification in their employment. Even such a saint as Xavier believed that the Inquisition was the only means of saving a world for which he was willing to die.

It may be asked: "Does any sane man believe that the American Catholic Church in this twentieth century would re-establish the Inquisition?" The answer is that there is no such thing as an "American" Catholic Church. The dominating power is a foreign pope, himself dominated by the Jesuits, who are the embodiment of the mediæval spirit and are contemptuous of the spirit of the twentieth century. At present the spirit of persecution is impotent because the spirit of toleration animates the governments of the world, and they control the church. Therefore, there is no danger of such persecutions as have stained the garments of the church in the past. But it does not follow that this would continue were the modern spirit to become impotent. We have only to look at the Balkans and at Ireland to see what we owe to the spirit of toleration, which John Hay called a "principle of international law and eternal justice."

But there is no need to dwell upon this, for no doubt it will be said that it is the expression of prejudice.

Let us turn then to two statements—one from a distinguished historian of the Roman Catholic communion and the other from a prelate of the papal household.

"The Inquisition is peculiarly the weapon and peculiarly the work of the popes. It stands out from all those things in which they co-operated, followed, or assented, as the distinctive feature of papal Rome. . . . It is the principal thing with which the papacy is identified and by which it

must be judged. The principle of the Inquisition is murderous, and a man's opinion of the papacy is regulated and determined by his opinion about religious assassination."*

"Some sons of darkness nowadays with dilated nostrils and wild eyes inveigh against the intolerance of the Middle Ages. But let not us, blinded by that liberalism that bewitches under the guise of wisdom, seek for silly little reasons to defend the Inquisition! Let no one speak of the condition of the times and intemperate zeal, as if the church needed excuses. O, blessed flames of those pyres by which a very few crafty and insignificant persons were taken away that hundreds of hundreds of phalanxes of souls should be saved from the jaws of error and eternal damnation! O noble and venerable memory of Torquemada!" †

The latter quotation will excite the horror of some and the risibles of others. Yet I think it not unfair to say that both quotations represent the thought of different minds in the Roman Catholic Church.

Protestants have, however, no right to boast as if their fathers had not shared the delusion that error is identical with heresy, and that it was better that "one man die than that the whole nation perish." There is scarcely one of the Reformers who was not guilty of bloodshed. But this may be said with truth, that the Reformers carried over that heresy from the mediæval church, as they did much else that it has taken time to shed, but they have not gloried in their shame, nor would it be possible to find today in any Protestant church a respectable man who would declare persecution to be justified. Nor is this due to the fact that they have become tolerant because they are in-

* "Lord Acton's Letters to Mary Gladstone," p. 298*f.*, quoted in "The Age of the Reformation," Preserved Smith, p. 643.

† C. Mirbt, "Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums," quoted in *ibid.*, p. 390.

different, but because they have learned that error is neither heresy nor sin. And because they have learned this, they no longer look to the state to enforce uniformity of belief or worship. They are living in a new world and breathing a purer atmosphere. It was this better spirit which animated our fathers when they endeavored to effect a more perfect union under which the inalienable rights of the individual might be secure.

Nor are those who dream of a revival of the ages of faith less mistaken in their dream of unity. The divisions of Protestantism can be matched in the Roman Catholic Church in days of old and now. Franciscan and Dominican, Nominalist and Realist, Gallican and Ultramontane, Jesuit and Port Royalist, Catholic and "Papalist" in England, "American" and Irish Catholics in this land, show that the inevitable groupings of men in congenial companies is a perpetual social phenomenon. While all this must be admitted by every student of history, it may be urged that in the Roman Catholic Church this is mitigated by the central authority, to which all must submit. If all that is desired be uniformity, this is a complete answer; but if we are seeking spiritual unity, it has little significance. The meaning of conformity and its spiritual value can be seen by a reading of the "Life of Cardinal Manning." * Was there truer unity between Manning and Newman when they had entered into the bosom of the mother church than there had been in the days when they both were ministers of the Church of England? Those who say yes should examine what they mean by unity. Henry Ward Beecher, whose homely wit reminds us of Lincoln, was once asked what he thought about the unity of the Catholic Church. He said: "There is no more unity in the Catholic Church than there is among Protestants. The difference is like the life in the tenements and in the sep-

* See "Life of Cardinal Manning," S. Purcell, Member of the Roman Academy of Letters.

arate houses in the village. The tenement may seem to one outside to be the abode of peace, while it might seem as if a riot were about to break out in the village, so great is the noise. But if you went into the tenement, you would find the tenants quarrelling on the stairs, just as the neighbors in the village are disputing over the fence."

It is not outward conformity which constitutes unity nor is it groupings into separate bodies which is of the essence of schism. Schism is the spirit which first denies that the word of God has come to any save those with whom we find ourselves in agreement, and then persecutes those who do not follow us. From the first sin no Protestant church is entirely free; the second is ingrained in the Roman Catholic Church. It is quiescent now, but were that church to become dominant in this land it would be the triumph not of the One Catholic and Apostolic Church; it would be the triumph of the greatest sect in the history of the Christian church. Those who think that the cure for sectarianism is to be found in the extension of the Roman Catholic Church are deceived by outward appearance. The cure must be found elsewhere.

A sentimental idealization of the Roman Catholic Church is characteristic not only of some religious people but of not a few who, having failed to fulfil their obligations as members of one of the Protestant churches, would like to throw the responsibility upon the church which would have saved them and they "would not." They may decry Protestantism and idealize the Catholic Church, but in so doing they have left the firm ground of history and are floating amidst the clouds of an imaginary emotion. They might know that the Roman Catholic Church is essentially static, and that does not mean, as is often supposed, that it is truly conservative; it means that the people have been kept in a state of perpetual pupilage and have not known the days in which they are living. Its æstheticism is pagan, not Christian. The mystic appeal in the sacrifice

of the mass runs back, not to the new man but to the old Adam, and is drawn from the "mystery" religions which themselves run back to the primitive animism which could feed on the very flesh of the god. The power of the mediæval church lay not in the institution, with its insistence upon force, but upon the cross which it lifted up, and so drew men to Christ himself. Its discipline, which it is the fashion to applaud among those who have lost faith in democracy, is autocratic, and would use democracy for the re-establishment of a discredited autocracy. These are not pleasant things to say, but they are true, and ought to be said if thereby the Church of Christ can be saved.

If the foregoing be a true, even though to some it may seem too dark a picture, both of the world and of the church, we shall be compelled to confess that neither the Roman Catholic Church nor any one of the Protestant churches alone, nor any superficial confederation of the churches can accomplish the task of evangelizing the world, spiritualizing civilization, and keeping alive that conception of the gospel which the Reformation brought to light after the darkness which fell upon the world after the fall of the Roman Empire, upon which, we believe, the welfare of the republic depends. If we do not wish to drift out to the sea of controversy and lose sight of all landmarks of reality, we shall do well to confine ourselves for the present to the practical problem of Protestant unity. For, if the mission of the church is to evangelize the world and its task is the spiritualization of civilization, and we admit, as we must, that neither of these things is being done as it should be done, we are driven to ask: "What is the cause of the weakness of the churches?" The reason often given is that it is because the church is broken up into the many churches. But if we probed deeper we might find that it is no external division which weakens the church. It is the spirit of sectarianism, which paralyzed the spirit of Jonah and para-

lyzes the modern church. When the essence of sectarianism is clearly understood, the way will be open for a truer understanding of the meaning of unity. To a consideration, then, of what we mean by unity let us now turn.

# CHAPTER VI

## ORGANIC UNITY

If it be true that the largest group of Christian people in the Western world have not attained to spiritual unity and are no more free from the sin of schism than is the smallest and most insignificant group, and if, on the other hand, unity is the one thing needed to enable the church to fulfil its mission and accomplish its task, what is the nature of that unity and where is it to be found?

There is no question which has been more frequently discussed in ecclesiastical circles during the last fifteen years than that of church unity. While it is generally admitted that unity is essential for the well-being of the church, it has not been so evident that the nature of that unity has been clearly understood, and, as a consequence, men's minds have been bemused by various theories which have pushed experience and observation into the background. To some of these theories we must now turn, even at the risk of being thought to have wandered from our subject.

How often we come across some such statement as the following: "Our unhappy divisions not only weaken the church but are out of date because a nobler conception of the meaning of the church has been granted to us in this day than was known to those who lived in the days which immediately followed the Reformation. Unity has been the goal of the national movements which have made great the nations of the world in the last fifty years. In the United States the vision of unity rose, in the Civil War, like a 'cloudy, fiery pillar,' and the influence of America was felt in Italy and Germany. These were manifestations of an instinct of humanity which is unconsciously

actuated by a truth, the full significance of which is not understood. That truth is that humanity is an organism. When that truth is ignored; when it is forgotten that the welfare of the individual is dependent upon the welfare of the whole; when the individual has been made the end of life; then we see competition in the economic life, solipsism in philosophy, hedonism in ethics, and sectarianism in religion."

That this represents a wide-spread feeling cannot be denied. It is the foundation on which many plans for social reform rest. But when for humanity we substitute some special group, the doctrine may prove false. Because the ocean rises and falls with the tide, it does not follow that the local pond or even the Great Lakes are so moved. Humanity may be an organism, but special groups, such as a state or a church or a labor-union, may not be an organism. Because this has been overlooked, the mediæval church claimed to be an organism; so did the German state, and so to-day does the Russian Soviet government.

An organism is a structure composed of various organs which are dependent upon the composite structure for their existence. Each organ presupposes the existence and necessity of every other organ in the complex structure. The most familiar form of an organism is the human body, in which we recognize that no one of the organs could live and function apart from the whole. From this analogy the theory of social organic unity arose. The organs or the limbs of the state were supposed to be the individuals who compose the community. Therefore the life and welfare of the state is the final cause of the existence of the individual. But two things have been forgotten in this exposition: first, that the individual does not correspond to the organs or limbs of the body, but, rather, to the cells which are the fundamental and, perhaps, indestructible elements in the body. The human body is composed of a vast number of cells, each having a semi-independent life.

But the life, whatever may be its nature, whether mechanical, chemical, or spiritual, is what supports the structure. The structure makes the conditions for co-ordination but does not provide the life. It is true that unless these cells are sensitized and motorized by the cortex of the brain there results, not harmonious activity, but a sort of "twitching," which is a sign of nervous disorder. This semi-independence of the cells is declared to be analogous to "anarchy" in the state, when certain individuals refuse to obey the inhibitions of the higher commands which, it is claimed, answer to the brain in the human body. "Perfect national life requires the absolute subordination of the individual to the will of the state." This had been the teaching in regard to the church before it was applied to the state, and, if it be true, there is no reason why it should not be applied to a labor-union or any other group. From this solemn dogmatism one is tempted to turn to a wise book called "Father Tom and the Pope." In it there is a scene in which Father Tom, after listening to an explanation by the pope of one of the mysteries of the faith, exclaims with enthusiasm: "*Verum pro te;* true for you, Holy Father; the figures of speech are the pillars of the church." This wise saying seems to have been forgotten by some modern philosophers, who have made the fatal mistake of confusing analogy with identity.

From early times the relation of the different members of the composite structure called the human body has been used as an illustration of the relation of the individual to society. It is so used by St. Paul; and, properly understood, is as illuminating to-day as it was of old. There should be in the social order the same harmony which is exhibited in a well-functioning organism. But to declare that a political or ecclesiastical or industrial corporation in the social order is an organism in the sense that the individuals who compose it are to be subordinated to some higher will in the group analogous to the "inhibiting" brain in

the human body is to fall into the mediæval error of deducing a fact from a dogma, and, could it be carried into effect, would lead us back to the tyranny of the mediæval church or to the ruthlessness of Germany in the Great War, or to murderous strikes and their brutal repressions.

The German theory of the state was partly an inheritance from the mediæval church and partly a reaction from Rousseau's doctrine of the social contract. It is true that human society did not arise in the way Rousseau supposed. The probability is that it was fear—first, the fear of the wild beasts and then of man, the enemy—which made association necessary; then the clever and the strong compelled the stupid and the weak to do their will, and so the state came to be. But this is not the whole story. Why should love be excluded? We know that sexual impulse played an important part in the earliest social activity as it does to-day. But did not also friendship, the yearning for companionship, passing the love of women, influence primitive man and form an essential element in the cement which held together the primitive society? It was not a "voluntary" association which produced the primitive society, for the individual had not yet been differentiated from the mass; force was the necessary protection of the individual as well as of the social group. It was a necessary element in the social evolution, but it is not the last nor the highest. Therefore Rousseau was right ideally. The ideal society will be the voluntary association and co-operation of individuals for self-realization and a common good. St. Paul had a truer conception of society when he called upon each individual to subordinate himself *willingly* for the welfare of the whole body.

But no more in society than in the individual can it be said that unity is produced by the unwilling subordination of one member to any other nor to a majority of all. When the analogy is pressed to the point where it is asserted that there is in the social organism something an-

swering to the brain of the individual, which the members must all obey, there are many fallacies which creep in under the cloak of a figure of speech. For, in the first place, it is not the obedience of the many members to the commands of the brain which is the cause for unity; the unity may become more effective in that way, but the unity itself pre-existed. The brain is itself no more than the material instrument through which the life reveals itself to every part; that is, it is the medium of communication, but also a member of the body, and can no more claim to be the "body" than can the "hand" or the "foot." Each member of an organism presupposes the existence and necessity of every other member, and all are dependent, not upon some mechanical arrangement of the different parts, but upon the current of life which flows through all and constitutes their unity. When that life current ceases to flow, the body remains for a time apparently complete, but we know that it has become a corpse—no longer an organism but a thing. That which made it an organism was the habitation of the spirit. Only in this way does man become a living soul.*

"But," it may be asked, "is there nothing in the social organism which corresponds to the brain in the body and sends its commanding message to every part?" There is, but it is not material but spiritual. It is conscience, or the consciousness of God which makes a true spiritual organism.

St. Paul says that every Christian is a "temple of the Holy Spirit." That means that every Christian is an organ of God—a true organism. Yet no one will say that the best of men is a complete organism in the sense that through his life the full harmony of God resounds. But

* "The difference between a mechanical whole and an organic whole is that the former may be regarded as the sum of its parts, and the latter is something more or something other than the sum of its parts." —"Moral Values and the Idea of God," W. R. Sorley, p. 155.

there are men who say: "While this is true, the church is an organism in the sense that the individual is not." What does that mean? In what sense is it true? Has any church known in history been the perfect organ of God? There can be but one answer. St. Paul's hope was that the church in his day might grow "till it became such an organ, so that through it the glory of God would sound forth in perfect harmony." But that hope was based on the expectation of the immediate return of his Lord. Later he learned that it was to be the result of ages of education. For the apostle knew that the only organism which could show forth the glory of God is humanity, and by humanity he meant the human race into which each individual brought his conscience as a contribution to the common consciousness of mankind, acting in the unity of the spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life.* The first step toward that goal was to make all men see what is the "mystery" or "secret" which Christ had made known, which is the meaning of humanity. "When the reign of Christ is complete the end will come and the

* "An organism is that in which life is exercising itself toward greater complexity and greater variety, and which, while it makes a portion of life its very own, lives also within that ocean of life which is our universe. There is no limit to the life it can use for its own ends, because to the organism its universe is practically infinite; that is, limited in the capacity of the organism to utilize the life for its own ends; and it is the power to use fully what is given it for its own end, when that end is in harmony with God, that would be its perfection. We see the fostering purpose in the teaching and training of organisms to use more and more of what is given them for more and more perfect ends, while all the time autonomy consists in the organism being able to accept this influence or to use life for retrograde ends. . . . We find that this last-developed, and as it seems to us highest, form in which human life can rightly exercise itself (spiritual life), gives man more power than any other of drawing in deep draughts of the universal life, and using it to fashion some portion of the earth into some higher stage in which the purpose of God can bear upon it more directly."—"Voluntas Dei," pp. 40–41.

If the church be conceived as an organism, it will have to be remembered that it is capable of degeneration as well as regeneration.

kingdom be delivered to God the Father because God then will be all and in all." The divine organism is a hope, not a reality. If that is borne in mind we shall be justified in speaking of the church as an organism, because we believe it the most perfect means known to man for keeping the hope alive and making the "secret" known to mankind. But it can be called an organism only by a figure of speech; it is so called as the expression of a hope but not as the description of a reality.* The church is that part, and the only part, of humanity which has learned the meaning of human life—that it is predestinated to be the organ of God. But if the church may ideally be spoken of as the divine organism, it is to be remembered that it is not such because of its visible structure or frame, but because it is filled with the spirit. Nor must it be pretended that the spirit dwells in an imaginary whole but not in the real parts, or that it animated the church in the past and is not dwelling in the church to-day. No one of the many churches is without the witness of the spirit, and no one has a monopoly of it, nor do all the churches taken in their totality contain the full life of God. So while we are not justified in saying that any one of the churches in the past, or now existing, no matter how ancient its organization or splendid its ritual or profound its theology, is the divine organ, we are justified in saying that there is not one of them, no matter how recent its organization or meagre its worship or inadequate its philosophy, which is not a "stop" in the divine instrument, and does not play an essential part in the great symphony of redemption. It is because the sublime spiritual ideal which St. Paul was the first to see has been obscured by the mists of "error, ignorance, pride, and prejudice" that we have identified

* "The ethical unity of the universe is a unity to be attained. It does not belong in its completeness to any stage of the time-process, but only to its realized purpose."—"Moral Values and the Idea of God," W. R. Sorley, p. 456.

organism with organization, and supposed that corporate unity was the same as organic unity. The latter is a sublime hope; the former is an undesirable impossibility.

It is because this fundamental truth has been overlooked and men have fixed their attention on the external that they have failed to understand the internal and spiritual life, without which there can be no organism, and, as a consequence, have been driven to believe that force must be applied to compel the individual to submit. The Germans reverted to the primitive type of society and, therefore, force was the essential element in the social structure as they conceived it. No doubt, force must for a long time be the necessary means for preventing anarchy, which would be as fatal to the individual as to society at large. But it is not ideal, that is, it cannot be the final will of God. As long as force is believed to be the essential cement of society, the "anarchist" will be necessary. For he has often been the most effective witness to the ideal order. Such was Jeremiah in the days of old. "Behold, I have made *thee* this day a defencéd city, and an iron pillar, and brazen walls against the whole land, against the kings of Judah, against the princes thereof, against the priests thereof, and against the people of the land. And they shall fight against thee; but they shall not prevail against thee; for I am with thee, saith the Lord, to deliver thee." * Such an anarchist was William Lloyd Garrison; he and other early abolitionists would not obey an inhuman law. They suffered patiently the penalty of their lawlessness, strong in their faith that their fellow countrymen would one day see, and do the right. Thus it has ever been with the men "born out of due time." They are in advance of their day; they see a better country, and bear witness to it. The ideal anarchist refuses to submit to a custom which he believes to be a menace to the well-being of society. He will not consent to the perpetuation of a

* Jeremiah 1 : 18, 19.

wrong which he believes would prevent the social order which is about to be; rather will he die to bear witness to the truth; and in so doing he follows the example of Jesus.

If the most important thing in the social organization were the perpetuation of the present custom rather than the adaptation of the organization to the ideal order which as yet has been revealed to but a few, the conduct of the martyrs would have been as abhorrent to God as it was to those in authority in the days when they suffered. But that does not seem to have been the case. They seem to have been blessed by God. The progress of mankind has been largely due to "anarchists." It is they who have written the laws under which we now live in security. On the banner of the church is inscribed the device which we are apt to think has only an historic significance: "The noble army of martyrs praise thee." Herein lies the glory of the Reformation. The reformers were, some of them, martyrs, and some only "confessors"; but they were all "anarchists"! It was because Germany forgot the example of the fathers that they made the state the supreme organism and, as a result, individual conscience was submerged in the great tragedy.

It has become the fashion to sneer at the doctrine of "private judgment," which indeed is open to many objections when it is supposed to mean that one man is as well fitted as another to decide technical questions with which an expert only has the necessary knowledge to deal. But when it is denied that the moral life is dependent upon it, we may expect again an "invasion of Belgium," or the re-establishment of the Inquisition, or the triumph of violent strikers. No organization can be intrusted with the responsibility which belongs to the individual.* "All souls

* "The moral consciousness, it is held, is simply a reflection of the social order, or at least in origin it was so; and its peculiarities are due to its origin. . . . The theory that morality consists in nothing more than conforming to the social order, or maintaining the social equilib-

are mine," said the prophet of the exile, speaking for the Eternal. His, like Jeremiah's, was a nobler teaching than theirs had been, who knew only the corporate holiness of Israel. It is the corner-stone of the morality of Jesus, and the clearest note in his call to man to come to God. In his view the fate of the ninety and nine, considered as a flock, was not to weigh for a moment with the value of the individual sheep. St. Paul carried on the teaching of his Master when he wrote: "Every one of us shall give account of himself unto God." We cannot shift the responsibility upon state or church or union or any other group. Each soul stands before God like Adam in the garden.

It may be objected that this discussion is not germane to the subject in hand. But a moment's consideration will show that it is of the utmost value in an understanding of the problem before us. Its influence upon the moral character cannot be too strongly insisted upon. The Germans whose ruthlessness shocked the world had been trained to believe that the state was the supreme organism, and as a result their individual conscience played no part in the awful tragedy.

What, then, is society? It is the necessary association for a more effective and nobler life than is possible for the

rium, or promoting social vitality, receives no support from the historical view that, for the conscience of the early or savage tribesman, morality and social custom had the same content. . . . Conventional morality simply means the morality of ordinary opinion, which is in close accord with prevailing practice. The morality of primitive man was strictly conventional; the morality of civilized man is often conventional in a less strict sense . . . and conventional morality may be used as a term of reproach just because the moral opinion of men is no longer restricted to opinions that are exclusively social in their origin. But the form of morality which is most purely conventional is that in which it is merely social; in objecting to any moral doctrine on the ground that it is conventional, the objector admits by implication that the social basis of morality is inadequate, and that it stands in need of reflective criticism."—"Moral Values and the Idea of God," W. R. Sorley, pp. 65–68.

individual in isolation. "It is not well for the man to be alone."

The unit is the individual. He does not exist for society nor does society exist for him. He becomes a person only in society. Society is the name for all the personalities who have preceded and are now living and who are yet to come. Each of these is dependent for his complete personality upon all. Society, then, is not a person; it is the necessary condition of personality.

It is due to a confusion upon this matter that the horrors of the late war fell upon us. But it is no new thing. The world has not suddenly grown worse. Indeed, the horror excited by the war is a proof that the world is better. The outrages in the late war are no greater than those of the Thirty Years' War. But in those days it was assumed that such things were inevitable. To-day they are believed to be preventable. That which distinguishes this age from any other is that we have tried to formulate a philosophic and moral justification of such horrors. This has been traced to German philosophy and to the scientific writers of the nineteenth century. But these justifications go farther back than that. They are the outcome of the mediæval theory of the sin of heresy, which was identified with difference of opinion and rebellion against the dogmas of the church before the state had become the group to which it was believed the allegiance of men was primarily due. It was the church which taught that the individual must subordinate his intellectual and moral life to the organization. As long as the life of the individual was subordinated to the church, both intellectual and moral progress were obstructed. This does not imply that the papacy and monasticism and scholasticism were without value. We may say of them all, as St. Paul said of the "law," that they were schoolmasters, but a scholar who never graduates degenerates into a slave. Each of these had a preparatory value in the education of mankind, but

became a tyranny because it was not recognized that "one good custom" may "corrupt the world." The "saints" continually violated their humane feelings in obedience to the supposed necessities of the church—the supreme organization—but by so doing they violated the social law because they violated the law of the individual. For the welfare of the community is as dependent upon the protection of the "inalienable rights" of the individual as upon the preservation of the present prevailing custom.

The hope of the future lies in an inspiring education which, recognizing the supreme value of personality, will set free the latent personality in the individuals now submerged in some "organization." At present we are confused between the claims of two theories of education; the one, which we might call the Jesuit theory, would crush individuality as an evil thing and subordinate free will to obedience; the other, which is the utilitarian, has no higher purpose than to enable the individual to succeed in the struggle for existence. The one would destroy the personality and the other society. But personality is not abnormal individuality; it is the individual life realizing itself in an inspired community. The late Prof. Royce taught us that there are two instincts which determine the relation of the individual to society; the one is "imitation" and the other "opposition." "*The entire process of conscious education involves the deliberate appeal to the docility of those two types of social instincts.* For whatever else we teach to a social being we teach him to imitate. And whatever use we teach him to make of his social limitations in his relation with other men, we are obliged at the same time to teach him to assert himself, in some sort of way, in contrast with his fellows, and by virtue of the arts which he possesses." *

But if this is true of the individual in isolation, it is equally true of the individual in voluntary groups. It is

* Royce's "Outlines of Psychology," p. 279.

in these religious groups which we call "churches" that man exercises the noblest art, which is the worship of God. Because this truth is ignored, we hear vague talk about "herd instinct," the "state as an organism," "the social conscience," "mob psychology," and the "national consciousness." But how seldom does any one take the trouble to tell us what these expressions mean! We suspect they are mere figures of speech. Had the "herd instinct" predominated, there would have been no progress. The state is not an "organism," but an organization or corporation. The popular saying that corporations have no souls is often interpreted as a reproach to corporations, but, properly understood, it is the statement of a psychological fact; corporations would have souls if they were persons. There can be no social conscience apart from the conscience of the individuals who constitute society; nor can "mob psychology" mean anything but the psychology of individuals acting under abnormal conditions, and thereby escaping from the inhibitions of habit, and in consequence becoming peculiarly susceptible to "suggestion." "National consciousness" is the consciousness of individuals of their national relation, with all the responsibility and glory which accompany such remembrance.

To assert that "unity" is the one thing for which the nations long to-day is to overlook another passion even greater among the small nations, and that is "self-determination." Not till the latter has been attained can there be any hope of an internationalism which will supplement the present rivalries of nationality. The same is true of the church. Unity is indeed the crying need to-day—as it has ever been—but it cannot be attained until there is the recognition of the desire of all the churches to enjoy self-determination.

The harmony of these two conflicting desires is the problem before religious men to-day. How is it to be solved? We cannot return to the unity of mediævalism

without the employment of force; we cannot rest satisfied with the present impotence of the various churches. What path is left? None so far suggested seems to me to be likely to solve the problem, for no one of them seems to appreciate the necessity of recognizing the two elements in the equation. We must do in the ecclesiastical life what our fathers did in the political life of this nation; we must blaze a new path into the wilderness. We must recognize that we have come to a new era and must serve it with new methods. We are to-day in our ecclesiastical life in a time not unlike that in our political life, which John Fiske called "the critical period in American history." Our fathers found a solution for the political problem by the discovery of a new form of political association, which they called "federalism." We must find a new form of religious solidarity which will protect the rights of the small and yet make more effective the life of the whole. But the first step cannot be taken till we recognize that there can be no return to the past. We can return neither to the Catholicism of the Middle Ages nor to the Protestantism of the sixteenth century. The one is identified with the Holy Roman Empire, and the other with self-sufficient nationalism; the one does indeed hold a certain theory of "development," but the other is identified with a servile dogmatism which is repugnant to the modern mind.* It is significant that no one of the modern protestants against the tyranny of the Catholic Church, from Döllinger to Tyrrell, has seemed even to contemplate turning to Protestantism.

* "I would say that the least valuable part of the inheritance which modern Christendom owes to the Reformation of the sixteenth century is its distinctive dogmatic theology, which was in truth very largely moulded upon the traditions and ideas of mediæval scholasticism in its last and most degenerate phase. From one point of view Lutheran doctrine (of justification by faith) is simply the last and not the best product of an expiring scholasticism."—"The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology," Dean Rashdall, p. 416.

This has been well expressed by a recent writer: "The Protestant Revolution was by no means a complete movement. The sixteenth century saw neither its beginning nor its end. No vital movement comes to an end at a given date, but continues on its way, transmuted but undiminished, along the great arteries of the world. Life is a fluid. Its horizons are always being extended. Religion is always being reformed. Less and less do we endeavor to confine it within the shell of some dogmatic system. Instead, we seek to interweave it with our daily lives. And if the sixteenth century has any word to say to our own it is that any attempt to harden religion into an institution inevitably results only in sorrow, in suffering, and in failure. Absolute truth lies beyond the grasp of man. Man must be content to increase his store of relative truth with the changing centuries. We are abandoning the ideal of immutable truth for the ideal of progressive truth. This is an unlooked-for result of the Protestant Revolution that is slowly but surely making its way to the surface. The deepest significance of the Revolution lies not in its negative element, not in the fact that it gave birth to new dogmas and organized new churches, but in the profound awakening of the religious sentiment that it produced, the desire to be in harmony with God that it implanted in the hearts of man. In doing this it exaggerates the dogmas of original sin, grace, and predestination to such a point as to reduce man to a cipher. The rectification of his error is the task of the later stages of the movement." *

It is because this truth has been overlooked that good men of different temperaments are seeking to restore the vanished unity of the church by attempts to return to a past that can no more be regained than the snows of the winter that has gone. Those who by temperament are Protestant think that there can be a revival of Protestant

* "Renaissance and Reformation," Edward Maslin Hulme, Century Co., p. 370.

dogmatism, and those who call themselves Anglo-Catholics dream of the restoration of the stately edifice erected in the Middle Ages. Both are dreams, neither of which in the day in which we live is greatly needed in order that we may do the work to which we have been called in this our day and generation.

# CHAPTER VII

## CHURCH UNITY

THE dogma of corporate unity when it is applied to the life of the church is called church unity. There is a tentative form of this doctrine which need not long detain us, because it is superficial. It is what is known as "the federation of the churches." It is an earnest and well-meaning attempt to lessen the unseemly denominational rivalry among the various churches. But it seems to assume the permanent value of the dogmatic conclusions of the Reformation theology, which it identifies with "evangelical" truth. This leads to a sort of historical provincialism which is distasteful to not a few students of the long history of the church. Moreover, in its attempts to produce harmony, it seems to overlook the *principles* for which the various churches believe they stand, and which is their sole justification for their being. We gain nothing by crying "Peace, peace," when there is no peace. Then its very name is unfortunate; "federation" is a political term and predicates a central authority to which the parts must submit. But who that has studied the political history of this country in the last seven years can be in doubt as to the fate of any scheme which seems even to suggest a "supergovernment"!

On the other hand, we should gladly admit that it is doing good work in bringing together the representatives of the various churches so as to produce a better understanding, and in establishment of "union churches" in scattered communities, especially in Canada, where sectarian rivalries were stifling religion. It also acts as a clearing-house, and keeps the various churches informed of present problems in order that they may, by a com-

bined effort, influence public opinion so as to prevent undesirable legislation or urge much-needed reforms.

But the classic example of plans for "church unity" is found in the Anglican communion. For the past twenty-five years good and devoted men have sought for some bond of union.* But when these plans are critically examined, it will be found that none of them is free from the heresy of confusing "organic" with "corporate" unity. Sooner or later we are sure to come upon some such statement as this: "Inasmuch as the church is an organization, it must have some sort of government, some definite teaching, and some form of worship." As each of the many churches in this land has continued for many years to minister to men of many minds, it is to be assumed that they have all been helpful in the highest realm of the spirit. But when we ask ourselves how the different churches are to be united into one common body, we find ourselves confronted by the old spectre of uniformity, which has been the obstacle to unity from the days of Constantine. Uniformity may have been necessary in the day when nothing but the power of the state seemed able to control the spirit of disputation which was tearing the church to pieces, which is what the picture of the church of the fourth century presents to us, but it does not follow that it is either necessary or desirable now.

Yet that is the spectre which seems to haunt many in our church who write on this subject. Bishop Gore's book on "The Ministry," as well as Canon Headlam's Bampton lectures on "The Church's Doctrine and Reunion," though they start from different points of view, and though the latter is written in a more liberal spirit than the former, both come in their conclusions to an agreement that would not have been expected. This is due, I believe, to the fact

* A full list of the various plans which have been formulated by the English Church and the Episcopal Church in this country will be found in the Appendix to Bishop Manning's "The Call to Unity."

that both are victims of a common obsession—Catholic tradition. Both, believing that the English Church has maintained the Catholic tradition, in doctrine, discipline, and worship, fail to imagine a unity which is not based on these lines. It is true that Canon Headlam finds an earlier tradition, but when he comes to the present problem, he seems to feel that the Catholic tradition is essential. If, however, we examine what these writers call the Catholic tradition, we shall find it is essentially a Protestant tradition. Both show the influence of the Protestant dogma of private judgment. For, unwilling as we may be to admit it, the crown of the Catholic tradition is the papacy.

Yet seeing that rock clearly before them, the good ship *Faith and Orders* was steered straight toward it, with a result which might have been expected. Indeed, we are inclined to think that the object was simply, as the lawyers say, to "go on record" as willing to unite with any church. However that may have been, the result was inevitable. The Roman Catholic Church said, in substance: "You are quite right in saying that a true church must have a valid ministry, a proper way of administering the sacraments, and must hold the Catholic faith. Very well! If that is what you are looking for, come into the communion of the Mother Church and submit to the Infallible Church—the same yesterday, to-day, and forever."

Then they turned to the Eastern church, *i. e.*, the Greek or Russian. The Orientals do not know a great deal about the history of the American Episcopal Church, and are a little uncertain as to the validity of its orders, and what they had heard about the Reformation they did not like; and, therefore, they suggested that if the Anglicans would change the Nicene Creed into the form that they have always used—which is the right one—and would get rid of some of the effects of the Reformation, then they might talk about church unity. The bishop of Harrisburg, chairman of the commission, representing the Episcopal Church,

addressed a letter to them stating in substance that those for whom he spoke greatly regretted much that had happened in the Reformation, and intimated that it was hoped that they would free themselves from its blemishes. The bishop of southern Virginia immediately protested, and so the attempt to bring about church unity between the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States and the Greek Church led to new disturbances. As the first reach toward union between the Anglican and the Roman Church encountered shipwreck, so the next tack came near producing mutiny.

What else was to have been expected? In the Anglo-Eastern Catholic Concordat it was proposed that relics and icons should be used as "adjuncts" in religious worship; that the seven sacraments be acknowledged, and the hope expressed that the Anglican churches would soon have a special service in the Book of Common Prayer for "extreme unction." In the preliminary statement of the American Commission we read: "We have been informed from time to time that the Orthodox Easterns have some difficulty in reconciling certain Protestant aspects of our position and policy with full and genuine orthodoxy—in particular the phraseology of our *Articles of Religion, the laxity of our discipline toward certain Protestant errors, and the existence, even among many of our clergy, of opinions inconsistent with loyalty to the Catholic Faith and Order.*" (Italics mine.) Then follows an apology for the Reformation in which such expressions as these are found: "The *Prayer Book* was set forth embodying the Catholic working system, *but in forms and language which it was hoped* would retain the loyalty of those *impatient* souls"! "Accordingly, our discipline has always been tender and sympathetic in that direction, and we are *indisposed to drive out those among ourselves who fail to realize the fulness of their Catholic heritage, lest we alienate Protestants altogether* and thus end all hope of winning them. This policy has worked

as well as could be reasonably expected." (It might be suggested that it could not reasonably have been expected to work at all.) "Those who fully and loyally adhere to the Prayer-Book working-system do become more and more consistently Catholic; and every loyalty in this working-system results in what is called a 'Catholic movement,' of which the Tractarian movement, beginning in 1833, is an example. And each new movement of this kind is more gratifying in its Catholic results than its predecessors. The sum of the matter is that our history establishes the Catholic nature and tendency of our position and system; and the seeming lax aspects of conditions show merely that we are adhering to the great work of helping Protestants to recover what they have lost."

There are two things to be said about this remarkable document; the first is that one wonders what will be its effect when the commission on "faith and orders" comes to conference with the "impatient" Protestants.

The second is, the men who signed this report are all good men and some of them learned men; moreover, there must have been some with a sense of humor. I think that the latter must have signed without reading it.

The letter of the bishop of southern Virginia is pertinent:

". . . I have the highest respect for the members of the commission and recognize their ability and their pure consecration to the cause of Christian unity. In both the preliminary statement and the proposed terms of agreement, however, there are expressed positions which I cannot take conscientiously with my sense of loyalty to the church of which I am a member.

"I find myself unable to disagree with the definition and what I feel to be the limitation of the number of sacraments given in the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles of our own church.

"I cannot join in the apology, which is made in the preliminary statement of the American Commission for the

English Reformation, nor share the regret expressed for the Protestant atmosphere in which the Anglican Church was compelled to set forth its liturgy and its foundation of doctrine. Nor can I share in the hope that in the near future, when 'the Catholic movement of which the Tractarian movement beginning in 1833 is an example,' has reached its zenith, the church will be thoroughly de-protestantized. Nor am I ready to accept the decrees of the seventh council and to lend my sanction to the worship of relics and icons.

"For these reasons I have cabled to the chairman of the commission not to sign my name, as a member of the commission, to either the preliminary statement or the terms of agreement. I do not desire to enter into controversy. For my associates on the commission I have a feeling of affection and of sympathy in their desire to promote Christian unity. Their judgment may be better than mine, but I am compelled to follow my conviction and do my duty as God seems by His Holy Spirit to indicate it to me. I shall reserve the right to express my views, as a member of the commission, when its report is presented to the General Convention." *

But a more august and, indeed, more hopeful sign was seen in the attempt of the Lambeth Conference to approach the non-Episcopal churches of the world. The letter of the archbishop of Canterbury is a beautiful letter; it breathes the spirit of peace and love. But we find in it the same fallacy which underlies all these Anglo-Catholic appeals. The archbishop's plan of unity is expressed as follows: "We would say that if the authorities of other communions should so desire, we are persuaded that the bishops and clergy of our communion would willingly consent to accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregation. It is our hope that the same motive would

* See *The Chronicle* of September, 1920.

lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through Episcopal ordination as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the fellowship." The answer of the non-Episcopal clergy is in substance: "But we have always allowed your ministers to come into our pulpits. We do not suggest that your ministry is not a valid one. But what you are really asking us to do is to declare that our ministry is at least an incomplete ministry, and has never been under the highest blessing of God."

The letter of the archbishop, which was hailed as the proclamation of peace by not a few of the clergy of the Episcopal Church who were influenced by its sincere note of love, should be critically examined. It cannot lead to unity because of what it explicitly states and implicitly suggests. It is evident that there is no equivalent exchange in the arrangement suggested, for what it requires is that those who have not enjoyed the advantages of Episcopal ordination shall, before being permitted to minister in Episcopal churches, be ordained by a bishop. On the one hand, a license is to be issued to minister in a particular congregation, and, on the other, an ordination is required which would give for the first time a valid ministry in the universal church.

All the bishops are not at one in what they are seeking. While it should be recognized that in this suggestion the majority of the bishops were animated by a pure motive, the language of the letter cannot fail to excite a suspicion that there is something implied which is not frankly expressed. Inasmuch as the letter of the archbishop received the approval of almost every one present at the Lambeth Conference, there will be a suspicion that it would never have been assented to by some of the American bishops had it not been that they believed the plan, if accepted by the non-Episcopal churches, would lead to the eventual abolishment of the non-Episcopal ministries, and give to each the "succession" *malgré lui*. The truth is

that the whole plan shows that these good and learned men are not living in the twentieth century at all, and as a result there is an air of unreality about the whole scheme which vitiates an unquestioned worthy motive.

What better reply could be made to it than the answer of the Rev. Francis G. Peabody? * "What seems to the bishops an open road confronts the great majority of their Protestant brethren with the sign 'private way.' In fact, the movement of united Protestantism has already advanced a considerable distance in quite another direction, toward a unity of spirit and a religion of practical discipleship of Jesus Christ; and the question of the transmission of the Episcopate already appears to those who are on the way to this spiritual unity to belong to a past era, when questions of ecclesiastical authority were of real interest, and the world had not been summoned to the weightier matters of co-operation, sacrifice, and service."

But it is not the impracticability of the plan which is so distressing as the confusion which it reveals in the minds of the representatives of the Anglican communion. Are they or are they not in sympathy with the churches of the sixteenth century? They cannot have it both ways. The real question which the Episcopal churches must face and answer before they can speak with authority to their religious brethren is far deeper than any question of orders; it goes down to the very foundation of religion itself. Does the Episcopal Church believe in "magical" or spiritual religion? That is the real question. The Roman Catholic Church does believe in magical religion. The Protestant churches do not. Where does the Anglican Church stand? The world has a right to know. Do its leaders know? I am inclined to believe that they do not. They are by training and inheritance free men, who believe in a desire to die in the "comfort of a reasonable, religious, and holy hope," but at the same time they are drawn to a magical

* See the *Hibbert Journal*, January, 1921.

religion against which our Saviour was the first Christian Protestant.* Till they are clear in their own minds where they stand on this fundamental question, it would seem to be the part of modesty to cease these suggestions for church unity to men who are quite clear that whatever may be the advantage of the Episcopate as a working order, or the glory of the liturgy as an expression of the church's continuous life, or of doctrine which perpetuates the faith of old, if the result is that men are "to be entangled again in the yoke of bondage" from which Christ has set them free, they will prefer to sacrifice all these treasures of historic inheritance in order to rejoice in the liberty of the children of God.

There is to-day a crisis which menaces all the churches, but that of the Episcopal Church is the most acute. When it has made the great decision, its duty will be plain—either to return from its wanderings to the mother church and admit that they and their fathers have sinned in tearing the seamless robe of our Lord, or else say plainly: "We are seeking a better country and have no desire to return." Till it does that its proclamations will have but academic interest, and the world is in too dreadful a condition to listen to unreal and futile schemes which fail to understand the signs of the times. This has been bluntly but none too bluntly set forth by the outspoken dean of St. Paul's:

"We do not sufficiently realize how completely the path to various church reforms is barred by those who refuse to consent to any change which would be an obstacle in the way of submission to Rome. . . . It is the *ignis fatuus* of reunion with Rome which blocks the way to reunion with our Protestant brethren. And I maintain that we cannot allow the road to be permanently blocked in this way. We may think it right to exercise patience for the sake of internal peace; but we must push steadily

* See below, Chapter XV.

against this absurd barrier till it breaks. We must show by actions as well as by words that we do not unchurch our brethren, that we wish to acknowledge them and the societies to which they belong. I repeat that it is recognition, not complete fusion, which we have to aim at. Let me conclude by quoting the words of Field-Marshal Lord Haig:

"'Now that the ordeal of war is over, I believe that the churches, if they will but act together, have a great and unequalled opportunity to secure and preserve for all time to the lasting advantage of our race that capacity for common effort, spirit of fellowship, and community of ideals which by their teaching and example they did so much to foster in the war.'" *

* See *The Churchman*, March 5, 1921.

# CHAPTER VIII

## SPIRITUAL UNITY

If what has been said in the foregoing chapters be true, then there inevitably follow certain conclusions which must affect our thought of Christian unity, and also the steps which should be taken to effect it. There can be no unity between organizations. Unity is a spiritual experience and can be nothing less than the unity of persons. If the various churches are persons, they may unite in a spiritual entity; if they be not persons, they cannot so unite. Unity, then, if it is ever to be attained, must be the unity among those individuals who are associated together in the various groups which we call churches—Episcopal, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist—what you will. The recognition of this truth might lead us to realize the unity which now exists, rather than to seek means for bringing about a unity which never did and, indeed, never can exist. This will not readily be admitted; it may be said that "as there is unity among states, so may there be unity among churches. Our own federal union is an example of that which seems here to have been denied." But it was a true instinct which led the framers of the Constitution to begin with the statement: "We, the people of these United States." It was the individual citizens who could unite and not the "States." The same is true of the church. The various churches cannot unite, though they may co-operate and associate themselves for more effective work. "Ye," says St. Paul, "are the body of Christ and members in particular."

If church unity is an impossibility as at present conceived, and yet it is evident that without some closer association the churches are impotent, what remains? I

answer: Fellowship. Whether there can be such an association of the churches as would reveal a complete manifestation of the indwelling spirit of God, which is really the desire of many earnest men, we need not now consider. It would be largely in the nature of prophecy, to which we do not pretend. This, however, will, I believe, be acknowledged by all reasonable men, that any such association must be preceded by a spiritual unity, which is what we mean by fellowship.

The pathway to fellowship is in some respects the same as that which the "Catholic" so much insists upon. It is the path which has already been traced by the feet of the saints of old. It is also in harmony with the devout spirit of the "Protestant," who insists that the appeal to history shall be carried back to the beginning of the history of the church, when the influence of Jesus was predominant in the lives of his disciples.

Let us begin with the first. The Catholic who affirms that no progress is possible for those who overlook the fact that there was once a single church, and that in the New Testament it is stated in terms which cannot be mistaken that there can by no possibility be more than one, is, I believe, on sure ground. "There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Nothing can be clearer than that there can be but one church. But when we ask ourselves with which of the existing ecclesiastical organizations this one church is to be identified, our difficulties begin. Has any one of the churches succeeded in emancipating itself wholly from the mediæval spirit? It is to be doubted. Now, one characteristic of the mediæval mind was that it began with a dogma, and then sought for facts to buttress it. If we have determined that the church shall have certain characteristics or "notes" and none other, then inevitably we shall be led

to identify the "one church" with that body which seems to us to be the manifestation of those characteristics or to strike those "notes." We then forget that St. Paul, in his exposition of the one church, was careful to point out that diversity was an essential characteristic of the one church. "Unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ." It is the spirit of Christ which determines the identity of any group with the true church. Can it be said that any one of the existing churches has a monopoly of that spirit? If instead of the mediæval spirit we were to seek for the solution of our problem in the scientific spirit which has led to such marvellous results in other departments of life, we might come to a better knowledge of the truth in this one.

St. John says: "If we walk in the light, as God is in the light, we *have* fellowship one with another." It would seem then as if he identified the brotherhood with those who are walking in the light. He tells us that light is the atmosphere in which God lives; something purer than that of ordinary life. Whoever, then, enters into that rarefied atmosphere of the divine life becomes one of the brotherhood.

But it means more than that. The word "light," as it is used in the New Testament, means ethical goodness. If the Christian life is not an ethical life, then it is a vain speculation. Now, as a matter of fact, there is not one of the churches which has not been tempted, and sometimes yielded to the temptation, to place something rather than ethical goodness as the goal of human endeavor. It may have been the reception of the sacraments, submission to authority, or the expression of an orthodox faith; but the only value in all these is that they may be means to an end, which end is ethical goodness. If anything is ever set up in place of that, then we walk in darkness, and not in light. It is a lamentable fact that, because of the ecclesiastical and theological idols to which we have turned,

the Christian church has, in some respects, lost something of the ethical life known to paganism before the preaching of the gospel. This is the dark shadow cast by the light of "justification by faith." Belief or mere assent has sometimes been substituted for moral goodness.

"Light" means more than moral goodness; it means also knowledge—specially the knowledge of God. "Light" is the manifestation of the unseen, and that means that the divine light is the manifestation of the divine nature, which is ultimate reality or truth. Those, then, who walk in the light are walking in the atmosphere of God, and are receiving, by direct personal revelation, truth or the ultimate reality.* Bearing these truths in mind, let any man ask himself this question: Is there any one of the churches which can claim perfectly to represent the moral life or to reveal the full knowledge of God? The question has only to be asked to be answered in regard to the first: there are churches which claim to have and to reveal the full knowledge of God, but a history of the church will show that the claim is not justified.

Let the question now be turned the other way: Is there a single one of the many churches in which there will not be found members who are leading a noble moral life or are without that knowledge of God which enables them to call him Father, Redeemer, Sanctifier? If such a church can be found, then, indeed, we may say that it is not a church nor any part of the Church of the Living God.

"Light" means also love; "God is light" because "God is love." Light is the manifestation, the epiphany, of love. Is there any church which has a monopoly of that? Is there any church some of whose members are not inspired by love, and do not manifest that love in good-will to man and in deep and awful gratitude to God? Again we may say that to these questions there can be but one answer. But the right answer to these questions would enable us

* See "The Fourth Gospel," E. F. Scott, pp. 255–256.

to answer our previous question: "What is the one church?" The one church is the brotherhood. It is not to be identified exclusively with this church or that one; it is the "blessed company of all faithful people."

This, one would think, should be a truism. But, as a matter of fact, it is a truth that has been long ignored. But were it recognized, it would be seen that the problem before the churches to-day is not at all what it has been assumed to be, viz.: "How shall we attain church unity?" The real problem is: "How is the spiritual unity of the brotherhood, which already exists, to be made more effective in the life of the world?"

There are men who find any spiritual fact difficult to grasp; they "seek after a sign." Such men will say: "This may be a partial truth, but what, then, becomes of the 'visible' church of God?" It might be answered that if the "visible" church existed, it could not be visible. It would still be an ideal to which any group of the one church would bear witness. When the devout Catholic enters into any little chapel of his faith, he has a sample of what he believes to be the true church. He certainly cannot see the whole body. Well, why can we not see in any company gathered together in Christ's name the "communion of saints"? The colors of the rainbow may be seen in one drop of water depending from a leaf as well as in the arc which spans the firmament.

Let us turn back to the example of Jesus, for in his hand we may find a clew to the labyrinth. When he went up to Jerusalem, we assume that he saw a unity such as some would like to see to-day, but the fact was quite different.

When our Saviour was on earth the rule in Palestine was that any ten Jews might establish a synagogue; and there were many synagogues in Jerusalem itself. The "visible" Jewish Church had succeeded after a long struggle in establishing the one altar at Jerusalem—the sign of the unity of the "visible" church—but the "invisible" church

was nourished in the synagogues, with their wide diversity of opinion. Against the former, St. John tells us,* Jesus uttered an emphatic protest. But against the latter there is no record of any word of disapproval. The reason for that is doubtless due to the fact that he recognized that the "unity of the Jewish people was not in opinion but in conduct." † That was the original unity of the disciples. As to the Jews, the law was the ideal which bound them together and manifested itself in life or conduct, so the bond that held the early disciples together was the love of Jesus, which manifested itself in newness of life. Because this is true, it follows that there was *Christian unity before there was church unity!* The unity of the Apostolic Church, which is described in Acts, is the same unity which bound together Peter and James and John, while Jesus was with them. And it continued for a hundred years, as the keen eye of Gibbon discerned. "It has been remarked with more ingenuity than truth that the virgin purity of the church was never violated by schism or heresy before the time of Trajan or Hadrian, about a hundred years after the death of Christ. We may observe with more propriety that during that period the disciples of the Messiah were indulged in a freer latitude both of faith and practice than has ever been allowed in succeeding ages." ‡

Our Saviour's words on this subject are often quoted, but I am sure that I do not speak for myself alone when I say that it is with a feeling of shock that I hear them quoted! How often are we told that our Saviour's last prayer was "that they all may be one"? But how seldom is the saying completed! "As thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they all may be one in us." That is the unity which will convince the world that the Father sent him. This is a prayer for unity. But what sort of

* John 4 : 19–24.
† "Landmarks of Early Christianity," Kirsopp Lake, pp. 39–40.
‡ Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. XV.

unity was it for which our Lord prayed? The answer that is usually given is that it is "organic" unity. But often that is confused with physical or mechanical or corporate unity! * What, then, is the unity of the Father and the Son which our Lord wished the disciples to experience? In theological language, it is unity in the Holy Spirit. The Father and the Son are not one "person" but two "persons" in one "substance." Is that "substance" physical, so that it may be spoken or thought of as one body? It must be, if the analogy which it is sought to establish is to be complete. We believe that "substance" to be spirit. So must our unity be unless we are willing to be content with something less than that for which our Saviour prayed.

It is sometimes said that this leads to the "invisible" church, while what we seek is the "visible" church. "Our Lord prayed for a church which the world could see and therefore believe that God had sent him." Is, then, the unity of God visible? Is it physical, mechanical, or corporate? We must answer that it is spiritual. It is not visible, but it is effective.

It is a sad fact that we must step outside of the churches as they are to-day if we would understand what the unity of the spirit really is. In the family, in business, in daily intercourse of neighbors, in hours of deep distress and in days of national danger, men whom the churches divide realize a true unity of the spirit, and have fellowship one with another. This was the unity for which we believe our Saviour prayed, and the unity which the imperialistic church substituted for it was the unity of the kingdom of this world, which can be maintained only by force.

To deny that, in spite of the sins and failures of the churches, unity does exist, or that when it manifests itself the world does recognize that it is divine, or to say that it did exist for a little while in the "undivided" church but

* See above, Chapter VI.

has not been seen on this earth for centuries, is a dreadful thought, and will not be entertained by any man who seriously considers to what it leads. If we were thankfully to acknowledge the unity we have, we might find a way to make it more effective than it is.

I know that to some this will seem mere sentiment. But nothing could be farther from the truth. A mere sentiment is a superficial sensation. This is a sublime spiritual fact. It is the very unity of God himself. It is the joy of the Son to do the Father's will.* Such faith had Jesus in the wisdom and love of the Father that no sorrow or pain made that burden too heavy to bear. The cross itself became a joy, for by it he believed the will of the Father was being accomplished. And the joy of the Father was bound up with that of the Son; he was "satisfied." The Father's heart asked nothing more of his child than this perfect submission to his righteous will, even when, as He knew, that will would seem to be the hatred of the Son: even when the agony seemed to be the sign that the Father had forsaken him! If two or three are gathered together in that "name," that is, in that spirit, of trust and joy, Christ is with them, and where Christ is, there is the church. Each of these individuals has his own peculiar view, and as a result his reaction to the divine influence will be different from that of any other individual, but these differences of temperament cannot divide those who have the "unity of the spirit." The story that is told in the Acts of the Apostles is a beautiful and moving one. Under the influence of a great and awful sorrow, and inspired by a glorious hope, that little company of men and women were, as we are told, of "one heart and one mind," praising God.† That was fellowship. But as the numbers increased they naturally and properly assembled together in convenient groups, and

* See "Theologic Definitions," Frederic Palmer.

† Acts 2 : 42–47.

then each group began to claim for itself peculiar privileges and advantages. We do not have to go out of the New Testament for that. We turn to the Epistles to the Corinthians,* and find Paul lamenting that there were some who declared that they were the Church of Peter, and others that they held to the rigid puritanism of James, others so fascinated by the eloquence of Apollos that they would listen to no one else, and some were so devoted to Paul that they called themselves by the name of Paul, and there were others who said that they alone were the true disciples of Christ. To all these Paul said: "Is Christ divided? Has any one died for you but Christ?" The unity is to be found in the atmosphere of God and in loyalty to Jesus Christ, and not in any ecclesiastical arrangements: "Ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord."

But when the church grew still larger and passed into the atmosphere of the Roman Empire, and was hypnotized by the great state, which with all its divisions still manifested unity in the emperor, then we find that the quest for unity soon took the form of uniformity in discipline and in doctrine, and as a result Arian began to persecute Catholic, and Catholic in turn, when the power came, to persecute Arian; the East broke from the West with awful anathemas; then Franciscan and Dominican, Jesuit and Port Royalist, Catholic and Protestant, Lutheran and Zwinglian, Calvinist and Socinian, Churchman and Puritan, Puritan and Anabaptist, generation after generation the awful strife went on, until the whole of Europe was deluged with blood in the Thirty Years' War.

"Love your enemy, bless your haters, said the Greatest of the great;
Christian love among the churches look'd the twin of heathen hate."

* I Cor. 1:9–13.

Then at last the state stepped in and said the vendetta must cease, and Locke's philosophy of toleration passed over into the churches. But, alas! the long history had left its influence upon men's thought, and toleration soon degenerated into indifference and contempt, and the result is what we see in the religious life of the churches to-day. The exclusive spirit which prevents fellowship is the scandal of our religion.

"Is that all?" it may be asked. "We read in the Acts of the Apostles that the disciples not only 'continued in the Apostles' fellowship' but also in their 'doctrine'; does not that imply that there must be some definite doctrine upon which all must be agreed?" There must indeed be some "doctrine": man is an intellectual being, and his mind, as well as his heart, must be in unity with God, and so in unity with those who feel God's presence. But to say that the doctrine must be expressed in some particular form which cannot be changed is to affirm that the mind of man is incapable of progress. *It is just because it did progress that the creeds were formulated.* But before we consider those, would it not be well for us to ask ourselves what this doctrine was in which the early disciples continued steadfast? It was that Jesus was the Messiah promised by the prophets of old. That was the fact upon which they were all agreed. Are not all Christians agreed upon that? Not, perhaps, in the same way in which the Jewish Christians were, but in a deeper sense. Do not all believe that Jesus is the "end of the law"? Do not all believe that the "spirit of the Lord was upon him and that he was anointed to preach the gospel to the poor, to give sight to the blind, to bind up the broken-hearted, to set at liberty them that are bound, and to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord"? There has never been any deviation from that early apostolic doctrine.* They continued,

* It is to be remembered that we are speaking of the doctrine of the early disciples, and not of its later development under the influence of Paul and John.

also, we are told, in "the breaking of bread." If we interpret that, as we probably should do, as the Lord's Supper, is it not true that all the churches continue in that? Some more frequently than others, some with greater ceremonial than others, some with theories which others repudiate, but the fact remains that all the churches do continue to commemorate the death of the Saviour in the way they believe the Lord commanded. The early Christians also "continued in prayer." Need that be amplified? Are we not all of every name agreed that the communion of the disciples with God in prayer is of the essence of the religion of Jesus?

I see no sign that the spiritual unity of the church has been broken. What I do see is that another sort of unity has been substituted for the original one, and that because of that the rivalries of the churches have been increased. I think the time has come when we should ask ourselves whether a more spiritual union should not be sought.

To attain that it is necessary that we should cease to read into the story that which was not there at the beginning. We must not say that "fellowship" means discipline, nor that "doctrine" means the Catholic creeds, nor that the "breaking of bread" means a sacrifice offered by a priest, nor "prayers" a liturgy. But inasmuch as we neither can nor should desire to return to that primitive age, and therefore cannot restore that early expression of unity, it follows that we should seek for some way of expressing our common fellowship, doctrine, communion, and worship. But as we cannot return to the apostolic days and manner, neither should we insist upon returning to any particular age which may most strongly appeal to us. We have a great history, and none of it should be lost. The customs which have been helpful should be continued as long as they remain helpful, but they need not be a hindrance to spiritual unity.

The mistake of the extreme individualist is that he in-

sists that the individual is at liberty to "join the church" or not as he sees fit. The truer statement would be that the individual is at liberty to choose the particular kind of church he will join, but of some church he must be a member, not because he will "go to hell" if he does not, but because unless he is in communion with some company of Christ's disciples he cannot develop the highest spiritual life of which he is capable. Thus the old saying, "*Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*" is true, though the prevalent interpretation which would substitute some particular church makes it false. That mankind should be organized both politically and religiously is necessary, but the particular form which either organization takes will depend upon the time and place and intellectual condition of the individuals who constitute the association. That must be decided by the free activity of the individuals who are most intimately concerned.

Doubtless it will be objected that this truth does not need to be emphasized in this country; that it has been carried to such an extent that there is danger of the dissolution of every ecclesiastical bond. All this may be admitted; yet, having won the battle for private judgment, there is need of ceaseless vigilance lest we be caught by the heresy which would lead us back into the bondage from which our fathers escaped. It is not by denying private judgment and the results which must inevitably follow, but by the fulfilment of its obligations, that peace and prosperity are to be found. The problem to-day is to manifest the existing unity so as to protect the inalienable rights of the individual and at the same time make the corporate activities of the whole company effective.*

* "Christ's people, in the power of his spirit, will give effect to his message and vindicate its truth and value. The world which had rejected and condemned him in his own lifetime will be compelled to reverse its judgment when it witnesses the marvellous work of his spirit within his church. Paul, in his discussion of the comparative value of the different spiritual gifts, expresses in a simpler form the

Let us turn, then, to the figures of speech employed by Jesus to express his conception of the spiritual community. He did not take the state as his model nor, like some to-day, call his disciples an army; he spoke of them as a family, as a flock, and as the free citizens of his Father's kingdom. They were a family because they were united in the spirit of brotherhood; they were a flock because they followed the Good Shepherd; they were the citizens of the kingdom of God because the passion of their lives was to do the will of their Father in heaven. This was the threefold unity which the presence of Jesus produced, and to it we must return in the power of the Holy Spirit. What prevents it? There was never more brotherly kindness among men than there is to-day. All Christians are trying to follow the Good Shepherd, and all will to do the will of God. But in spite of this we have not been able to agree upon the way in which the existing unity can express itself. Well, if it were once admitted that each of the ways now in use had certain advantages, might we not agree to honor one another in the continuance of those ways which have been found by experience to nourish the spiritual life? If that were our spirit, we should be able to see why the different plans for church unity on which so much earnest labor and a sincere desire for nobler religious life have been expended, yet have failed, and we believe must continue to fail until we find the way of Jesus in the realization of the spiritual unity for which our Saviour prayed.

fundamental idea of the difficult Johannine passage (15 : 15), 'But if all prophesy, and one come in that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all: and thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so falling down on his face, he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth' (I Cor. 14 : 24, 25). The evangelist gives a wider application to the idea of Paul. He imagines the church as a whole confronting the incredulous world and impressing it with the sense of a divine power, which finds expression in the various Christian activities. In this manner the work of the spirit will have a universal significance, although its proper and exclusive sphere is the church."—"The Fourth Gospel," E. F. Scott, p. 337.

I am convinced that a vital unity of Christians cannot be obtained by ignoring the past. I believe that what is now needed is a fair statement of the position of each of the churches, so that there will be a better understanding of the reason, not alone for the original separation, but also for the continuance of each. It is because of this that I shall venture, even at the risk of being thought sectarian, to point out why, in my opinion, the Episcopal Church is not justified in allowing itself to be absorbed into a general American Church, which might fail to safeguard those things without which I fear the larger church might lose much that is of permanent value. But the same is true of all the churches. Not by ignoring our differences, but by emphasizing our principles, shall we be in a position to know what is of permanent and what of merely temporary value.

I would suggest then that, paradoxical as it may seem, the first step toward more effective association will be found not in ignoring the differences of the churches, but, on the contrary, in glorifying them. "He that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his works may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God." Suppose each of the churches were to set forth in popular form the reasons that lead its members to think that their church was not only justified in separating from some other group in the past, but is also justified in continuing to bear witness to that aspect of truth which seems to them valuable for the whole body of Christ, it might be that there would result such a mutual understanding and respect for one another as would enable each church to learn from every other, and so prepare the way for some more effective association of the various churches than is now possible. Too long has the "hand" said to the "foot": "Because you are not the hand you are not of the body." Let us now see what each member has to say for itself, and what it believes to be its value not to itself alone but to the whole body of Christ.

It is because I believe that the Episcopal Church has a gift for the American Church of the future that I would not have it enticed into a poor imitation of the Roman Catholic Church; not that I fail to recognize that the Roman Church has also a contribution to make, but only that it is unwilling to make its contribution till every other church has denied the grace which God has given it. And, on the other hand, I believe it would be a loss to the future religious life of this land were the Episcopal Church to be absorbed into a great American religious trust, without the assurance that the things which those who belong to that church have found helpful will be guarded and kept for the welfare of those who are to come after. But what I believe of the church which I know best and love most, I believe also of all the churches. With this in mind, and because I know of no book in reasonable compass which so deals with the Episcopal Church, I venture to ask the reader to look with me into the meaning of that church and consider if it have not a value which has not been appreciated, partly because of the sectarian spirit in which the value of it has been too often exhibited.

# CHAPTER IX

## THE ENGLISH TRADITION

THE first question which will be asked by those in the Episcopal Church who have been in the habit of thinking of their church as the exclusive depository of God's grace, is: "What advantage, then, have we who belong to this church, if it be once admitted that the means of grace, which we have been taught can be found only in an organization which enjoys the apostolic ministry, are really existent in other organizations?"

In order to answer that question, it might be well for us to remember that the crisis which came to the Jewish Church and ended so disastrously, came also to the Apostolic Church, and, therefore, may come to us as well, even if we have the apostolic ministry.

Only careful students of the New Testament know how near the Christian church came to making the great refusal, under the leadership of the prince of the apostles, Simon the son of Jonas. They also know that it was Paul who saved the church, even as the author of the Book of Jonah would have saved the Jewish Church.

The early Christians inherited from their Jewish fathers a repugnance to the Gentiles. They found it almost impossible to believe that those who had not enjoyed the privilege of the Law had, nevertheless, been under the guiding hand of God. So when Paul said that "God hath made of one blood all nations to dwell on the face of the whole earth, that they might seek after him and find him," the question which immediately arose was: "What advantage then hath the Jew?" If the Jew has no *exclusive* privilege, what advantage has he? So, in the same way,

it will be asked to-day: "If we of the Episcopal Church, with our apostolic ministry, have no exclusive privilege, what advantage have we?" In other words: "If this church of ours, differing from our Protestant brethren in manner of worship and in discipline, is unable to enter into perfect communion with our fellow Christians in this country, would it not be better for us to abandon those things which are peculiar to us, and be absorbed into the religious life of America? If we do not do this, are we not schismatics?" It must not be forgotten that those who ask the question have no intention of doing this, but that they ask the question simply because they believe it to be valuable in controversy. Nevertheless, it is a fair question and should be answered.

What advantage, then, has the Episcopal Church? If by advantage is meant means of eternal salvation, I answer frankly that I believe we have none that is not shared by all the disciples of Jesus. But if by advantage is meant what do we hold in trust for the future religious life of this country, then I say with St. Paul: "Much every way."

In every organization there are three things which distinguish it: doctrine, discipline, and worship. We shall speak of these a little later. For the moment, I should like to speak in a more general way of certain characteristics of the Episcopal Church, which are either lacking or at least are not emphasized in other churches.

The first is that, so far as I know, the Episcopal Church is the only American religious organization that is consciously endeavoring to keep alive the spirit of unity among the English-speaking peoples of the world. And this it is seeking to do by reminding us of the fundamental glory of the English people. This the Episcopal Church tried to do in the beginning and is trying to do to-day.

Whoever will take the trouble to read carefully the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer will see that our fathers were very particular in stating that they had no

desire to depart from the English Church, except in so far as the political conditions of the day made necessary. It required great courage to say such a thing at that time, for the English Church in the colonies lay under deep suspicion, and not without reason. Many churchmen had been Tories; not a few of the clergy had deserted the country in its hour of danger. More than that: the dislike of the English Church had its roots in the beginning of our colonial history. In New England the word "bishop" was as distasteful as the word "pope" in an Orange lodge! In New York the Dutch Church—possibly for reasons not altogether disconnected from real estate—was not particularly friendly to Trinity Parish, which was practically the Episcopal Church in the southern part of the State. In Pennsylvania the Quakers looked askance at any church which laid emphasis on the value of rites and ceremonies. In the South the Methodists could never forget the flouting of the saintly Wesley by the bishops of his day. They contrasted his life with that of the fox-hunting parsons of the Old Dominion, and drew conclusions not favorable to a church which was helpless to deal with open scandal. The Baptists, following the track of the "Winners of the West," carried with them the story of Bunyan's imprisonment. More than that, the strong belief in democracy was leading to the reversal of King James's shrewd saying, "No bishop, no king," to "No king, no bishop."

Now, with these strong and not altogether unjustified prejudices affecting the public mind, it required great courage for men who wished to commend their church to the new republic, boldly to state on the first page of their service-book that they had no desire to depart from the mother church of England, save as the political exigencies of the day made necessary.

Their courage was based upon a true vision of the meaning of the conflict from which the colonies had just emerged with triumph. Bishop White and Dr. Duché were as

truly patriotic as were Washington and John Adams, and much in the same way. They all had a true understanding of the meaning of the American Revolution, a meaning that has not penetrated the minds of a good many of our fellow countrymen even to this day. They understood that the war was not against England, but against a German autocrat.* They believed they were fighting for the liberties of Englishmen. This truth was recognized in England by such men as Burke and Chatham and Coke, of Norfolk—the last-mentioned of whom is said to have drunk the health of Washington every day. This is now recognized by most English historians. Indeed, it is not too much to say that the foundation-stone of the present British Empire was laid on Bunker Hill. Our fathers fought not against England but against a king who, had he been able to have his way, would have made of England what Frederick William made of Prussia. This the wisest of our fathers saw. While they fought against the soldiers of the king, whether sent from England or from Germany, their hearts were true to the motherland, and they desired to found in this country an organization which would keep alive the remembrance of the ideal England.

They were wise again in understanding that that ideal England was to be found not in the changing government of the day. But they knew that there is a difference between political organization and the great people which the government of the day may or may not represent. They believed that the heart of England was to be found in the English Church, which Mrs. Humphry Ward has finely described as "England in its aspect of faith."

It is because the Episcopal Church is a potent force in keeping alive the remembrance of the ideal England and the ideal America which are essentially one, that the value of that church primarily consists. Most thoughtful men

* While George III was born in England, his temperament was essentially German.

are agreed that in the crisis of the world to-day the future of civilization largely depends upon the faithful and earnest co-operation, the mutual understanding and reciprocal respect of these two great branches of the English-speaking peoples of the world.

The conditions have greatly changed since our fathers wrote the Preface to the Prayer-Book. The opposition of our Protestant brethren to the Church of England has died down, and, if it exists at all, it is now directed against the "establishment" rather than against the church. The Lutherans cannot be expected to be very enthusiastic, because their traditions are largely German; the Roman Catholic Church is intensely hostile, first, because it is largely Irish, and, secondly, because the stronghold of Protestantism has been transferred from Germany to England. In England the Protestant Church is the representative of the people and the people are loyal to it.

Is there not need, then, for just such a church as this—a church which will influence the life of the people of this land so as to cement the spiritual union of the great race of which we form so important a part?

The second thing to which attention should be called, because I think it characteristic of the Anglican communion to a degree not found in any other, is the spirit of comprehension. The English Reformation, which was, it must be admitted, marred by fanaticism, political wire-pulling, and sometimes by an ignoble opportunist spirit of compromise, had, nevertheless, a great ideal—a nobler one, I believe, than any other church existing at that time. The English reformers did honestly try to build a religious home for the English people, in which men whose sympathies were Puritan could worship side by side with those whose sympathies were Catholic, provided the latter were not "papists"—that is, who were loyal to the nation when it came into conflict with the church. I do not say the ideal was perfectly realized—few ideals are—but I do say

it has influenced the life of the English people in a way we might rejoice to have the churches of America influence our national life. For, whatever may be our opinion of an established church, however strongly we may believe in Cavour's dictum that "a free church in a free state" is better than an established church to which all must conform, it cannot be denied that an established church has this advantage, that it does impress upon men the truth that they are, by birth, as truly members of a church as they are members of a nation; that it is as natural for them to be enrolled in the church by baptism as it is for them to be admitted to the privilege of citizenship; that, at the proper time, they should by confirmation themselves acknowledge this privilege, and take their place at their Father's table and be fed with the bread of life till the end. Undoubtedly this has disadvantages as well. It may lead to mere formalism and lessen the sense of personal responsibility in making a choice of the life which they should lead. But this is an accident and not a consequence of the life in a religious nation.

In this country, where liberty is so precious—and it cannot be too precious—there has been a constant tendency to disintegration. The result of the multiplication of churches has been to accustom people to look on the various churches as religious clubs. So, just as we have clubs where men are associated together because they agree—for example, politically, or where the tradition of the college from which they graduated is kept alive, or others where the unity is found in similar tastes in art or literature or music, more and more it is coming to be felt that a man is welcome in one or other of these religious clubs if he happens to be in entire agreement with the prevailing opinion of those who are the charter members. But if he be not in entire agreement, it is thought that he may not be acceptable to the "admissions committee," and therefore he does not seek for admission, because he does not believe that

he will feel entirely at home there, and has no reason to suppose that he is missing anything that is of permanent value in life. Or even if he be assured that he will be welcome, even though he do not agree with the opinion prevailing at the moment, he hesitates to enter a company where it will be supposed that he accepts the traditional opinion which not a few of the members believe to be the essence of membership. The result of this wide-spread opinion is that not only have the churches disintegrated in an attempt to furnish meeting-places for those of congenial tastes, but also the individual churches are rapidly disintegrating, and multitudes of men who need the church and whom the church needs are drifting from the one organization where the deepest things of life are constantly kept before their minds.

Now the Episcopal Church, while it has not committed itself to a belief in an established church, has kept alive the English conception of the church as the home for the children of various temperaments and various degrees of religious culture. It has taught that the church is not a club—where those who are members are in entire agreement—but has other grounds of appeal, the essential one being loyalty to Jesus Christ, making that the link between widest differences within the fold. The result has been that though the Episcopal Church is not large as compared with some others, it is vital and growing in influence.

There are ministers in its orders who hold a theory of the Sacrament which the plain man cannot distinguish from the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation, which he believes to be a delusion. On the other hand, there are men in its pulpits who are thought to be preaching—as men in his day believed Phillips Brooks was preaching—the doctrine of Unitarianism. To the sectarian this seems a shocking state of affairs. But to the churchman it is a glory. It may be said: "Why is it a glory? Does it not mean that your church speaks with an uncertain voice?

That you have no standards by which the teaching of your church can be judged?" The answer is that we have standards. Of those we will speak later. But for the moment it is sufficient to say that the test is to be found in the loyalty of every one of these ministers to what *he* believes to be the teaching of the church of which he is a minister. There can be no other test which does not become a tyranny. The conclusion hastily drawn that because they do not all look at the question from the same angle one must be wrong is not justified by the facts. The truth is, that just because the Episcopal Church has held to the tradition of the English Church and has tried to make a home for men of various opinions, there must be found in its standards differences which each is justified in emphasizing. The time may come when a minister or layman—and there is no doctrine for one that is not binding upon the other—comes to the conclusion that he cannot conscientiously continue in the ministry or membership of a church which does not emphasize exclusively that aspect of truth which he believes to be of vital importance. In this case he must withdraw. I do not believe there will be found any man in the ministry of the Episcopal Church who is ministering at its altars or preaching from its pulpits who does not believe that he is in thorough loyalty to the church which he represents. But this must be decided by each man for himself. No man's loyalty is to be judged by another's conscience. "Does not this lead to confusion?" I believe it leads to catholicity of spirit. The spirit of comprehension predicates differences of opinion and at the same time recognizes that the true bond of union is loyalty to the church, which is wiser and greater than the individual.*

* An analogous spirit, also inherited from England, is found in our political life, where the minority peacefully submits to the decision of the majority, because subconsciously they recognize that the judgment of the whole people may be trusted to do what is right. See "Character and Opinion in the United States," George Santayana, p. 197.

Is not such a church greatly needed in this country, where the scoffing criticism that we "have but one soup and a hundred religions" is not without force? Emerson says that "Protestantism began by establishing many churches in which each man has had his own pew, and that it may end in every man having his own church"! It is to this we are tending. And that means that we are tending to the end of all churches. The only possible way in which religious men can be held together is by substituting loyalty to Christ for theological agreement.

Such a church is greatly needed. No one of the existing churches can supply that particular need. Each has some contribution to make to the ideal American Church, but the one which has done more than any other to allow the widest interpretation of the standard to which all are loyal cannot be absorbed into the general religious life of the country without loss to the religious life of the community until this principle has been recognized and applied. Every church is suffering for this lack of comprehension. The children of fathers and mothers whose early religious impressions were gained in a Ptolemaic universe cannot worship in a church which satisfies their parents, for they are living in the universe discovered by Darwin, unless it is understood that the widest liberty of individual interpretation is not only tolerated but also welcomed.

For these two reasons it seems to me that the Episcopal Church should be kept intact until these things have been accepted as truisms in the religious life of America.

But if, on the other hand, those who are now members of the Episcopal Church take the other path and say, "We alone have a ministry that is valid; we have a privilege that no other church can claim," then, in my judgment—and I believe it would be the judgment of Paul and the judgment of Jesus—we shall be in danger of a dreadful disease: the hardening of the arteries of human sympathy, accompanied by excessively high ecclesiastical blood-pressure.

But if we say to ourselves and to others, "We have no exclusive privilege, but we have great and unique advantages, which by the grace of God we will hold in trust for the church of the future, which will mean a better nation, a better church, and a better world," we shall have accomplished the purposes of God, and done our part to make men and women of the English-speaking race a nobler power in the future than they have been in the past. Then may be seen that ideal American Church which in the large spirit of comprehension becomes the servant of the world.

It is not a pleasant thing to be told, but it is well that Episcopalians should be reminded, that many of their brethren of other churches feel that the weakness of the Episcopal Church lies in what they believe to be a lack of loyalty to Christ. Indeed, that is what they believe constitutes the difference between high and low churchmen. The latter they think of as more "evangelical" than the others. I feel that I can speak with a certain authority on this question, because my early training was entirely among high churchmen, and people who more faithfully endeavored to follow the "footsteps of that most blessed life," I do not think could be found in any company of Christians.

I believe the misapprehension is due to a confusion on the part of "evangelicals" in all the churches between personal devotion to the Jesus of the gospels and loyalty to Christ. It is due to this that it is often supposed that members of the Episcopal Church have transferred from Jesus to the church the devotion which is his due. But this I believe to be due to a misunderstanding of the churchman's conception of the church. He does not consider the church as the rival of Jesus, but as the manifestation of his spirit. He feels that in being obedient to the tradition of the church he is following the footsteps of our Lord. Here, I think, we find the dividing line between the

Anglican and the German Church historians. Such a great scholar and teacher as Harnack seems to think that after the days of the primitive church there was a falling away, and that the true escape from the power of the "secular" is to be found in a "return to Jesus." How different is this from the teaching of the late Prof. A. V. G. Allen, who followed the Anglican tradition! To him the development of the church's history was not a lapse into the secular, but rather an evolution under the guidance of the spirit of God, which is the spirit of Christ. To those who so read history, while they must admit that there have been sad departures from the spirit of the Master, the way to enter into his spirit is not by a return to the past—ever an impossibility, and therefore an undesirable thing to seek—but by the fuller understanding of the leading of the same spirit as it is manifested in the continuous progress of the church. The "Continuity of Christian Thought" is more than a happy title to a most instructive book; it is also a summary of a vital philosophy of history. If the spirit of Christ is being manifested in the church, then loyalty to the church is loyalty to Christ.

But it may be asked: "Is the spirit of Christ being manifested in the churches?" If not, then of course there is no reason why any devout Christian should continue in their communion. But it has already been admitted that the spirit of Jesus is seen in the lives of men and women in every communion. "Yes," it will be said, "but this spirit is the result of the individual communion of the soul with the Master." This is true. But it is not the whole truth. It has been forgotten that "No man liveth to himself." We are individuals, but we are more than individuals. We are a part of the past which has made us what we are. No man can understand the influence of Jesus who does not know more than his own individual experience has revealed. "I am a part of all that I have met." That is a truth which the Anglican and Roman communions have

emphasized more than the Protestant churches as a whole. I am far from denying that in this there has too often been a failure to develop the life of the individual soul by fresh communion with Jesus, and for that reason it is important that the Protestant churches, which have held so tenaciously to that vital truth, should not perish from the earth. But, on the other hand, if that individual experience be not supplemented and enlarged by what we call the historic consciousness, there will be inevitably a shrinkage of the content of religion, and it will have no appeal to those who are beginning to understand, as never before was possible, what a wonderful thing the Church of the Living God is.

The Episcopal Church has maintained this historic consciousness by the perpetuation of the ancient rites and ceremonies and the constant use of those forms of worship which have come down from ancient times. For this reason, too, it is loath to give up the expression of its living faith as it was expressed in days when men thought differently from what they do to-day of the world, of man, and of God.

It may be said: "All this is far more true of the Roman Catholic Church than of any Protestant church." This may be admitted without in any way derogating from the glory of the Anglican communion. The Roman Catholic Church has indeed kept to the tradition of the fathers, but it has not only lacked discrimination and so embodied in the tradition much that is alien to the spirit of Christ; it has also laid such undue emphasis upon the organization as to obscure if not destroy the spontaneity of the individual soul. There is a truth in the much-condemned "Via Media" which needs to be recognized to-day. The question is not between Rome and Geneva, the question is between autocracy and democracy. Either carried to its logical conclusion becomes a curse to mankind. The liberty that finds its highest expression in service is the ideal for which the world longs.

This has been the ideal of the Anglican communion, and it believes that it can only be obtained by the union of the wide experience of the past guiding and inspiring the individual experience of the present. To hold the balance even is no more easy here than in other departments of life. And it may well be that in the Anglican communion the individual soul has been sometimes overlooked in the endeavor to reproduce a sense of the corporate communion. It, then, is not true, as is sometimes supposed, that the Episcopal Church is indifferent to the devotion of the soul to Christ, but, rather, that its emphasis has been laid upon the larger communion.

If this be true, then it will be seen that the Episcopal Church does not think of the church as the rival of Christ, but rather as a potent—though by no means exclusive—means of full communion with him.

Until that is recognized there can, I think, be no real understanding of the reason for its insistence upon the perpetuation of its doctrine, discipline, and worship. To the consideration of these we will now turn, not in the conventional order in which they have been just named, but in the order which may make clearer what it is in each that we value.

The decision of our fathers to follow the Church of England so far as possible in a republic freed from all interference by the state met with a serious difficulty in perpetuating the ministry of the English Church. Before 1787 there had been no bishops in America, and every minister of the Church of England in the colonies had been obliged to seek ordination in England. How great the difficulties were the records of travel in those days reveal. Besides the "peril by water," the expense was almost prohibitive. As a result many of the clergy had come out from England, with all the prejudices which one would expect from men trained in the great universities and now thrown into a land, as it seemed to them, but half civilized. The piety

of the mother church at that time was at a low ebb, and some of the men who came out to minister in the new land were those who could obtain no benefice at home.* The wonder is not that there should have been unworthy ministers, but that the English Church should have survived at all. What appeal could such men make to the youth of this land? And how could they compete with the ministers of other churches who had been trained in the native colleges and were filled with an enthusiasm for the new republic and had a profound faith in the people whom they knew and loved? Moreover, not only were the ministers of the English Church at a disadvantage, but the laity were without the full administration of the rites of their church. No children could be confirmed, with the result that many were never admitted to the communion, and those who were admitted were often lacking in that serious preparation which would fit them to undertake the responsibilities of their membership.

How great must have been the temptation to follow the example of Wesley and appoint overseers who would guide the flock in the wilderness! How practical must it have seemed to the "man in the street" to accept the suggestion of Benjamin Franklin that he and John Adams should consecrate Dr. Seabury! How strong must have been the repugnance to seek favors from a church which had so shamefully neglected its children who were scattered abroad! The reference, in the Preface to the Prayer-Book, to the "long continuance of the nursing care and protection" of the Church of England must seem to be either an example of biting irony or else an imitation of the fulsome and insincere flattery of the Preface to the King James version of the Bible. But Bishop White, while not without a sense of humor, was not the man to

* Those who do not care to read more serious histories may turn to Thackeray's "The Virginians" for a picture of the English Church in the colonies immediately before the Revolution.

indulge in such subtlety as irony, and was too honest to flatter any man. The truth is, the "nursing care" had not been altogether lacking, but it had been provided, not by the bishop of London, to whose diocese the colonial churches were officially assigned, but by the missionary spirit of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. "Queen Anne's Bounty" and some communion services given by one of the Georges had a certain material value, but the spiritual gifts were the offerings of a voluntary society, without which the English Church in this land would have perished.

"Why, then," it may be asked, "were our fathers so solicitous to perpetuate the ministry of the Church of England when they might have followed the example of those who set up a new form of civil government?" No doubt the first reason was that they desired to perpetuate the ministry with which those who were already members of the church were familiar, and also, as has been already pointed out, they were desirous of continuing in the new land the church which had been a unifying force in the old. Of course those who hold to the exclusive theory of the episcopate will see in this an indication of the overruling Providence which insured the one true ministry to this nation! But we are dealing not with theories but with the facts of history. So far as we can discover, Bishop White and his fellow laborers held no such exclusive view of the ministry.* In the Preface to the Prayer-Book they simply claim for themselves the same liberty as was enjoyed by "the different religious denominations of Christians in these States . . . to model and organize their respective churches and forms of worship and discipline in such manner as they might judge most convenient for their future prosperity."

* That Bishop White seriously contemplated an abandonment of the Episcopacy is well known. See "The Holy Communion in Great Britain and America," J. Brett Langstaff.

Our fathers then determined to perpetuate the ministry of the English Church because they deemed it "convenient" so to do. Unquestionably, there were men in the English Church at that time who believed that no ministry save the Episcopal was in accordance with God's will, just as there were probably to be found as late as the nineteenth century men who held to the nonjurors' belief in the divine right of kings. But they were the exceptions. Tillotson, Bishop Butler, and Paley were the representatives of the prevailing opinion in the English Church in the eighteenth century, and they would have repudiated such a theory. They also believed in episcopacy because it was "convenient" or expedient.

So much for the reasons which led our fathers to insist upon a ministry which was apparently opposed to the democratic spirit of their day. They were subconsciously influenced by the tradition of the English Church, as the framers of the federal Constitution were influenced by the tradition of the political life of the English people.

To this tradition we must now turn if we would know why to many thoughtful Christians the Episcopal ministry seems to have a value for this day and country. In this I shall not argue nor shall I quote authorities. The opinions expressed are the result of many years of study, and those who are interested will find the authorities open to them as to every student of the history of the church.

# CHAPTER X

## THE EVOLUTION OF THE MINISTRY

In the Epistle to the Ephesians St. Paul says: "He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens that he might fill all things; and he gave some to be apostles and some evangelists and some pastors and teachers for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." It will be noted that in this description of the ministry as it existed in his day the apostle says that it was one of the "gifts" which followed the ascension of Christ. What we understand by this somewhat unfamiliar language is not that the ministry was settled in a permanent form by Jesus when he walked with his disciples on the earth, but was the result of the influence of the spirit of Christ, which led to the establishment of a ministry which was found suitable for the upbuilding of the church and making men good. These men were not "officials." They were what they were because each had some particular "gift" or aptitude for the particular work to which he felt himself called. One man showed that he had the "apostolic" gift. When the word "apostle" is used today we are apt to think of one of the Twelve whom Jesus appointed, whom he called apostles or ambassadors. They were to go forth and bear witness to the fact that the king had come, and that all who would be saved must obey the law of the kingdom of God; just as William the Conqueror sent his ambassadors to the Saxon thanes, bidding all to come and "lay their hands in his" and work loyally with him for the building up of a true kingdom of England. After the death of Judas, we read that the Eleven came together to choose one to take the place of the traitor.

We are told that the reason they did this was that they felt it necessary that there should be twelve to carry on the work to which the Master had called them. There is no hint that this was the ordination of a minister, still less that the Eleven had in mind to perpetuate a "succession"; on the contrary, we are told that their purpose was to complete what might be called the twelve witnesses, the representatives of the Twelve Tribes. They said that those only should be considered who had been familiar with the ministry of Jesus from the preaching of John the Baptist until "he was taken up." Two such men were found. They did not "elect" one of them; they cast lots, and "the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered among the eleven apostles." Probably the Eleven laid hands upon him, but no mention is made of it if they did. These men were not in any sense "officials"; they were witnesses to the ministry and resurrection of Jesus. In the nature of the case they could have no "successors."

But by the time of Paul the name "apostle" was being given to others who had never seen Jesus, and therefore could not be numbered among the Twelve, though they were carrying on the work for which the Twelve had been originally chosen. As the Twelve had been sent forth by Jesus to declare that the king, in the person of Jesus, was now among men, so the new "apostles" were going forth to declare that Christ the king of glory was as truly in human life as Jesus had been in Palestine. They were not the ambassadors of Jesus as the Twelve had been, but "ambassadors of Christ." Some of these men had not seen the Twelve as had Paul, though he is emphatic in stating that he had not been ordained by them. The only ordination Paul had received was from Christ himself. In other words, he had received the apostolic "gift." So had many others, most of whom are scarcely now known by name, such as Junius and Andronicus as well as Barnabas. The latter can never be forgotten, and the significance

of his "gift" has been kept alive in the Prayer-Book by the beautiful Collect for St. Barnabas Day, written in 1549:*

"O Lord God Almighty, who did endue thy holy Apostle Barnabas with singular gifts of the Holy Ghost; leave us not, we beseech thee, destitute of thy manifold gifts, nor yet of grace to use them always to thy honour and glory; through Jesus Christ our Lord."

But Paul had more than the ambassadorial gift; he was first known as the "chief speaker," but later he showed that he had pre-eminently the love of organization—which later was called "government." He not only converted individuals, he organized his converts into local congregations or churches. So it came to pass that the gift of organization became the characteristic of an apostle even more than the gift of preaching. Paul was soon surpassed by Apollos as a preacher.

Then began that process of differentiation which is the sign of progress. Men were found with a special gift for preaching but with no peculiar "executive ability" as we say to-day. These were called "prophets." Others could neither organize nor preach but they were gifted with a marvellous memory. They remembered what they themselves had heard the Lord say, or they could accurately report what they had been told by those who had been the eye-witnesses of the wonderful works of Jesus. These were the "evangelists." Some were oral reciters, others committed to writing what they had gathered, and so preserved the tradition which was later to be worked into its present form by those whom we call evangelists *par excellence*—Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Some read of this gift of ministry and identify it with the revivalist. Nothing could be more different. The "evangelist" did not "cause his voice to be heard in the street"; he was a

* See "The Teacher's Prayer-Book," by Bishop Barry, p. 203, where Barnabas is called "The Apostle of the Holy Ghost."

shy and retiring person. But what do we not owe to him! It is to these gifted men that we owe the stories of the Gospels. One remembered or reported the account of those who had heard Jesus tell the story of the Good Samaritan; another told the story of the Prodigal Son.

Besides those whose gifts were extraordinary there were men who seemed to have no gift. They were not business men like the organizing apostles; not preachers like the prophets; they had no great memory and were without literary gifts; they were the "weak things" which God chose to do the great work of the ministry. These undistinguished men had nothing to offer but a loving heart. They became "pastors," the tender shepherds of the flock. They gathered the little ones and made the way of Jesus seem easy to them; they comforted those in sorrow and strengthened those who laid down their lives in the days of persecution. Like their Master they "gathered the lambs in their bosom and gently led those that were with young."

And, lastly, there were men who had none of the gifts so far enumerated, but were men of unusual intellectual ability. These men became "teachers." Much of this teaching must have been monotonous in the extreme. Many of the new converts could not read and had to be taught the principles of the doctrine of Christ: "Line upon line, here a little and there a little." The Lord's Prayer must have been one of the first things taught; then the stories of the Old and New Testament, specially the Sermon on the Mount; and then in time some simple statement of those "things which were most firmly believed"—a "form of sound words." These teachers were the forerunners of that notable band of scholars, whose "successors" are in every church.

This earliest ministry, in which is found neither bishop, priest, nor deacon, is technically known as the ministry of gifts. These men were not officials; they were not a caste;

they were not "clergymen"; they were the representatives of that spontaneous enthusiasm which followed from the conviction that the Lord who had died was alive again and was in communion with those who were willing to obey him.

Any heathen philosopher, detached from this enthusiastic movement, might have foretold that this could not continue. It did not. But the miracle is that the church should have been able to pass from this spontaneous ministry to an official ministry without losing entirely the glory of the first. That this was done is due to the spirit of Christ working through the mighty personality of Paul.

Very early, however, in the history of the church, as we see from the Epistles to the Corinthians, a protest was made against the new "apostles." It was being claimed that they only might be called apostles who had been sent forth by Jesus himself or had been commissioned by the Twelve at Jerusalem. Against this Paul vehemently protested. The ministry, he said, is not from man but from God direct, and its credentials are to be found in the work which it is able to do. Is a prophet able to bring souls to Christ? Then he is a minister of Christ. Is an apostle able to establish churches in which the name of Christ is glorified and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is celebrated to the edification of the body of Christ? Then such an one is an apostle, even though he has not seen Jesus in the flesh nor received "letters" from the church in Jerusalem.*

Our sympathies are so entirely with Paul in this controversy that perhaps we have failed to do justice to "those at Jerusalem." It may be that there was far more than Bauer and other writers of the Tübingen school have seen

* Phillips Brooks once said: "Bishop Meade did not make me a minister; he authorized me to exercise my ministry in the Episcopal Church."

in this conflict. It may well be that the Twelve at Jerusalem who had never known the enthusiasm of those who preached to the Gentiles felt that the day would come when this early enthusiasm would begin to wane, and that it would be necessary to have "officials" to carry on the work begun by the ministry of "gifts."* At any rate, that is what did actually take place. When the church, under the leadership of Paul, passed over into Europe, and its numbers increased in a marvellous way, and men and women who had never had the training of the Jew nor of the proselyte were drawn to the Saviour; when Greeks, with their experience of local independence, were formed into congregations, organization now became as important for the welfare of the church as "gifts" had been at the beginning. A well-articulated organization was ready to the hand of the church prepared by the Roman Empire.† So the earlier ministry of which St. Paul spoke in writing to the Ephesians gave way to a new ministry, equally divine. We hear now of "apostles, prophets, teachers, miracles, gifts of healing, helps, *governments*, diversities of tongues." Still later we find an unknown writer speaking of those who "resist governments" and "speak evil of dignitaries" as the enemies of the Lord.

With the increase of members came a gradual cooling of the early enthusiasm, and so a new problem presented

* A conflict not unlike that between the apostles to the Gentiles and "those at Jerusalem" arose when Wesley inaugurated his revival in the English Church. Latitudinarians, like the great and wise Archbishop Tillotson, were suspicious of an "enthusiasm" which violated all the conventionalities of the established church. This does not mean that men like Tillotson and the author of "The Whole Duty of Man" were irreligious men, but simply that they valued the tradition which they had inherited. See Lecky's "History of England in the Eighteenth Century," vol. II, pp. 560–561.

† Headlam may be right in saying that the episcopate originated in Asia Minor, in which case it probably arose earlier than I am inclined to think. But Asia Minor was a part of the Roman Empire—the model on which the church founded its organization.

itself to the church. The difficulty now was not so much to make converts as to keep those already made faithful. How was that to be done? If there were not enough men endowed with the "gifts" which at the first were the proof of their ministry, what was to take their place? What would we not give for some record of what the men who succeeded Paul and his first disciples said of this matter! We have no such record, and therefore are compelled by the exercise of a sympathetic imagination to guess what took place. In this there is, of course, danger of mistake. But it is the only path open to us, and as we follow it it seems to lead to an understanding of the evolution of the church which we can gain in no other way. We venture, then, to say that what probably took place was something like this: Good and wise men said to themselves: "The church must be organized. An official ministry must take the place of the early unofficial ministry of the 'charismata.'" Whether it was as deliberate as we have suggested or not, the fact remains that this is what did happen. The empire was organized, with its representative in each village and district. Each city had its *Decurion*, and over them was a *consular* in charge of a large district called a *diocese*. Then the empire was divided into four divisions, over each of which presided a *præfect*, who in turn owed obedience to the emperor himself.* The church followed the path of least resistance. The "pastor" now became the "elder" of the local congregation. The "teacher" became the schoolmaster, developing finally into such university lecturers as Origen and Clement at Alexandria. The "prophet" continued to be what he had always been, a preacher. But it is significant of the deadening influence of institutionalism that the prophet tends more and more to disappear. The evangelist became the chronicler or scribe, and the apostle assumed the name given first to the

* See Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. XVII.

presbyter, and became known as the bishop *par excellence*;* he no longer remained in the local church, but became the overseer of the district in which there were many churches, as the *consular* was overseer of many towns.

This is the point at which the Episcopalian would be glad to have had the evolution pause. But having appealed to Cæsar, the church in its organization had to go to Cæsar. The diocesan bishop could no more retain his independence than the *præfect* could be independent of the emperor. The larger divisions of the empire had their *præfects* and the church followed its example and placed archbishops or metropolitans over the dioceses. Here is the point at which the English Church paused. But the last step had to be taken, and the evolution on the lines of the empire ended in the pope.

* "The public functions of religion were solely intrusted to the established ministers of the church, the *bishops* and *presbyters*—two appellations which, in their first origin, appear to have distinguished the same office and the same order of persons. The name of presbyter was expressive of their age, or, rather, of their gravity and wisdom. The title of bishop denoted their inspection over the faith and manners of the Christians who were committed to their pastoral care. But the most perfect equality of freedom requires the directing hand of a superior magistrate; . . . and the order of public deliberations soon introduces the office of a president (and) induced the primitive Christians an honorable and perpetual magistry. . . . It was under these circumstances that the lofty title of bishop began to raise itself above the humble appellation of presbyter. . . . The advantages of the episcopal form of government, which appears to have been introduced before the end of the first century, were so obvious, and so important for the future greatness as well as the present peace of Christianity, that it was adopted without delay by all the societies which were already scattered over the empire. . . .

"Such was the mild and equal constitution by which Christians were governed more than a hundred years after the death of the apostles. Every society formed within itself a separate and independent republic. . . . Towards the end of the second century the churches of Greece and Asia adopted the useful institution of synods . . . and the Catholic Church soon assumed the form and acquired the strength of a great federative republic."—Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. XV.

If this be a true account of the evolution of the organization of the church, the question naturally arises: "Why should the bishops have been called the successors of the apostles?" They are the "successors of the apostles," but not of the Twelve! The Twelve, as we have seen, were chosen for a particular purpose and could in the nature of things have no "successors." But the "apostles" of whom Paul speaks and of whom he was one were the organizers and overseers of the churches which they founded. When, then, in the new or more developed organization overseers were appointed, they not unnaturally took the title of "apostles."

By some this will be objected to because it is a "natural" explanation of a divine institution. But they will be only those who feel that the more "natural" a thing is, the less divine it must be. To such the only sacred history can be that of the Jews. The marvellous story of man's pilgrimage cannot have for them the significance that it has for those who, with Paul, believe that God "hath made all nations of men to dwell on the earth, that they might seek after him and find him." But to those who know this, the organization of the church is no less divine because it followed the path already blazed by the Roman Empire, than is Paul's journey to Rome because he followed the roads already built.

But now look at it in the other way and call it "supernatural." It is equally true so to do. It was the spirit of God which was guiding the hearts of his faithful people as truly now as in the days when the presence of that spirit had been shown by the power to "speak with tongues." This activity of the spirit is what is called in one of the collects "the Divine Providence." This we believe is what led the church to follow the example of the empire and build an organization which enabled it to minister to the whole body of Christ throughout the world.

But the Catholic may object: "If this be admitted, how

can you choose the point in this evolution at which you will pause and say, 'Thus far the spirit of God guided the church, but at that point it was left to itself'? And if you do not do that, how can it be maintained that the papacy is not as truly the gift of the spirit as is the presbytery or the episcopate?" I do not believe that any such position is tenable. I believe that the papacy is as truly divine as is episcopacy or presbytery. But as the "gift" of tongues has ceased, having done its work, so the "gift" of the papacy may cease without loss to the church.

With this in mind we can see what the real objection to the papacy is, and how essential to the welfare of the church the rebellion against its tyranny became. As long as the Holy Roman Empire was thought to be the final form of human society—as Dante thought it to be—the papacy was accepted as a divine institution.* But every organization has a tendency to become autocratic, and fatal as this is to political liberty, it is still more fatal to spiritual liberty. When it was found that that which once had been the servant of the spirit was now the enemy of the saints, the great revolution came. Because the organization had become, to use modern terms, "full of graft," the "independents," in revolting against the "machine," took advantage of their liberty to reorganize the church in the way that they believed would better serve the purpose of God in their day than the old organization could do.

There are many angles from which the Reformation may be viewed. It may be thought of as a religious—that is, ecclesiastical, theological, or moral reformation; to others it is interesting as an economic or social development; or, finally, it may be treated as the political dis-

* But, on the other hand, it is to be remembered that from the days of the Franciscans to Wycliff there were continual protests against the papacy, many of them identifying it with the anti-Christ of St. John the Divine. See "Studies in the Apocalypse," R. H. Charles.

solution of the Holy Roman Empire. There is much to be said for each of these ways of writing history. But he who fails to see that it was primarily the seeking of a thirsty soul for the living God, fails to enter into the secret of the human spirit. That it was a political movement no student of the time would deny. But the political results were by-products of the religious emancipation. The word "Protestant" was, of course, primarily a political term. It was the expression of the "State rights" theory of government, a protest against the centralizing power of the empire. It was the first step in the "nationalism" which was the necessary successor to the imperial rule. The German reformers believed that there could be no religious liberty which was not guarded by the state, and as the imperial state was bound up with the papacy they uttered their political protest. When that step had been taken and the followers of the Reformed religion were protected, the establishment of national churches was the next logical step.

Each of the churches of the Reformation reverted to one of the forms of that early ministry of which Paul had spoken in the Epistle to the Ephesians. The Lutheran Church exalted the "pastor." The Zwinglian churches chose the "teacher" as their model minister. But the English Church said: "We will retain the 'apostle' or bishop or overseer." Which of them was right? They were all right! Each had the same right to reorganize the church as they had to reorganize the state. This can be denied only by those who are obsessed with the belief that there can be but one form of church government which was ordained by Christ himself. The churches reverted to the ministry of gifts which had preceded the ministry of organization, and each had an undoubted right to be ministered to by that one which seemed best fitted to edify the body of Christ in the community in which they dwelt. This was the judgment of all the reformers at the begin-

ning. None of the Reformed churches questioned the validity of the ministry of any other until a later date when controversy had succeeded to co-operation.

That this was the feeling of the leaders of the English Reformation every student of the period knows. The English Church retained the historic ministry that it had received from the early days of Christianity, but never indicated that it felt that in so doing it had the only ministry approved by Christ. It admitted to its pulpits and altars men who had only Lutheran, Zwinglian, or Calvinistic ordination. For a hundred years after the separation from Rome there were ministers in the English Church, rectors, deans, and teachers of theology who were without Episcopal ordination. Even so late as the time of the Commonwealth, when the Calvinists had set up their claim to an exclusive ministry, such a high churchman as Bishop Cosin advised the English refugees in Paris to receive the communion at the hands of the Huguenot pastors.

To those who do not look below the surface, this diversity of ministration seems to have been the disruption of the unity of the church. Yet, as a matter of fact, the spiritual unity of the churches had never been closer. There were political and theological disputes among the different churches, but the essential value of each was recognized, and the English Church held communion with the sister churches of Frankfort and Zürich and Geneva as it does to-day with the Episcopal churches of the colonies and of America. It was not until the restoration of Charles II that Episcopal ordination was required as necessary for ministering in the churches of England.

The English Church, then, retained the "apostolic" ministry, but recognized the "pastoral" and the "teaching" as of equal validity.

This, as I say, is familiar to students of the Reformation, but it ought to be more familiar than it is to those who call themselves "good churchmen," and who yet have

never taken the trouble to read the Thirty-nine Articles, in which the opinion of the English reformers is set forth. If we turn to the article which defines the church, we shall not find one word as to the necessity of the episcopate. "The visible church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance, in the things that of necessity are requisite to the same." *

The same liberal spirit breathes through the article which deals with the ministry. "It is not lawful for any man to take unto him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyards." †

On this, as has been said, the English Church rested until the restoration of Charles II, acknowledging that Lutheran, Zwinglian, and Huguenot ministers had all been "lawfully called and sent, . . . by men who (had) public authority given unto them in the Congregation." Then there was a change of policy, which changed the Church of England into a church of Episcopalians. This is expressed in the Preface to the Ordinal.‡ "It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests, and deacons. Which offices were evermore held in such reverent estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, and examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public prayer, with the imposi-

* Article XIX. † Article XXIII.

‡ Book of Common Prayer, p. 509.

tion of hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority. And, therefore, to the intent that these orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed *in this church,* no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon *in this church,* or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, and examined, and admitted thereto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had Episcopal consecration or ordination." (Italics mine.)

It is in the last line that the change of polity is expressed. Till this time, as has been said, men had been counted lawful ministers "in this church" who had not received "Episcopal consecration or ordination."

It would take more space than can be given here to show how this change was brought about. But two things may be noted: first, this was the result of the inevitable reaction from the tyranny of the Commonwealth, under which those who had received Episcopal ordination were persecuted and the Prayer-Book suppressed. But there was a deeper cause than this. But before considering that, it might be well for us to pause a moment and note, that even in this Preface there is not found one word which claims for the Episcopal ministry more than any student of history would be willing to grant. It is true that "from the apostles' time"—an indefinite period, but very ancient —the ministers afterward enumerated had been found in the church and, therefore, should be highly esteemed. Second, while it is asserted that hereafter "in this church" none who have not received Episcopal ordination shall be permitted to minister, there is no hint that the ministers of other churches were not lawfully called to minister in those churches or that their ministry was less "valid" than the Episcopal. This careful statement was the more remarkable when it is remembered that it was made at the end of a long controversy.

Attention has been called to the fact that at the Ref-

ormation the different churches reverted to that primitive ministry of which St. Paul speaks in his letter to the Ephesians. But there is one great church of which no mention has yet been made. The church of Geneva did not revert to the ministry of "gifts," but to the earliest form of the ministry of officials.

Calvin, who, though he was a layman, had taken preliminary orders in the Roman Church, and had been trained at the Sorbonne—the school in which the spirit of the Middle Ages had been kept alive—went to Geneva to establish his model church in the mediæval spirit. He had a theory and he turned to the New Testament, not to learn but to find arguments and authorities to buttress his theory. Of course he found them. He was convinced that the only ministry which had the approval of the Apostolic Church was that of presbyters. His conclusion was that he who had not the Presbyterian ministry had not that which was approved by the Scriptures, which all the reformers were agreed was to be the rule by which the church was to be tried.

The men of Puritan tendencies who went to Geneva from England during the reign of Mary fell in love with Calvin's logic and returned to England with Calvin's "high church" doctrine of the ministry. It was the Presbyterian who introduced the dogma of "apostolic succession" into the controversies of the English Church, and the result has been most disastrous. These Puritans, as they were called, were not satisfied with the Elizabethan settlement, and wished to make a revolution which would change the polity of the English Church from Episcopal to Presbyterian, which, at the same time, would have changed it from a comprehensive to a sectarian church.

That the English Church was saved from this calamity is due in no small measure to the labors of one of the greatest men the English race has produced: Richard Hooker —to be known as long as the English Church shall last as

the "judicious" Hooker. What Marshall did for the American nation, Hooker did for the English Church. His great work on "ecclesiastical polity" is a classic which every churchman should know. It has the same value as an interpretation of his time as has "The Federalist" in our own history.

Calvin represented the mediæval mind; Hooker represented the scientific mind as truly as did his better-known contemporary, Bacon.

The substance of Hooker's great argument is this: "We should not go to the New Testament to find proof of what we have already determined to be true; we should go to it in a teachable spirit and learn what are the facts. The fact is this: that in the New Testament there is no form of church government so clearly set forth that it is to be followed in all times and places. Therefore, the churches are at liberty to choose such form of government as seems best. The English Church chose to retain the Episcopal, and in so doing did nothing contrary to 'God's word written,' but, on the contrary, followed the ancient custom of the church for fifteen hundred years, and has what is probably the best ministry that could be found." This, he goes on to say, does not imply that those who have another form are without a valid ministry—far from it—though he does believe that while episcopacy is not of the "*esse*," it is of the "*bene esse*" of the church.

How wise and restrained, how filled with the English spirit, which is suspicious of "logic" and the following of a premise *à outrance* in a way so dear to the French mind, and, therefore, to the Frenchman Calvin! Hooker is as utilitarian as Paley and as pragmatic as the latest psychologist, and, therefore, his book is more modern than some written yesterday. This argument, I venture to say, has now the approval of most students of repute. So that the way is open, as it has not been for centuries, for the Reformed churches to reconsider their positions. But the

English and Episcopal churches are still in the trammels of mediævalism, because they forsook the scientific methods of their greatest teacher, and took up with the revived mediævalism of Newman and the Oxford leaders of the early-Victorian era. As a result, there are many members of these churches who believe, and alas! teach, that the "apostolic succession" is part of the doctrine of the church of Hooker!

If it then be true that the different ministries are of equal "validity," the question may seem to be: "Why should any church, and above all the Episcopal Church, lay such stress upon the perpetuation of one of them? Have not each of them shown that it is efficient, and is not that what the apostle said was the purpose of the spirit in giving these 'gifts' of the ministry? Were they not all for the 'upbuilding of the body of Christ'?" I think this is the way in which the question should be approached. It is the true American way of dealing with the problems of history. Does something which has had value in the past "work" to-day? But we must consider the morrow. Will these various ministries be as effective in the future as they undoubtedly have been in the past? I doubt it. And one reason which leads me to doubt it is that they have already largely been merged in another ministry revived in the Reformation period, of which so far no mention has been made.

# CHAPTER XI

## THE FUTURE MINISTRY

As the English Church sought to perpetuate the "apostolic" ministry, and the Lutheran the "pastoral," and the Zwinglian the "teaching," and Calvin the first official, the "Presbyterian," so the Anabaptists revived the "prophetic." The "prophets" of Zwickau were far removed from the preachers Paul had in mind, but nevertheless they were preachers who were believed to be filled with the spirit. They tended indeed to take the form of Old Testament prophets rather than of New Testament preachers, and seemed to be more interested in social reorganization than in the cultivation of "love, joy, and peace." But this was a temporary form of the movement. When it passed from Germany to England it became more sober and intelligent. It did indeed sometimes "revert to type" as, for instance, in the extravagances of the Latter-day Saints in the time of the Commonwealth, and met the scorn of the pragmatic Cromwell, but it profoundly affected the religious life of England both in the Baptist and Independent or Congregational churches. But it was not until it passed over to America that the Anabaptist movement showed the vitality which its long-forgotten truth enshrined. It is not too much to say that the "prophetic" ministry revived by the Anabaptist movement has triumphed in America. One proof of this—and many more could be produced—is found in the fact that in more than one of the prominent Presbyterian churches the Presbyterian ministry has given place to the Congregational and Baptist without either protest or loss in spiritual life.

These men are true prophets, and it is a shame that the Episcopal Church compels its children who wish to hear their message to leave their own churches for that purpose. Its own pulpits should be open to them. But while we gladly acknowledge the glory of this ministry, and believe it to be an essential element in the edification of the church, we do not believe that it is well adapted to the work which is opening up before the Reformed churches in a republic as great in extent and population as that of the Roman Empire. We believe that it would be a loss to the religious life of the republic to have the "apostolic" ministry absorbed, as the "pastoral" and Presbyterian ministry are apparently being absorbed in the "prophetic." We gladly acknowledge the beauty and power of the prophetic ministry, but we must also recognize its limitations, unsupplemented and unregulated by the apostolic.

For I believe that the task before the churches of this land to-day is not unlike that which the early church was called upon to meet in the conversion of the Roman Empire. As long as the church confined its ministrations to the great centres—like Antioch and Ephesus—the prophetic ministry was the leading and more important one. Thus, we read in the Acts that "there were in the church at Antioch certain *prophets* and teachers"; and that "as they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas [one of the prophets] and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." This new work was not prophetic but apostolic.

Now look at the life of the churches in this land. We find that most of the great prophets are in the large cities. It cannot be otherwise. The small town or village does not offer the field for their activity. What then is the condition of the small town which cannot enjoy the prophetic ministry? Every minister is supposed to be a prophet or preacher, and is judged by that. His people now journey to the great cities where the preachers speak to large crowds

every Sunday, and his own little church seems in comparison a paltry thing. We need not repeat here what has already been said of the condition of the Protestant churches in the small towns.* Can a prophet do his best work in such an atmosphere? The Roman Catholic Church is filled to the doors not once nor twice only each Sunday. I recognize that there are motives which lead Roman Catholics to church which we neither can nor wish to employ; but, when all is said, there must be some reason why Christian people should flock to one kind of service and seek to escape from the other. May not one reason be found in the fact that we are attempting to do work with tools which are not fitted for the purpose? I am inclined to think that this may be in part the cause of the lamentable state of many of the country churches. The minister is supposed to be a preacher and he is not. He might be somewhere else, but he cannot be there. No minister who recognizes the failures of his own ministry would willingly point out the failures of another. But as I have listened to some of these pathetic efforts to "prophesy," when I have seen the restlessness of the children, the indifference of the young —not many of them present indeed—and the patience of the old, whose experience of life has been so much richer than that of the preacher, I have wondered why any one goes to church! I may have been unfortunate, but I regret to say that the chief burden of the sermons to which I have listened has been the evils of intemperance or the use of tobacco; both of them, no doubt, subjects which should be judiciously touched on from time to time, but a meagre fare for the hungry sheep!

The "prophet" plays a subordinate part in the Catholic Church. Only an occasional sermon is preached, yet, in their own way, there is brought to the worshippers the conviction that the living God is among them to judge, to comfort, and to bless.† Moreover, the priest is not

* See above, Chapter IV.

† See below, Chapter XV.

simply an "official" ministering at the altar; he is also a pastor dealing with the people through the confessional. In spite of the dreadful abuse of the confessional in the Roman Catholic Church, not a few earnest Protestants are beginning to recognize that nothing is more needed for the welfare of Protestant churches than a revival of the "pastoral" ministry—the bringing of the minister into such personal touch with the individual as will enable him to counsel and comfort individual troubled souls. If the prophet be a prophet, indeed, he can make me feel, more than I have ever felt in the cathedrals of Italy or France or Spain, the presence of God. But I do not feel it in the average American country church, and I have no reason to believe any one else does.

"But," it may now well be said, "has the Episcopal ministry better fruit to show in the country towns?" Before I answer that, I should like to say that I do not think that in any of the great *cities* of the land the pulpit of the Episcopal Church is equal in spiritual power to the pulpit of other churches. But in the country I think the Episcopal Church does better work. And the reason is that in the country it is not so dependent upon "prophecy." The sermons in the small churches may not be great, but I believe they are better than in the average church of other names; first, because they are shorter, and, secondly, because as a rule they are more reverent in tone. The little ones have early learned to take part in the service and so do not feel the tension of "sitting still," and the indifferent are interested and, let us hope, instructed by the reading of the Bible, which fills a larger space than in any other form of worship. "Well," it may be said, "this is a defense of the liturgy, but has no bearing on the ministry." It has this bearing, that the ministry of the Episcopal Church, being not exclusively a preaching ministry, is not so limited in its appeal. But indeed the service cannot be separated from the ministry. It is all part of a

whole, and tends to keep alive a consciousness of association with something larger than the local congregation. It is the bishop, the representative in our modern life of the apostolic ministry for which Barnabas and Saul were "separated"; it is the bishop who carries to every little village in the land the greetings not only of the American church, of which the parish is a part; but also the remembrance of that larger church which from the times of the apostles has been ministered to by bishops, priests, and deacons. Every child is reminded at his confirmation that what is done when he is confirmed is in imitation of an apostolic custom. Every communicant is reminded that he is a member not alone of the local church but of a church which, though relatively small in numbers, is growing and increasing in influence, and his life is thereby enlarged. The ministry of the prophet is essentially a local ministry, and needs to be supplemented by the apostolic —universal—organizing ministry.

It may be said that the foregoing is scarcely a true picture of the average country church. I would not assert that it is true of the average church, but I think it is fair to say that it is true of great numbers of the Protestant churches. "Well, even so," it may be answered, "the country church is not so spiritually isolated as you seem to think. It does not have the oversight of a chief pastor—which the democratic spirit of our people does not greatly care for—but it has its own bond of union with the larger church in the periodic revivals which quicken the conscience of the local church." That they so do I should be the last to deny. But, on the other hand, does the revivalist deepen the sense of the universality of the church, or does he intensify the sense of individual responsibility? I do not question the value of so doing, I only ask if it can be said that the revivalist does the same work as does the bishop. Another question arises here: In the early history of the country, when the sense of individual initiative and

the separatist sentiment—especially in the West and in the South, where the revivals were most successful—were strong, the appeal exclusively to the individual was more congenial than it is to-day, when the sense of the unity of the nation is greater and the "social conscience" is being quickened as it has not been for ages, has not the vocation of the revivalist largely ceased? As a sense of the importance of education has deepened, is there not need of some ministry which will impress upon the young that the religious life is a continual growth in grace rather than a sudden conversion, which may soon lose its power? It is upon this that the ministry of the bishop lays stress. Every child confirmed is admitted to the communion—that is, to a lifelong education in truth and righteousness. May not the question then be fairly asked whether a ministry which is in harmony with the two great aims of the country—education and nationality—be worthy of the serious consideration of those who heretofore have thought of it only as a sign of an exclusive claim to a valid ministry? This I believe is the feeling of many serious men who are as far as possible from the heresy of the fiction of the "apostolic" succession.

I am aware that this may be thought an appeal to sentiment and lacking in that practical value which the age demands. This may be, but it ought not to be forgotten that we are a people more filled with sentiment—which we seek to hide under a sort of irony—than any people in the world. But the Episcopal ministry can also be justified on the ground of utility.

No church which is truly comprehensive can dispense with the services of an arbitrator. If there is to be wide difference of opinion among the clergy, there must be some one to whom may be referred questions which trouble the conscience of brethren of the clergy or of the congregation. Such difficulties arise in every church. In the non-Episcocal churches those who are great preachers are allowed

great liberty because the congregation would not lose their services. But in the country church, where the position of the minister is often dependent upon the approval of some influential—which often means rich—member of the congregation, the welfare of the minister and of his family may depend upon the whim of some ignorant man or prejudiced woman. No system can entirely guard against such tyranny. But it is certainly an advantage to the minister to have an arbiter whose judgment, because of his office, carries weight with the laity. Such an one is the bishop. To him every minister has the right to refer any brother clergyman who is offended by his utterances or any parishioner who is of the opinion that his teaching is not sound. How many a layman, who would be happy if he could browbeat his minister if the matter could be kept between themselves, or at most would be known only to the local church which he largely supports, will hesitate to take the matter to the bishop and have the dispute settled by authority. The minister, at his ordination, promises obedience to the godly admonition of his bishop. This does not mean that any whim of the bishop is of divine origin and is to be obeyed. It means that if the judgment of the bishop can be shown to be in accordance with the will of God—and of that the individual minister is the judge—it will be followed. But even if, in the judgment of the individual, the counsel of the bishop though well-meaning is not conclusive, he is at liberty to refuse to follow it, and has his appeal to a court of his brethren. How seldom that happens shows how wisely the bishops as a rule exercise their prerogative. They too are constitutional officers, and must give an account of their work to the laity as well as to the clergy. But even if the minister be convinced that the judgment of his bishop is not the best, unless the question be one of morals, he will be likely to yield his own judgment to that of the bishop for the sake of peace. And this he can do without loss of dignity or

the danger of the imputation of unworthy motives because of the universal respect for the office of the bishop.

But the presumption is that it will be a "godly judgment," first, because as a rule the bishops are mostly chosen because they have shown themselves men of affairs, *i. e.*, men of judgment; and, secondly, because, being removed from the local atmosphere, they are better able to take an impartial view of the question in controversy. This is why there is seldom a public scandal in the Episcopal Church. That is why the clergy are protected from the tyranny of the laity and the congregation saved from the idiosyncrasies of the minister. The system is not ideal, but, like the Constitution, it works. There are foolish bishops, as there are conceited presbyters and bumptious deacons; there are a few, no doubt, who "presume to wear an undeserved dignity . . .," who

> "Do a wilful stillness entertain
> With purpose to be dressed in an opinion,
> Of wisdom, gravity, profound conceit;
> As who should say, 'I am Sir Oracle,
> And when I ope my lips let no dog bark.'"

But these are the exceptions. Taken as a whole, the bishops of the Episcopal Church are as fine a body of men as the country produces. They are unquestionably superior in character and wisdom to the Senate, and compare favorably with the federal judges of the country. To lose this ministry out of our American life might not be a great loss in the cities, but it would be a distinct loss to the country at large.

What is the conclusion of the whole matter? It is this: No one of the historic ministries should be discarded; no one of them should set up a claim to be the exclusive channel of God's grace; each has its place and work in our national life; but I have laid emphasis upon the value of the episcopate because I believe if its utility and senti-

mental value were emphasized, it would make an appeal to many who are now deterred from considering its value because of the unwarranted and exclusive claims which have been made for it. If the Episcopal Church, in the spirit of the great teachers of the English Church, were to say, "The ministry of pastors and prophets and elders is as truly of divine origin as the ministry of apostles," there would be a disposition to consider the wise words of the Prayer-Book: "It is evident to all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors that, from the apostles' time, there have been these three orders of ministers in Christ's church—bishops, priests, and deacons, and therefore they ought to be reverently esteemed"; and we in turn were to say: "It is evident to all men diligently seeing the signs of the times, that other ministries also have been the ministers of Christ, and by them the body of Christ has been and is still being edified"; there would result such a unity of spirit as to open the way for a freer co-operation than is now possible, and, in time, a unification of the forces of the church in such a way that without asking for the reordination of those who have shown themselves the ministers of Christ, the episcopate could obtain such a wide-spread trial as would result in the peace and liberty of the church such as is not otherwise possible. Under the leadership of bishops there might be an evangelization and edification of the religious life of the country churches such as has not been known for centuries, and such an expansion of missionary spirit as would lead to the conversion of the world.

If some one is inclined to ask if one of the other forms of church leadership would not lead to the same result, we need not enter again into the controversies of the past. I am aware that these considerations will have no influence with men who have decided that whatever may be the practical advantages of the episcopate as compared with the presbytery or any other form of church government,

the question should not be approached in this utilitarian spirit. Christ himself ordained the ministry which the church must perpetuate, whether that ministry is successful or not. But this does not show that the argument is weak; it only shows that some men are not open to conviction. They are not open to conviction, not because they are lacking in intelligence or knowledge, but for a deeper spiritual reason of which we shall speak later.* They value the episcopate, not for its practical utility, but for its spiritual necessity. As the value of the drone in the hive is to be judged not by the amount of work which it accomplishes but by its power of fertilizing the queen bee, so these men seem to think that the value of the episcopate is to be estimated by its power of fertilizing the church so as to bring forth priests to celebrate a valid sacrament. The Protestant believes in the virgin birth of the ministry; the Catholic insists that there must be an earthly father. Therefore, tables of genealogy seem to him to be an essential part of the church's gospel.

The problem before the churches in America is in many ways the same as that which confronted the early Christian church. As long as the question was one which concerned the particular locality, one of the ministries mentioned by Paul seemed as well fitted as another to do the work, but when the problem was to Christianize an empire, then the Episcopal form was found essential. I believe it is the same to-day. All the churches in America are essentially local, not to say still colonial, churches, and there is no conception of a national church—that is, no conception of a united body which is able to bring the spirit of God to bear upon our political, economic, educational, and social life. Every prophet is doing what he can in the locality in which he finds himself, but nothing less than the united action of the religious life of America will suffice for the work of regenerating America. No congregational

* See below, Chapter XV.

form of government can in these days serve the need of the nation, any more than the town meeting, valuable as it is in the village, can function in a great city, and still less in a State or throughout the country at large.

If there were in the churches to-day the same spirit of wisdom that inspired our fathers in the days when the nation was called upon to pass from a colonial to a national form of government, a way would be found to substitute for our provincialism a national religious life. The first duty of the Episcopal Church, in this crisis of the church and nation, is to cease its foolish talk about its ministry having an exclusive privilege ordained by Christ himself, while all the others are of man's invention and cannot give the gift of the Holy Ghost. We need to learn what it is our church has stood for from the time of the Reformation till the Oxford movement. Hooker and all the great teachers of the English Church in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries knew the value of the ministry of which they were justly proud, but few of them made the mistake which the men who followed Newman—as far as they dared follow him—made of taking the theory of Calvin, turning it upside down, putting a mitre on the head of the "presiding elder," and saying: "This and this only was ordained by Christ."

I believe that if the true teaching of the English Church would be first learned by our own people and then made known to others, there would be found not a few of our brethren of other churches who would say: "The day has come when the prophetic ministry of this country needs to be supplemented by the apostolic ministry." If that could be done, then we might look forward to the day—perhaps still far distant—when the work which our fathers began, when some of the same men who drew the Constitution of the United States drew the constitution of the Episcopal Church, would be crowned by such co-operation of the churches as would make us a religious nation

instead of a nation with many religious clubs. The men who framed the tabernacle of the Episcopal Church had a vision of a national church, and the day is drawing near when we feel that it is no longer a dream but a necessity.

The Episcopal Church again follows the synthetic method. It seeks to escape from provincialism by its form of government which emphasizes the universality of the church, but on the other hand it is not indifferent either to the country of which it forms a part nor to the democracy in which it believes. It does not balk at the papacy because it is unwilling to take the last step in an evolution which it recognizes; it objects to the papacy because, though it admits that it was the last step in the evolution of the historic ministry, it knows also that the papacy so changed its character that it became not the servant but the tyrant of the church. If it were only a question of consistency which is involved, one might be willing to admit that if the time were to come when the nations of the world would unite in an association which would not destroy the nations forming part of it, it might then be a practical question whether it would not be a feasible and practical thing to have a religious president of the churches, chosen not by a majority of Italian cardinals, but by some body which represented the suffrage of the universal church. It is not the theory of the papacy which is objected to; it is its practical working, which has always been fatal to democracy unless restrained by a large Protestant community.

The church which is to serve America must be an American church. Neither Italian nor English nor Scotch nor Dutch nor German nor Irish. No church at present existing in these United States is fitted to minister to the life of the whole nation. Each has its own contribution to make, and that of the Episcopal Church is not the least.

# CHAPTER XII

## WORSHIP

In the two preceding chapters we have considered the ministry, which in ecclesiastical language is technically known as the "discipline" of the church. An effort was made to show, not that the ministry of the Episcopal Church is the only valid ministry, or that others are without advantages of their own, but rather to point out why, as it seems to some of us, it is a ministry specially adapted to the needs of the present, since it was evolved in a time not unlike our own so far as the problem of the church is concerned.

In the same spirit, I now venture to set forth some of the reasons which lead Episcopalians to lay emphasis on the value of the Book of Common Prayer.

The first is this: they have learned by experience that the surest bond of union is neither doctrine nor discipline, but worship. They do not believe that their method of worship is the only one acceptable to our Heavenly Father, but they do know that it has been helpful to them, and therefore wish that it should be given careful consideration in any worship which the churches might be inclined to recommend as a bond of union.

John tells us that, in his vision, he was permitted to behold the heavenly worship. The "four beasts," which represent the powers of creation, and the "four and twenty elders," the representatives of humanity, join in the praise of the Creator, to whom at the beginning, "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." But this praise of the Creator is now supplemented by the adoration of the Lamb who "has redeemed them out of every kingdom and nation and tribe, and made them

kings and priests unto God." Then, we read, an angel brought forth the "golden censor, full of incense, which are the prayers of saints."

What church can claim to have reproduced that heavenly worship, the characteristics of which are eternal awe and everlasting thankfulness? None can claim to have made its spiritual tabernacle according to the pattern shown in the Mount. Yet may not the Episcopalian modestly say that his fathers, in bequeathing the liturgy which they had received from men of old, have left to his church a jewel which they intended it to keep, not for its own ornament alone, but as an heirloom for the children yet unborn? That is why they are not eager to enter into a "religious trust" without the assurance that that which has a history far more wonderful than those who are not familiar with it would be inclined to suppose, will be given the consideration it deserves. Many believe that even those who are convinced, as many devout men are, that no liturgy can be the final expression of the growing devotion of the church will, if they seriously consider the wonderful history of the Book of Common Prayer, feel that it combines to a great degree those two elements of devotion —awe and thanksgiving—which are the essentials of the ideal worship as seen by John the Divine.

Dr. Huntington used to say that as every man is born either a Platonist or an Aristotelian, so is every man by nature either a liturgist or an extemporanean. There are multitudes of devout people to whom any liturgy is a bondage. They must pray with freedom of spirit, pouring out their hearts to God in the simple language of daily life. And because, in their public worship, they cultivate the habit of extemporary prayer, they have a freedom of utterance seldom attained by those who use exclusively a liturgy. In the ideal church room would be found for both the formal and the free. But because the latter is at present more popular than the former, to abandon the less

well known would be to lose a gift to the church which has been bequeathed by the saints. This surely would be an irreparable loss. But while it must be reluctantly admitted that the exclusive use of a liturgy has been accompanied by a loss of freedom in prayer such as the non-liturgical brethren enjoy, it is not to be supposed that it is admitted that this is the inevitable result of the use of a liturgy. The wide-spread belief that this must be true is one of the reasons why many are loath to consider the power of the Prayer-Book. Yet President Eliot, no extravagant admirer of our liturgy, once told me that he esteemed Phillips Brooks more wonderful in prayer than in preaching. Yet any one who heard him pray must have noted that he usually began with some well-known collect, and, using that as a "taking-off" ground, rose to spiritual heights which few in any church have reached. When Harvard commemorated the sacrifice of her sons in the Civil War, Lowell's "Ode" was forgotten in the splendor of Brooks's matchless prayer* of resignation and hope, even as the rhetoric of Everett was eclipsed by the simple eloquence of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. It will not do to say that this was an eccentricity of Brooks's genius. Genius can indeed be bound by no forms, *but the daily enrichment of the mind by the thoughts of the great,* which he learned by heart, made Lincoln the master of speech he was, and the daily communion with the thoughts and language of the saints gave to Brooks the power of prayer. The children of the Episcopal Church should be the most powerful in prayer. That they are not is due not to the use but to the abuse of the liturgy. It is because they do not use it intelligently but mechanically that it becomes deadening instead of vitalizing. It seems to me, then, that the recalling of some of the simplest facts about what may be called in some respects the most

* For a full account of the effect of this prayer, see "The Life and Letters of Henry Higginson," by Bliss Perry, pp. 237–238.

wonderful book in the English language might be helpful to an understanding of the love that the children of the Anglican communion have for it, and perhaps be a means of its introduction to the notice of those who, possibly through prejudice, have never given it serious consideration.

It was on Whitsunday, June 9, 1549, that there was placed in the hands of the people of England the Prayer-Book, which was more than anything else, except the King James version of the Bible, to affect the religious life of the English-speaking peoples. The first source of its influence was its catholicity. It was compiled from the devotional books of the Roman Catholic Church, with which the people were already familiar—the breviary, the missal, the manual, and the pontifical. These services were now combined in one book and used, the first for daily prayer, the second for the communion, the next for special services, and the last for the office of ordination. For the English Church, in its rejection of the papacy, did not wish to cut itself off from spiritual communion with the saints of the Roman Church, therefore many of the prayers are those which had been gathered together by Pope Gelasius and had been said for centuries in every church. Much that disfigured these books, in the opinion of the reformers, was omitted, but if what was drawn from the Roman books of devotion had been all the book contained, it could not have been the power that it has been in the life of the church. But, indeed, the books as Cranmer used them were not quite the same as those in use on the Continent. The English Church had for generations been semi-independent of Rome, and had what were called its own "uses." Thus Salisbury—the religious centre of the kingdom of Wessex, which Alfred the Great made the nucleus of his larger kingdom—had its own form. York, the see city of the old Northumbrian kingdom, had its "use," and so had Bangor, which was the mother church of those de-

scendants of the early British Church who had been driven into the mountains of Wales, but never quite exterminated. So not only did the new service-book perpetuate the ancient tradition, it also became the spiritual cement of the kingdoms which had at last found their political union under the leadership of the Tudors. But even yet the whole story has not been told. The Church of France had not received the gospel originally from Rome, but from the East, perhaps from the Church of Ephesus. From Asia Minor had come pilgrims to the mouth of the Rhone, and gradually the tradition of the Eastern churches had followed the stream to Lyons, and then overland to Paris, and so through Normandy had come into England. Thus there came to the new service ancient prayers from the venerable liturgies of the East. Thus the closing collect for morning and evening prayer is called "The Prayer of St. Chrysostom." While it probably was not written by the great preacher of Antioch and Constantinople, it is evidently an Eastern, that is, a Greek, prayer. The petition that God will grant his people "in this world knowledge of the truth and in the world to come life everlasting" is the spirit of Greece baptized into Christ, for the two things for which the Greeks longed were truth and life. On the other hand, the litany came from the Church of France, where it had first been heard in the days when the plague devastated the south.

But while the compilers of the new book naturally and wisely turned to the past, they were not unmindful of the spirit which was breathing into the churches of the day in which they lived. The First Book of Edward the Sixth—the one of which we are now speaking—was largely influenced by Luther, who in liturgics was far less hostile to the Roman Church than many of the later reformers. But Cranmer's handiwork is the one which appeals to us more than anything else in the book. Many of the most beautiful collects were his, as for instance that for the

second Sunday in Advent, beginning, "Blessed Lord, who hast caused all Holy Scripture to be written for our learning"; so is the collect for Trinity Sunday. Indeed, most of the collects for Trinity season are Reformation prayers.

The First Book of Edward the Sixth was, as has been said, influenced by Luther, with whom at that time Cranmer was in sympathy. But the growing influence of the Puritans was not content with a book which differed so little from the Roman books of worship, and so in 1552 there appeared the Second Book of Edward the Sixth, in which more radical changes were made. It shows the Zwinglian influence rather than the Lutheran, for by this time Cranmer had begun to understand the teaching of the reformer of Zürich. While this book was temporarily repressed at the accession of Mary, it still remains essentially the book that is in our hands to-day.

After the accession of Elizabeth an attempt was made in 1559 to restore the First Book, but the Puritan influence was too strong for that. On the other hand, the Catholics did succeed in making certain changes and, it is said, almost persuaded the pope to give his consent to the use of the English book. But this attempt failed because the two parties could not come to an agreement on the subject of the royal supremacy. Elizabeth might have been willing to restore the mass, but the daughter of Henry VIII had no intention of relinquishing any privilege the crown had once gained. Nor did the nobles, even though they were not particularly religious men, intend to do anything which might weaken the new spirit of Nationalism.

In 1604 King James convened the Hampton Court Conference, and attempted to bridge the ever-widening breach between the two parties. But it came to naught. The uncompromising Puritans were determined to rule or ruin—and they did each in turn!*

* Those who sympathize with the Puritans will be inclined to lay the blame upon the bishops. Thus Gardiner ("History of England," vol. I, p. 158) says: "Men whose fame for learning and piety was un-

In 1637 the Catholic party was triumphant, and Archbishop Laud imagined that there was nothing which he with the approval of his royal master might not accomplish. But, finding he could not have his will in England, he had the happy thought to impose the new book which he had revised upon—of all people in the world—the Scotch! But the sons and daughters of the men who had heard Knox preach made short work of that, and Laud's ill-starred effort was one of the causes of his own betrayal and the death of the king.*

surpassed by that of any Bishop on the bench, had been treated with cool contempt by men who were prepared to use their wit to defend every abuse and to hinder all reform." The facts do not justify this judgment. Bancroft, for example, time-serving courtier though he was, recognized the need of reform and was ready to do all in his power to effect it. But he knew that the real question at issue was not reform, but the way in which it could be brought about. When he had convinced the king that it was not reform but reconstruction of the church which the Puritans desired; when it was seen that the aim was to displace episcopacy in favor of the Genevan discipline, there was no hope of agreement, nor would anything less than the Presbyterian establishment have satisfied the Puritans. But, on the other hand, neither Bancroft nor Whitgift any more than Hooker claimed that episcopacy was of divine origin, but only that it was well fitted for the edification of the church. Instead of meeting the bishops on Hooker's and Bancroft's plea of expediency, and retorting that episcopacy ought to be abolished because it was inexpedient and did not work well, they (the Puritans) shifted the issue completely and appealed to Scripture and to the early church fathers to prove not that episcopacy was a bad form of government, but that it had never been warranted by Scripture or by the practice of the early church. Bancroft retorted that "Even if episcopacy was not the God-given scheme, even if it did not work very well, they had educed no reasons for supposing that their scheme would work any better. . . . The Puritans treated such a demand as supererogation. Could the will of God be at any time inexpedient? Their scheme, they declared, was demonstrated by Scripture to be the will of God. . . . And yet here were these bishops who did nothing but prate of expediency!" (See "Reconstruction of the English Church," vol. I, book II, chap. II, by Roland G. Usher.) How completely the situation has changed! The argument for the apostolic succession has been taken over by high churchmen when it had failed the Puritans.

* Archbishop Laud denied at his trial that he was responsible for the Scotch liturgy, and laid the blame upon the intractable Scotch bishops. We need not attempt here to untangle the skein of intrigue in which

In 1660 the Savoy Conference was held, and, though the saintly Baxter pleaded the cause of the Presbyterians, the churchmen were too embittered to yield on any point, and so the last opportunity to heal the schism was lost.

After the Restoration, in 1660, there were certain changes made in the book, the one in the rubric to the ordination service being the most important, and from that day there has been no change in the English book.

In 1790 the American book appeared. Like the First Book of Edward the Sixth, it was largely the work of one man. As that had been compiled by Cranmer, so this was the work of Bishop White. Although the Preface states there is no desire to depart from the English Church save as political conditions made necessary, nevertheless the good bishop states that advantage was taken "of the happy opportunity" to make certain changes which seem to Americans an improvement. For example, the "Venite" in the American book composed from the 95th and 96th Psalms makes a more joyful hymn with which to begin public worship than does the 95th, with its gruesome threat of never entering into God's rest.

On the other hand, the American revisers were not equally successful in their treatment of the "Te Deum." "Thine honorable, true, and only Son" is stronger than "Thine adorable"; moreover, a certain provincial squeamishness seems to have led to the change of "When thou tookest upon thee to deliver man, thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb." This is a truer translation of "Tu ad liberandum suscepturus hominem non horruisti Virginis uterum" than our somewhat feeble, "Didst humble thyself to be born of a Virgin," nor is the meaning of the latter phrase quite clear. The great hymn expresses the "humiliation" of the incarnation, following the creed. The

the king and the archbishop and the Scotch bishops all had part. A fair statement of the whole case is presented in that excellent book, read since this was written, "The Holy Communion in Great Britain and America," by J. Brett Langstaff, p. 100.

humiliation, it was believed, consisted in "taking upon him the form of a servant," and being "born of a woman." It was not the virginity of the mother but the reality of the humanity of the Son that the writer, following the creed, desired to emphasize. But the American version would seem to imply that birth from a virgin is a deeper humiliation than birth from a married woman, the last thing the holders of the traditional opinion would acknowledge. But had the American revisers done nothing more than free our book from the anachronism of the so-called Athanasian creed, they would deserve our thanks.

Under the leadership of the late Dr. William R. Huntington the Prayer-Book was again revised, and, while the changes were unimportant, the fact was significant, because, as Phillips Brooks said, it showed that our church did not consider the Prayer-Book infallible, and so opened the way for further changes as they became desirable. It was, however, enriched by a new collect, written by Dr. Huntington for the festival of the Transfiguration, August 6, which shows that the liturgical gift has not departed. It is, I think, one of the most beautiful of the collects. "That we, being delivered from the disquietude of this world, may be permitted to behold the king in his beauty," was the prayer that issued from that study in Grace Church rectory, into which the ceaseless roar of the traffic of Broadway enters with disquieting confusion.

While this is being written, there is another revision in process in which there is a tendency to revert to the First Book of Edward the Sixth. This is disquieting to some, but it is what was to have been expected, for it will be noted that each revision has alternately shown the influence of Puritan and Catholic.

This long historical review* has had two purposes: first, to show that in this book of devotion is embodied the history of the English people, which is our history as well.

* I have largely followed Bishop Barry's "Teacher's Prayer-Book."

It was the first of those great spiritual bonds of which the works of Shakespeare and the King James Bible are the other two. But it should be remembered that this one was compiled fifteen years before the gifted child of Avon was born whose magic wand was to make the whole world kin, and sixty-one years earlier than the sonorous translation of the King James version.

It is a comprehensive service-book, the like of which can nowhere else be found. There are hymns in this book from the temple worship at Jerusalem, stories from the Gospels, letters written to the apostolic churches; there are prayers which were first heard when the little church began its perilous journey from Asia into Europe; there are words of wisdom from Alexandria—utterances which are the outcome of Greece's long search for truth; there are solemn warnings from Rome, that there can be no liberty which is not founded in law, no freedom which does not express itself in order. There are cries of agony from France, smitten by the plague and threatened by the Saracens. There are prayers of saints and martyrs, of crusaders, and kings and bishops and unknown monks, of reformers and scholars and simple men and women.

This is what Cranmer and his fellow laborers gave to England, hoping it would be a spiritual bond to bind together in devotion the children of the petty little kingdoms which were at last united into the nation we call Great Britain. Little they dreamed that this book would be carried to the uttermost parts of the earth, to Canada and South Africa, to New Zealand and Australia, to every island in the seven seas, and still less that a mighty republic would arise in the West where their work would be received with joy, and that this book would become a spiritual bond between the two great nations, separated in politics but one in their ideals and so one in love.

The review of the various changes made in the Prayer-Book, since the first book appeared, was not alone to show

the historical development of the devotional life of the English people, but also because the American book is in a sense more "Catholic" than the English.

The First Book of Edward gathered up the various services of the past and contemporary devotions, and that of the Second gave the Protestant stamp to the book, which endears it to us, but, as we have seen, with the exception of the changes made at the Restoration, none of the other attempts to improve the book succeeded in England. But, though the changes wished by Elizabeth were not carried out, while the king's supremacy was insisted upon, the American book got rid of that, owing to the political revolution. The Hampton Court Conference came to naught, fortunately for us, as well as for the English Church. But Laud's Prayer-Book has had a curious history, which is of interest to us. When the nonjurors were driven from England, they found refuge in the Episcopal Church of Scotland, and Laud's book was in accordance with their ecclesiastical notions. Now, when Dr. Seabury went to England, seeking consecration at Lambeth, he was rejected because the oath of allegiance to the king was essential. So to Scotland he went and was consecrated by the successors of the nonjurors. But one of the conditions was that he should use his influence to have the prayer of consecration in the communion service incorporated into the American book. So, by a strange irony of fate, the book which the Puritans refused to listen to in England was adopted in this particular by their children in this country! I do not think it can be denied that this prayer is nobler than the corresponding one in the English book.* Indeed,

* Nevertheless, it would probably have been better had what is called *The Prayer of Acceptance*, beginning, "Wherefore, O Lord and Heavenly Father . . ." been placed after the reception of the communion, as expressing the will of the communicant, strengthened by the reception of the sacrament, to offer and present soul and body as a reasonable (that is, spiritual), holy, and living sacrifice unto God. See "The Holy Communion in Great Britain and America," J. Brett Langstaff, p. 65.

while objection has been raised against it on the ground that it savors of the doctrine of the mass, a careful examination will show that it has much of the spirit of the ancient Greek liturgies in which the fruits of the earth are offered in thanks to the Giver of all good.*

The failure of the Savoy Conference was the cause of much of the weakness of the English Church in the days which followed. But many of the suggestions made by the Presbyterians have been incorporated in the American book. The Preface to the Prayer-Book refers to the Savoy Conference as "the great and good work which miscarried at that time," showing that while the compilers of the American book were willing for the sake of peace to accept the changes suggested in Archbishop Laud's book, they were rather in sympathy with the Presbyterian revisers of 1689.

Some years ago a distinguished layman of one of the non-liturgical churches, in addressing a meeting of Episcopal ministers, remarked that the use of a liturgy was an "intellectual economy." This was not so wise a saying as one would have looked for from such a wise man. The objection would be equally true of the art of the actor who interprets Shakespeare. Doubtless there would be considerable intellectual extravagance on the part of the actor who attempted to improvise an expression of Hamlet's vacillation, or Iago's craft, or Portia's plea. But would the result be to move the spectators to "terror and pity"? The art of interpretation is a high form of intellectual, as well as emotional, activity. It is because this is forgotten that so little is done to train the ministers of the Episcopal Church in the dramatic art, and, as a consequence, the liturgy is rendered dull, monotonous, and unintelligible. But who has listened to the devotional rendering of the solemn burial service, or the still more solemn marriage service, or (in spite of serious blemishes) the lovely bap-

* This was the opinion of Bishop White. See *ibid.*, p. 208.

tismal office, without feeling that the "depths were broken up"? It is said that those who heard Frederick Maurice *pray* the familiar morning and evening prayers felt as never before that they were in the presence of God.

Of course there is danger in approaching the divine liturgy in the dramatic spirit. It may become "theatrical" and degenerate into what has been called "histrionic insincerity," but the same danger lurks in all public prayer. It becomes "theatrical" when the auditors are the object of attention—as in the many-times-told story of the "most eloquent prayer ever addressed to a Boston audience." But it is devoutly "dramatic" when the minister, in solemn awe, interprets the awful tragedy of sin and redemption, as in the presence of God.

In all Episcopal churches there may be found three types of worshippers: the "Catholic," who would have the liturgy resemble, as far as possible, the mass—the less intelligible it is, the more devout it is supposed to be; the "Protestant," who is indifferent to the "preliminary exercises" in hope of an interesting sermon; and, lastly, those who used to be called "Prayer-Book churchmen." To these last the sermon is of no great consequence; it is the service they love. They, I believe, represent the large majority of the laity. Many of the clergy value the Episcopal Church chiefly because they believe that it alone of the Reformed churches enjoys a valid ministry and has kept the "faith once delivered to the saints"; but the laity, while not entirely indifferent to these considerations, were originally attracted to and have been held in loving allegiance to the church because they find spiritual delight in the Prayer-Book. Doubtless they, like all of us, have the "defects of their qualities," and are unwilling to see one jot or tittle of the Prayer-Book changed. It is they who hold their church back from ministering to the people according to the needs of the present. They little guess that they are hindering the scribe in his efforts to bring out of

his treasure things new as well as old. There are prayers in the book which few have ever heard, because they are embedded in unfamiliar services, such as the visitation of the sick, the consecration of churches, and the family morning and evening prayer. These might be brought out into the Sunday service to the enrichment of the liturgy. But there are many prayers not found in the liturgy which might from time to time be substituted for the appointed prayers with advantage, such as certain of Bishop Wilson's, Cardinal Newman's, Stevenson's, and Washington's noble prayer for the nation: "Almighty God: We make our earnest prayer that thou wilt keep the United States in thy holy protection; that thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to the government, and entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large. And, finally, that thou wilt most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility, and pacific temper of mind which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion, and without a humble imitation of whose example in these things we can never hope to be a happy nation. Grant our supplication, we beseech thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen." * And, above all, there should be restored the ancient liberty of the "prophet," described in the apostolic constitution, to leave the liturgy and break forth into spontaneous prayer, "as the spirit gives him utterance."

Besides enrichment there should be retranslation. There are obsolete words which have radically changed their meaning since the days of Shakespeare, and so mislead the people. Such words as "prevent" and "take no care

*I am indebted for a copy of this prayer to the Hon. Roland Maurice, of Philadelphia, who informs me that it is used every Sunday in the Memorial Chapel at Valley Forge.

for" and "person" are not only confusing but the last positively heretical. Both rubrics and public opinion hinder such changes. But suppose the non-liturgical churches were to use the book with greater freedom than is allowed its custodians, can it be doubted that there would be a deepening of the spiritual life as the sense of individual dependence was enlarged by the consciousness of the unity of Christ's body? "O God, we have heard with our ears and our fathers have declared unto us the noble works that thou didst in their days and in the old time before them." It is not without significance that Edward Everett Hale, in his moving tale of "The Man Without a Country," should have depicted Philip Nolan lying dead, with the "Episcopal Prayer-Book open at the prayer for the President of the United States."

Are we not justified in saying, in no sectarian spirit, that this is indeed a wonderful book? Are we not right in treasuring it, not as an exclusive privilege but as the heirloom of the American people? Are we not justified in believing that if it were seriously considered by those who have never examined it, it might be a bond of union because it brings all sorts and conditions of men together at the throne of God? We who have learned from it and have used it these many years think of it as "a golden censor filled with incense, which are the prayers of saints."

# CHAPTER XIII

## DOCTRINE

### *A.* The Faith of the Church

We have now reviewed the theory of the ministry and the manner of worship which divide instead of unite the churches.

We have now to consider the doctrine of the church, and immediately we are met with the objection that here lies the insuperable barrier to the unity of Christian people. "Would it not be better," it is frequently said, "if the churches were to agree to dispense with doctrine, on which men can never agree, and unite in good-will and helpful works that would benefit mankind?" But the first question we should ask is: Is there as much difference as is commonly supposed between the churches on the subject of doctrine as there is on the ministry and manner of worship? I think quite the contrary is true. While on the question of discipline and worship the differences are acute, it will be found that the Greek, the Roman, and the various Protestant churches are, with one small exception, agreed that the fundamental doctrine of the Christian religion is the Trinity of the One God. We have not, then, to consider now, as previously, the question, Why should not the Episcopal Church abandon that which the large majority of our fellow Christians in this land have already abandoned? but, rather, Why should not all the churches in America follow the example of that small but nevertheless highly intelligent body of disciples who have cast aside as unreasonable the doctrine which the great majority still hold, and with them devote themselves to an increase in the knowledge of science and the improvement

of humanity in those matters which it is in their power to influence?

If this were a new movement in the history of the church, it might be supposed that at last the truth had been discovered, and that all we had to do was to follow it. But, as a matter of fact, it is very old. That is to say, it has been tried more than once in the history of the church, and the result has never been what its promoters fondly expected.

The Arian schism in the fourth century differs in many important respects from the later anti-Trinitarian movements; but it has this in common with them all, that it denied that Jesus Christ is the unique partaker of the divinity of the Father. The result of that opinion was tested when the Mohammedan invasion ravaged the churches of the East, northern Africa, and southern Europe. The Arian churches could not endure the fiery trial. Not that they were less devout or less courageous than the Catholics, but because, when it came to a question of life and death, it did not seem worth while to die for an opinion which after all did not affect, in their view, the essential of the faith, which was the unity of God. The Mohammedan believed that as truly as did the Catholic—perhaps more truly—therefore, the Arians did not fall martyrs to the faith, they were absorbed into Islam. It may be said that the same is true of the Eastern churches. Undoubtedly, but what is significant in the lapse of those churches is that Christ as a "living, breathing, feeling man" had given place to a phantom in which men could not trust when the test came. Apollinarianism led to the Monophysite heresy, and that in turn to the Monothilite. Whatever truth these heresies enshrined, and unquestionably they did stand for a vital truth, nevertheless the man Christ Jesus disappeared in a mist of speculation. Men will not die for a dogma but only for the faith. Much as we may dislike the phraseology of the so-called Athanasian creed,

it is nevertheless true, as has been finely said, that the "*Quicunque vult*" was the Marseillaise of the early French Church.* The men who—not "rightly," as it is erroneously translated, but "firmly"—held the Catholic faith died that Europe might not become as Turkey. They died for Christ because they believed Christ to be as truly human as themselves and as divine as the Father.

The question now is not whether they were right or wrong; nor whether they were able to express their faith in a formula which meets our approval, but: Why did the church which had done so fine a missionary work in the conversion of the Barbarians, which saved Europe by making its invaders Christian and brought them to a condition where they were able to absorb the religion and civilization of Europe, fail, when the Catholics met the wave of the Saracen invasion like a rock? The dramatic check of the Barbarians by Pope Leo I has been the subject of picture and pen, but the obscure work of the early Arian missionaries which alone made the Barbarians responsive to the church's appeal has been forgotten.†

In the sixteenth century the Socinian current in the Reformation flood had elements which have enriched and purified the life of all the churches. But it was unable to satisfy the longing of the human soul for a gospel of redemption. Socinianism protested, and we believe rightly, against the Calvinistic doctrine that man was so far gone from "original righteousness" that nothing less than the sacrifice of the sinless Son of God could placate the wrath of his offended Father. We call this the Calvinistic doctrine of atonement, but indeed it was part of the *damnosa hereditas* which Protestantism had inherited from the mediæval church. A protest against the Protestant

* "Christ's Thought of God," J. M. Wilson.

† Attila, of course, was a Hun, that is, a heathen, but a very considerable part of the army which he led into Italy was nominally Christian. See Chapter II.

scholasticism was needed and the church should be grateful to Socinus for making it; but what Socinus and his followers overlooked was that the world cannot be saved by a protest, it must have a gospel of salvation. Whatever may or may not be necessary for redemption, it is redemption which the world needs. It was because it failed to lay hold of the truth that the holiness of God is the essential element in the divine nature that Socinianism became an arid intellectualism, and so failed to appeal to the conscience of the churches of the Reformation.

The Deistic movement of the eighteenth century refused to believe in the divinity of Jesus because the argument on which the church thought it necessary to base it—the power of working miracles—made no impression upon men like Hume, who were convinced that the finger of God had never touched this earth since the hand of God made man out of the dust of the ground and then left him to his own devices!

In its noblest and most spiritual form the anti-Trinitarian protest appeared in England and New England in the eighteenth century as Unitarianism. Who can estimate the debt the churches of every name owe to the men and women of the Unitarian faith? The Calvinistic churches had degraded Christ by making him a mere instrument for the placating of a God who was spiritually "muscle bound," and had not the power which every good man possesses of freely forgiving those who have done him wrong. Moreover, they failed to see that God's hatred of sin was not because of any offense to his divine majesty but because sin is the destruction of the divine life in God's child. It was the Unitarian Church which showed us the Father by revealing the Son as friend and example, making him appear before us as a "living, breathing, thinking man," in whose companionship we, like the disciples of old, could feel at home with God. At the time of the Unitarian revolt from what was called the Orthodox Church

in New England, the knowledge of God was expressed much in this way: "God is arbitrary Will; he can do what he pleases; and he did please to choose a certain number to be saved out of this world, but even there he was limited and in order to accomplish his purpose, it was necessary to subject his Son, the Sinless One, to an excruciating and shameful death in order that his own heart might be moved to love sinners." Now, inasmuch as the whole doctrine of the divinity of Christ was at that time based on the necessity of the vicarious punishment of the Son of God, when the moral revolt of the Unitarians against that doctrine, unworthy of God because unworthy of man, occurred, the divinity of Christ fell with it, because it was the only proof with which they were familiar. No one who knows the history of the churches in this land can doubt that every one of them owes a great debt to the Unitarian protest which literally brought Christ back into the church.* As Dean Rashdall has said: "Modern Unitarianism was originally quite as much a protest against the traditional doctrine of the Atonement as against the traditional doctrine of the Trinity. The value of these protests must be acknowledged by all who feel how deeply the traditional views have libelled the view of God's character which finds expression in the teachings of Christ and in a truly Christian doctrine of the Incarnation."†

It is popularly supposed that this libel originated with Calvin and was cast into its rigid form by Jonathan Edwards, but, as a matter of fact, Calvin, the great French lawyer, took part of the theory from Anselm, who in turn had borrowed from St. Augustine; so that the record of this doctrine is not to be found in Calvin's "Institutes," but rather in Anselm's "Cur Deus homo," the tract of St.

* I owe this to the late Prof. A. V. G. Allen, though I cannot at the moment verify the reference.

† "The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology," Hastings Rashdall, p. 43 (Macmillan & Co.).

Augustine against Pelagius, and St. Paul's rabbinical teaching in the Epistle to the Romans.

But, while all the churches should gladly acknowledge the debt, it cannot be denied that the Unitarian churches are not only becoming smaller, through some failure to appeal to plain people, but also that their own children are leaving them and are many of them agnostic in their philosophy, and not a few, ignorant of the first principles of the life of Christ, are living on their spiritual capital in the vain hope that the ethics of the gospel will survive when the Master who gave the new law of life with its sanctifying power is thought of as a myth. The God of Unitarianism tends inevitably to become an individual removed from the universe, a conception which modern science has made it impossible for thoughtful men to hold.

Not a few earnest Unitarians acknowledge this, but comfort themselves with the thought that the reason their church is losing ground is due to the fact that its message is now being preached by other churches. There is truth in this. All the churches have been influenced by the Unitarian movement, but they were able to absorb it and make it vital because they have learned that the essential truth in it is a forgotten truth which in no way conflicts with the doctrine of the Trinity. One most important effect that Unitarianism has had upon the Trinitarian churches has been to drive them to examine their faith as expressed in the ancient formulas and ask themselves what these formulas really mean.

The Unitarian believes them to teach a plurality of gods. Therefore he will say: "Supposing it to be true that the Unitarian protests have failed to convert the church, it does not follow that the truth for which the Unitarian stands is weak, but that it is in advance of the time. The pragmatic test is not the final one. If what we believe to be true is not convincing," says the Unitarian, "it may be due to the fact that the church is unable to receive the

'truth as it is in Jesus.' We are convinced that the unity of God was taught by Jesus, and that the church, under the influence of Greek speculation, has fallen away from the 'faith once delivered to the saints.'"

This is indeed a serious charge and deserves our most careful consideration. Whether the statement that the churches fell away from the early faith be true or not, it is certain that the reformers did not believe that to be the fact. They made not the general councils but the Scriptures the final appeal. If the decisions of the councils were contrary to the teaching of the Scripture, then the churches should not be bound by them. This is particularly true of the English Church, as a reference to the articles will show.* May it not be that our Unitarian brethren have misunderstood the teaching of the church? This would not be strange, if it be true, as it undoubtedly is, that many who call themselves Trinitarians have unquestionably misunderstood it.

Turn to the faith of those who call themselves Trinitarians. What is it they really believe? If we speak the truth we must admit that many of them are really tritheists—that is, polytheists. They have lost the first element of the faith of Jesus, that the "Lord our God is one." They are really worshipping three gods. They visualize the Father as a venerable man, sitting on a throne somewhere above the sky. The Saviour who hung upon the cross they think of as sharing the Father's throne—another man—and the third they find it difficult to make an image of, and so try to satisfy themselves with the figure of a dove, or else dissolve it into the atmosphere. So it has come to pass that the unity of God has largely departed from the popular theology of the day. There are not a few devout Christians, not only among the laity but among the clergy as well, who would be glad if the doctrine of the Trinity were not dwelt upon on Trinity Sunday. They

* See Articles XX and XXII, Prayer-Book, pp. 561, 562.

feel instinctively that something is wrong, and though they desire to hold the ancient faith, they wish they might hold it in some way that did not call for discussion or definition. Yet there is only one question to-day to which mankind seeks an answer, and that is: "How are we to think of God?"

Let us follow the invitation of the Unitarian and turn to the teaching of the Bible. As we open the Old Testament we find that the earliest thought of God was very crude but entirely natural—that is, what was to be expected from a people who wished to live with their God. God was conceived as an heroic man. He was believed to be interested in the Jews alone. The Jews shared the common belief of the people of their day. Each nation had its God as Israel had. Jehovah dwelt on Mount Sinai, and the Jews believed that on one occasion Moses penetrated into the very presence of God and saw him, and that God with his finger wrote on the tables of stone the law which they believed was the expression of the Divine Will.

This belief continued for centuries. Then in the time of the great prophets, a nobler conception of God came to holy men. Isaiah says: "In the year that King Uzziah died I saw the Lord, great and lifted up, and his train filled the temple." God no longer dwelt on Mount Sinai, he dwelt in the heaven of heavens. His law was not confined to the Holy Land, as Jonah had thought; he was the Lord of the whole earth, though in Jerusalem alone could he be rightly worshipped. The transcendence of God had now banished or was slowly driving out the earlier thought of a local God.

In the latter part of the Book of Isaiah another prophet took up the theme. He lived more than a century and a half later than the prophet whose name we have given to the whole book. He had been through the great experience of the Exile. He had found God in the uttermost parts of the earth, after the temple had been destroyed,

and he writes: "Thus said the high and holy one which inhabiteth eternity, I dwell in the high and lofty place, with him also that is of a humble and contrite heart." What a revelation of God's glory had come to Israel when the prophet could speak of God as indeed in the heaven of heavens and yet also in the contrite heart of the humblest soul!

This is the thought of God in which Jesus was trained and from which we believe he never departed. I do not say there may not be found expressions in the gospel which might lead us to believe that our Saviour shared the earlier and cruder conception of God, but such we believe to be the reflection of those who failed to enter into the secret chambers of his soul. John tells us that when Jesus came to Samaria, where men were worshipping a God who dwelt on their mountain as the Jews were worshipping a God who they believed dwelt on Mount Zion, he said: "That is not the way to worship God. He does not dwell here or there. God is spirit"; that is, like the atmosphere, penetrating every part of life. We then are not to think of God as having form, any more than the air we breathe. We are not to think of him as dwelling apart from the universe, but as permeating all life. So the divine life is really to be found wherever there is life. Eternal life is manifesting itself in myriad forms.

This thought of God is as far removed from the popular Trinitarianism as it is from the popular Unitarianism. It is indeed a thought in which each can find itself at home.

Children repeat the experience of the race. The children to-day think of God as a great man dwelling apart from the universe from all eternity, and then some day deciding to make the world. This is unworthy of the mature Christian. He should think of God as eternal life, no more confined by time than by space. We are to think of eternal life as manifesting itself in the stars, in the hills "in verdure clad," in the fish of the sea, the fowls of the air,

the creeping things on the earth, and, above all, in man, different from all other creatures in the fact that, so far as we know, he alone is conscious of failure, yet hopes and dies in faith. All are manifestations of the spirit, who is God.

This thought is so closely allied to Pantheism that it is often mistaken for Pantheism. And, indeed, if it be unsupplemented by other thoughts of God, to that it must come. And if it come to that, then there will be a falling away from that ethical idea of God which was the ground of Jesus' revelation.

So we are driven to ask ourselves what we can know of the *character* of this divine "atmosphere." That question arose among the Twelve. Philip spoke not only for himself and for the Twelve, but for us as well when he said: "Lord, show us the Father and it sufficeth us." "What is this spirit like, that you call Father? What is its character? If we knew that, we should be content." We feel the same. Jesus said: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also." What does that mean, except that the character of God is like the character of Jesus? And what does that mean except that the character of God can only be fully revealed in man? Something of the glory of God is revealed in nature. But the heart of God can only be revealed by man. By man? By what man? Jesus dares to say what we should never dare to say of ourselves nor of the holiest we have known, that God is like him. If we follow the teaching, we shall find that Jesus is saying, not once or twice: "You love, you obey me, you trust me, you know that I am about to sacrifice myself for you, you believe that I am going to prepare an eternal home for you, you are convinced that no matter how often you fail me I will never fail you. You know that I have been going about among the outcasts seeking to save the lost. Now believe that it is God who is doing all this. Believe that I am dwelling in the Eternal Spirit, and that what I

embedded in a creed which contains statements about other matters which those who recite the creed are supposed to believe. Do they believe them? The first question is not, "Are these things true?" but "Do those who say the creed believe them to be true?" If they do, and unquestionably the uneducated, simple-minded people who constitute the vast majority in all the churches, do believe, that is, assent to them, then no doubt the church is justified in retaining the primitive form of creedal expression. But can those who do not believe these statements, taken in their plain meaning, continue to assert that they do believe them when they know in their hearts,

neither of which alone is entirely satisfactory. For while it is desirable that there should be a statement of purpose, it is essential that there should be a clear statement of the faith from which this purpose proceeds. We are in danger to-day of substituting emotion for thought, and the great value of any creed consists in the recognition that the intellect is an essential element in Christian character. This has been well stated by Dr. Glover:

"When we compare the development of religion in Israel with the course it took in the Græco-Roman world, it seems a fair conclusion from the experience of Israel that more is gained in the quest of the knowledge of God along the line of thought and intellect than by the line of cult and emotion. Emotion has its place; it may be doubtfully true that some experience of facts is only reached by means of emotion; but emotion seems a normal concomitant of the deepest experiences. Thus emotion has to be cross-examined, its evidence has to be checked, and its data corrected. Every man is born a metaphysician, and knows that emotion and intuition are amenable to the court of experience, and that experience can only be interpreted by reason; though not every man will take the trouble to carry the process through. . . . The Græco-Roman world, depressed by long wars and ruined by the loss of freedom, was in a hurry for spiritual peace; it swung off from the philosophic school to the shrine, and before long it compelled the philosophers to come and make their peace with the gods of taboo and magic." —"Jesus in the Experience of Men," T. R. Glover, Student Christian Movement, 1921, pp. 103–104.

Are not the churches to-day manifesting the same spirit of "hurry" which is here said to have been characteristic of the churches of the Græco-Roman world? If so, it might be better to retain the ancient formularies for the present, even though we recognize the difficulties in so doing, rather than to attempt a hasty solution which might lead to even greater disadvantages.

and some of those who worship with them know, that they no more believe them than they believe the sun moves around the earth? No value of historic continuity or æsthetic feeling will justify any man in continuing the use of words in the worship of God who cannot declare that he is worshipping God in truth. Men and women, and above all the clergy, are obliged to use a subtlety which would be condemned in the practical affairs of life, when they say that they believe Jesus was born in the way the creed asserts or that he rose from the dead "taking again his body, with flesh and bones," as the Fourth Article of Religion declares, when, as a matter of fact, they believe something very different.

This is a very serious charge and should not be ignored. It is not always brought as a "railing accusation"; it is rather a serious difficulty which should be dealt with conscientiously and frankly.

It arises, I am convinced, from a misunderstanding of the purpose of the creeds. That purpose is to present to the faithful a form of words in which is embodied the faith of the church, and those who recite the creed are witnessing to their unity in the faith which has been the banner of the church from generation to generation. Had it never been formulated and were the church to undertake its formulation to-day, it would probably be expressed in the scientific and philosophic and perhaps economic language of the best thought of the day. In other words, it would be expressed in the language which reflects the prevailing opinions of the day in which we are living. Now, if one could imagine one of the faithful who lived in the fourth century returning to earth, he would find a creed formulated to-day so different from the opinions with which he had been familiar that it would be impossible for him to repeat it intelligently or, as we say, "*ex animo*." But suppose he finally made himself familiar with the prevailing opinions of this age, and it was explained to him that the

purpose of the creed was to express the faith of old in the language of modern times, can we not believe that he would find it possible to recite the modern creed though the opinions were unfamiliar and even unbelievable, if by so doing he could bear witness that the faith in which he had lived in the days of old was identical with the faith which is now stated in terms which he never would have employed in the days of his flesh?

Something like this, it seems to me, is what we are called upon to do when we recite the creed. It is the ancient expression of a *faith* which is the same "yesterday, to-day, and forever." We know what the men of old were trying to express; they were so convinced that Jesus was a superhuman person that they could not think—as probably Paul and John did *—that he had come into this world as the other children of God had come, and therefore they said that "he was born of a Virgin." They were so convinced that no phantom had appeared and influenced their lives that they said that "Jesus after his death declared that he had flesh and bones." These were the necessary forms which the expression of their faith took. But suppose a man who lives in this day is convinced that in these matters they were mistaken, is he debarred from using the ancient words because the opinions of the former day no longer satisfy him if he be firmly persuaded that his faith in God and Jesus and the Holy Spirit is the same as they held? Can such a one be accused of dishonesty if he makes no pretense of accepting the current opinion when he uses the ancient words to express the living faith?

"Perhaps not," it may be said. "But inasmuch as so much explanation is required and inasmuch as the plain man identifies the spiritual conviction with the intellectual opinion, why should we not abandon a form which leads to such misunderstanding?" There is much to be said in favor of so doing, but it might be found that the loss is

* *Per contra* see "Belief in God," by Bishop Gore, p. 275.

greater than the gain. In the first place, it would require the church to identify the faith with the current opinion of this age. But who can assure us that this opinion will not change in the next hundred years? The Darwinian theory of evolution was almost a matter of faith with scientific men twenty-five years ago, but how greatly has it been modified by later discoveries! God is the unchanging element in life, and the classic expression of the faith in God may be taken as a symbol and intelligently used rather than attempt to vary the expression with every change in changing opinion.

We not unnaturally think that the difficulty is a modern one. It is, as a matter of fact, very old. Those who in our own church are most insistent upon the literal interpretation of the creeds in the two articles which speak of the Incarnation and the Resurrection of our Lord, have forgotten that they have changed the interpretation of other articles without any consciousness of dishonesty. Who believes that the world was made in six days as the Book of Genesis declares, which was unquestionably the opinion of the framers of the Apostles' Creed? No educated man to-day; but that was what practically every one believed when the creed was set forth. Who thinks of the dead arising from their graves, as our fathers thought? Who that has given any serious thought to the matter can think that Raphael's picture of the "Ascension" is the representation of a great cosmic fact? Who now thinks that this earth is to come to an end in the way the Epistle of Peter predicts, and that the Lord is to descend, as Paul once thought, to inaugurate the reign of the saints? All these are exploded opinions. Yet the faith in the exaltation of the man who once was crowned with thorns to be crowned with glory now; the standing up of the living personality in a new life after death, and the gradual spreading of the light of the Sun of Righteousness till all "the earth is filled with the knowledge of the

Lord as the waters cover the sea"; the inheritance of the earth, not by the violent, the men who delight in war, but by the meek, the peacemakers—this is the faith of Christian men to-day as truly as when they expressed it in the childlike language of a prescientific age. The creation of the heavens and the earth is no less mysterious nor sublime than the compiler of Genesis thought; it is infinitely more mysterious and glorious when conceived as the effect of that Being

> "Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
> And the round ocean, and the living air,
> And the blue sky, and in the mind of man:
> A motion and a spirit, that impels
> All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
> And rolls through all things."

Opinions vary from age to age, but the faith remains the same, and it is the living faith, and not the fleeting opinion, to which we declare our adherence when we recite the childlike words of the church.

We say "childlike" not in the spirit of pitying superiority; we recognize that in the days to come, our thoughts and words will seem childish to those whom the spirit of truth has led more deeply into the mystery of life than we have yet penetrated; we use the word in deep affection for those who knew so little and yet loved so much, and because we would keep in that innocent and lovely company all the days of our life. But the only way in which this can be done is by the use of the child's language. The child may be taught to speak as men speak, but it will be a forced word. The elders in the family must speak the language of the children until such time as the children are able to speak as men. In this way only, in the family life, are the hearts of the children turned to the fathers, and the hearts of the fathers to the children. "Mother, where did the baby come from?" says the little girl to

her mother, and the mother does not try to instruct her in the science of obstetrics, but answers in the way the child's heart will respond to a great truth, and says: "It came from God, my darling, and was brought by the holy angels." Has the mother spoken the truth? The boy says: "Father, at what time did the sun rise to-day?" Does the father explain that the sun never rises, but that the earth, turning on its axis, produces an optical illusion? If so, he may produce a little Sandford or Merton or a little Rollo, but the father will never by that method gain the confidence of the child. If he answers that the sun rose at such or such an hour, he tells the truth, for the truth is that at that hour the light of the sun began to bathe the earth and call men to their duties and their pleasures, and later the child can learn the scientific explanation, but never quite loses the ancient sense of the coming of the light in the way the vast majority of the human race had opined that it comes, and which is so embedded in the child's consciousness that it must not be rudely eradicated.*

By such a use of the creeds we keep alive the consciousness of the spiritual unity of the church. And this is not

* "Every revolution in the world-view has profoundly affected mankind in those aspects of life which depend upon reason. . . . So far as most of us are concerned the principle of relativity may seem a matter of small importance, dealing with infinitesimals which in the ordinary business of life are entirely inappreciable. It disturbs our general scientific methods no more than the Copernican theory disturbed the practical adjustments of the human mind. For mankind the sun continues to rise and set. We reckon the times and the seasons, as men have always done, and will do, irrespective of any change which has taken place, or may take place, in astronomical theory. Newton's law of the inverse square will not cease to be a practical rule for engineers and mechanicians for all economic projects, nor will it cease to commend itself by its simplicity, if Einstein's formula comes to be recognized as theoretically perfect. In religion, however, and in philosophy—philosophy as it concerns mankind generally, and not as technical metaphysics or theory of knowledge—its effect will be profound and far-reaching."—"The General Principle of Relativity," H. Wildon Carr (Macmillan & Co.), p. 153.

a mere sentiment. It has a practical value. There are multitudes of people who are still intellectually in the first or the fourteenth century. The number whose thought is purely in the twentieth is small. If, then, the church is to have any common expression of faith, it must be in the language and embodied in the opinions of those who think as did those who lived in an earlier age, and find the traditional language congenial.

I hope the foregoing may not seem trivial. It is only an illustration drawn from the life of the family of a truth which persists all through life and is the essential in all social intercourse. It is illustrated in legal practice, based on the common law, where the ancient forms are retained and applied to conditions which could not have been foreseen. It is the cement of our political life. Lodge, in his discriminating life of Webster, reminds us that Hayne represented the original meaning of the Constitution, but that Webster interpreted it not as the fathers had conceived but as it had become under the influence of an expanding Nationalism.* Its application is essential to the retention of the early ideals of the republic. The Declaration of Independence is our national creed. But can we interpret it as Jefferson did? Its significance has expanded. The black man as well as the white is now dwelling under the ægis of freedom.† What is more, it is seen to be not the declaration of a fact but rather the expression of a sublime hope. To say that all men are "born free and equal," as the Declaration is frequently misquoted,‡ is not a fact. To say, as the Declaration does, that all men were "created free and equal" is to announce the divine purpose which has never been realized, but toward which we press inspired by a sublime hope. In the same way we say we believe in the catholic church, which has never been his-

* See "Daniel Webster, American Statesmen," Houghton Mifflin Co.
† Alas, only theoretically.
‡ Almost always in English books, from Thackeray to Dean Inge.

torically realized, but is the goal of Christian endeavor. The employment of ancient words in a new and larger sense is not a new attempt to escape from the undesirable; it is to continue in the path marked out by Paul, following in the footsteps of Jesus. How can Paul say that the church is the Israel of God? It is not true, if we insist that words must always mean the same thing. It is true if words are enriched by experience. When Jesus was asked, "How say the scribes that Elias must first come?" he answered in the words of the creed of the synagogue in which he had been brought up: "Elias truly cometh and restoreth all things. But I say unto you that Elias has already come. Then understood they that he spake unto them of John the Baptist."

Israel was the company with whom God was in covenant. The Jews, according to Paul, had broken the covenant, and the church, having succeeded to their privilege, was now the true Israel. Elias, the scribes believed, would come in the person of the old Tishbite, but Jesus said he had come in the person of the heroic reformer who bore witness in the face of a modern Ahab and Jezebel to the kingdom of God. If the use of the creed is condemned on the ground that it is immoral to use words except in their original sense, and not as symbols of a truth which has been emancipated from outgrown opinions, then both Paul and Jesus must be condemned too. Indeed, we may say that the whole Bible is lacking in intellectual veracity. From *Isaiah* to *Revelation* there are innumerable illustrations of spiritual development which have changed the meaning of ancient conceptions. Only in this way has it been possible to preserve the continuity of religious development, and prevent each new prophet from anticipating the heresy of Marcion and the early Gnostics, which insisted that each new truth compelled an abandonment of past religious experience. But then who can escape? Not many of those who object, for they are using the word

"God" as if it had the same significance to-day as in the days of old. Yet who can say that that significance is true, or that any two men connote the same idea by the familiar word? To the child God is visualized as a great man; to the philosopher he is the spirit without form in whom we live and move and have our being. No social religious life is possible unless the learned and the wise are willing to use the words of the simple and the child-like, each having his own opinion and both united in a sublime faith which no words can adequately express.

There is another objection to this view of the creeds which, though it shows, as I think, a confusion of thought, has a real meaning which should not be ignored. "The creed," it is often said, "is a statement of facts, and therefore should not be dissolved into a mere theory of salvation." But this will hardly bear examination. A "fact" is something that is known, not something which is believed. If the creed is indeed a statement of facts, it is not the expression of faith but of knowledge. Well, look at the first article of the creed: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth." Is that the statement of a fact? Can it be proved? Is it susceptible of apprehension by the senses, or is it something which some man beheld and has handed down to us as other facts of history have been handed down? The universe is a fact. But the "creation" of it is believed by all who believe in God. Is the "Resurrection of the body" a fact, or the "life everlasting," or "the coming of Christ to Judgment"? This objection will not bear examination. What those who use such language mean to say is that certain parts of the creed are statements of facts. This is true. But if we ask what they are, it will be found that they are statements concerning the earthly life of Jesus, and it is most important that we should not suppose him to be a myth but a veritable historical person. Ours is, indeed, an historic religion. We may go further and say

that it was this primarily which the formulators of the creed had in mind to emphasize when they put forth the creed. The danger was that the life of Jesus should be thought of as one of the many "mysteries" which were appealing to the popular religious fancy in the second century. Against this the creed protested. One form of Gnosticism would have reduced Jesus to a phantom. It was the reality of his manhood that the creed emphasized. His divinity at that time needed no emphasis. It was believed, but in such a way as to make the Incarnation a myth. If, then, we ask what are the "facts" which the creed lays emphasis upon, they are the birth of Jesus, his sufferings and death under the rule of Rome, the reality of his death and burial, and his resurrection from the dead. Now side by side with these facts went a belief in the significance of this life which made it different from every other life. By his birth there had come into the world the perfect man, the express image of the Father's person. The Jew needed no miracle to convince him of this truth. He had been brought up to expect the "seed of Abraham" to bless the world. But the Greek had always insisted that such a one must be the offspring of the gods. To them the birth of the Saviour in the way it is described in two of the Gospels was a necessity. But the faith of those who believed the miracle and those who were indifferent to it was one.* Both believed that through him we have remission of sins. He who believes that believes what the creed embodies in a form which may no longer appeal to

* "Certainly nothing concerning the birth of Jesus was part of that assurance on the basis of which faith in Jesus was claimed. I may add that it ought not to this day to form part of the basis of the claim. . . .

"I think that those who believe that the historical citadel can be maintained should insist that the question of the birth is secondary and not primary, viz.: that the question of faith in Jesus must rest still, where it was made to rest from the beginning, on the life, teaching, death, and resurrection of Jesus. On these, quite apart from any questions concerning his birth, the faith stood and still could stand."—"Belief in God," by Bishop Gore, pp. 274, 279–280.

him, and to which he attaches little importance. The framers of the creed believed that it was by Jesus' death upon the cross that the sense of forgiveness had been brought to the world, and were therefore content to leave it with the simple statement of the "fact." They believed that they were as truly in communion with the Lord who had been dead and was alive again as the disciples of Jesus were. That this could be without his "resurrection," that is, his rehabilitation in the flesh, seemed to them impossible. And because they believed this of Jesus they believed it of themselves. The two go together. It is to be remembered that Greek philosophy had thrown but dim light on the problem of personality, and the early Christians were unable to conceive of the perpetuation of full personality dissociated from the body. Paul saw that and said we shall be raised from the dead as Jesus was. He attempted to meet this difficulty by declaring that a "spiritual" body shall be the manifestation of the risen personality. The faith the church held we hold too. The form in which the faith was expressed not a few believe to be the temporary clothing of great truths.

The whole question has been well stated by a recent writer who speaks with authority because he is at once a scientific teacher and a devout Christian. "The question is not whether it is honest to reinterpret old phrases in new senses; that does not describe what is being done. It is, May we frankly abandon some old phrases except as historical; using them as what they truly are, mile-stones on the path of knowledge of God; early intellectual forms in which faith expressed itself, still of devotional value to us all; but forms not intellectually binding on all men forever, mile-stones we have left behind?"*

Those who, in the interests of the "faith once for all de-

* "Christ's Thought of God," James W. Wilson, D.D. (Macmillan & Co.), p. 87. The whole chapter should be read by those who wish to see this question considered in a reverent and clear spirit.

livered to the saints," insist upon the literal interpretation of the creed may find that they have served neither the cause of truth nor of the church. I could name not a few devout men and women who are, I believe, in full accord with the faith yet who, because of the wide-spread opinion that the creed must be taken in a sense which is repugnant to their reason, refuse to say it at all, and, because they believe that the "church teaches" that the acceptance of the creed "*ex animo*" is necessary to the reception of the Sacrament, have for years failed to enjoy the full communion of the church of which they are in truth devoted members.

The defenders of the faith might do well to consider seriously such words as these: "Creeds cannot be . . . absolutely regulative of the church's faith. All that they can do, as witnesses to the continuity of truth, is to demand that the later doctrinal developments be not altogether out of harmony with the spirit of the earlier. When anything beyond this is claimed for them, as if they had the power of stereotyping the form of belief, they are exalted to a position which endangers the very truth they are supposed to defend. It is vain, then, to hope that the time will come when the church will only believe what is formally tabulated in her confessions. Such a time can only come when what is best in our theology is stifled by creeds, and when all connection between theology and general scientific culture has ceased." *

"Even when belief has not outgrown the formulas by which it has been traditionally expressed, we must beware of treating this fixity of form as indicating complete identity of substance. Men do not necessarily believe exactly the same thing because they express their convictions in exactly the same phrases. And most fortunate it is in the

* "Schleiermacher: Werke," vol. V, pp. 440–441. Quoted in "Schleiermacher," Robert Munroe. Paisley, Alexander Gardiner, 1903, pp. 104–105.

interest of individual liberty, social co-operation, and institutional continuity that this latitude should be secured to us, not by the policy of philosophers, statesmen, or divines, but by the inevitable limitation of language." *

It may be well now to sum up in a word the conclusions reached in these two chapters on "Doctrine." The fundamental doctrine of all the churches is the triune personality of God. In the creeds there is the early expression of the church's faith in the language with which their compilers were familiar and in the atmosphere in which they lived and breathed. These creeds cannot be used intelligently in the twentieth century except by the application of the same method which characterizes the writers of the Bible, and, in modern days, the practice of the law, and in the familiar family life. So used they may prove helpful and prepare the way for a more modern expression of the unchanging faith which will commend itself to the intelligence and the moral purpose of the church of the future.

* "Theism and Humanism," Gifford Lectures, 1914, by Arthur James Balfour.

# CHAPTER XV

## SACRAMENTARIANISM

HOWEVER reasonable much of the foregoing may seem to the average Christian, it will be strongly repudiated by the Anglo-Catholic, and that for two reasons: In the first place it contradicts his theory of revelation, and in the second seems to ignore the value of the sacramental life. Such an one, though far from wishing to deny that there are many devout men and women to be found in all the churches, or that these are, in a sense, disciples of Jesus, nevertheless insists that all that can be concluded from such a fact is that there are many individuals who are only potential members of the Church of Christ, because so far they have had no proper understanding of the church itself. Such seem to him like the young ruler in the Gospel, who "was not far from the kingdom of God," yet certainly not in it. Or he thinks of them as did Aquila and Priscilla of Apollos; he cannot deny that they are gifted, but he feels that he represents those who are to "teach the way of God more perfectly." Therefore he explains the division of the churches by saying that "it is caused by the ignorance of those who do not understand that the Church of the Living God is supernatural and demands the vital unity which would enable it to do the work for which it was ordained. This Protestantism has never understood, and so has failed to bear witness to the truth. It is impossible that any convincing witness can be borne with authority while the church is divided into a great number of groups, each one of which pretends to speak with authority. Their witnesses do not agree together. If the church is to speak with authority, it must speak as one."

How these objectors reconcile such opinions with their separation from the Church of Rome we need not now consider. But it is important to call attention to one thing that seems to have been overlooked, which is that if the message of the church be not true, it will gain no authority by being proclaimed by one body. The real question is: Is the message of the church true? Or to put it in another way: Are the metaphysical theories and the prescientific statements which the church has identified with the faith the real message of the church? The Anglo-Catholic seems to affirm that they are, because he is obsessed by a theory which has not been deduced from the facts. This theory rests upon an assumption that truth was "given" in its entirety centuries ago, and is incapable of increase, and that having been once formulated it can never be restated. But this is contrary to the teaching of Jesus, according to John. The promise of Jesus was that the spirit would *lead* into truth, more and more. Some truth, but not the whole truth, was set forth by Jesus, and of that only a part was apprehended by the first disciples: "I have yet many things to tell you, but ye cannot bear them now, but when the spirit of truth has come he will lead you into all truth." That prophecy, we believe, has been justified by the history of the church and is far from being exhausted. The church is not worshipping an "unknown God." It has learned, by the revelation of Jesus, something—and that the essential—about God. It does not accept that revelation on the external authority of Jesus alone—it begins with that, but goes on to verify it by experience.

The primary work of the church, then, is to bear witness to "the truth as it is in Jesus," and to test new truth by the principles which he revealed. But to say that the church has received all that it is ever to receive, while in every other department of life progress is being made in the knowledge of truth, is to admit that the church is dead. If the great progress which has been made in the knowl-

edge of this universe, of the human race and the psychology of the individual be not paralleled by an equal advance in the knowledge of God, it leads to one of two conclusions, either of which would be fatal to the life of the church. The first is that all this advance in knowledge has come apart from the influence of the spirit of God—that is, that all our education has been atheistic; or else that there is one department of life—and that the most important—where the spirit no longer leads, except backward. The wide-spread scepticism on the part of many educated men and women of the teaching of the church is due, I believe, rather to this error than to any specific attack upon the faith. The church needs to learn what the "world" has already learned, that truth is a call to a great adventure. It cannot be delivered once for all. The church, like her Master, must slowly "increase in wisdom." This does not imply that the statements of the past to which the church has given a sanctity which in some quarters seems greater than that ascribed to the words of Jesus himself are without value; it only means that they should not be supposed to be the final expression of truth.

The Catholic creeds are an important part of the church's varied and rich inheritance, and should be held in reverent esteem as one of the many attempts of the religious philosophic mind to express the truth in a form which would be intelligible to men who were seeking after God. As has been well said, they are "mile-stones" in the church's journey. But they fail of their purpose when they are made *termini*. We ought to say of them, as we say of some of the great scientific formulas which have been the starting-point for new advance in knowledge, that they are reverent hypotheses, which may in time be superseded by a larger statement of truth. But to identify them with the "faith," which is the spiritual activity of the soul of man in communion with God, the only faith which can remove mountains, is not to exalt truth but to belittle it,

do in this short space of time and on the little stage of Judea where God first spoke to Abraham, God my Father has ever been doing and will ever do. I dwell in the Eternal Spirit and it dwells in me. It is this that gives me power. Yet the power you see is nothing compared with the eternal power of the Father who is greater than I. You call me good, but my goodness is but a faint reflection of the perfect and complete holiness of God." Jesus never called himself God. Perhaps he spoke of himself as the Son of God, certainly the evangelists so spoke of him—the perfect manifestation of the eternal as far as such manifestation is possible in a perfect human being. Now, to speak of this as delegated power or goodness is to misunderstand the meaning of Jesus' life. It was not delegated, as if his life was alien to that of God, it was *manifested* because his character was essentially the same as the character of God. But it is neither power nor self-satisfied goodness which is the ultimate characteristic of God. It is love. God is love and he who dwelt in love as no other life has ever done, God also dwelt in him as in no other. "We have seen," says John, "the glory of the only-begotten of the Father, and it was true and gracious." From that day God the mighty became the father to all those men who had known Jesus, and they found rest to their souls. They did not speculate about God, they did not seek for proofs of God's existence, they knew God and found that they had eternal life.

But how few were they who came into contact with Jesus! About one hundred and twenty, we read in the Acts, were assembled in his name on the day of Pentecost. But that little company had a knowledge of God that made them different from any people who up to that time had lived upon the earth. For those who had received Jesus as their Lord and Master knew God not only as the eternal upholding power of the universe, but also as love communing with them. What now was to be the fate of those

who, never having had the privilege of the first disciples, were to live in the time to come? Jude, we are told, was troubled by this question and asked Jesus to answer it: "Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us and not unto the world?" And Jesus said: "I will manifest myself unto the world. If any man love me, my Father will love him, and we will come to him and dwell with him." How far John's account is to be taken as the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus and how far as the expression of the church's experience need not be considered here. The essential thing is that it reveals the expanding influence of the principle taught by Jesus. What interests us in this connection is: How was this promise fulfilled, or how did this experience arise? The first disciples had found that God dwelt in them while they were in fellowship with Jesus, but Jesus was about to depart; who could do for those who came after what Jesus had done for them? They said that Jesus had told them that it would be by the ministration of the Holy Spirit. If any man loved Jesus, his Father would love him as the disciples of Jesus knew he loved them, and into his life would come a new spirit which would make him feel at home with God, as the disciples of Jesus had felt at home with God. Paul, who lived to see the fulfilment of this promise, wrote wonderful words when he said: "No man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost." What that means, I think, is that *just as only the Divine can reveal the Divine, so only the Divine can recognize the Divine.* It was because Jesus was uniquely divine that he could reveal God to man, and it is because there is in every man something of the divine that man is able to recognize that revelation.

This, I believe, is the faith in which *all Christians, whatever they may call themselves,* really live. It is not so much the faith as the expression of the faith about which we differ. But I do not think it ought to be difficult for those who believe in the Trinity of the One God to express their

belief in simple language. We do not believe in three gods; we believe in one God. But we are confident that in order to know that one God as fully as it is possible for man to know him, he must be experienced in the three manifestations which we call Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Our faith, we believe, is the same as the faith of Jesus. Note I say our *faith.* The *creed* of Jesus was the expression of his faith in the familiar language knowledge of God; and while we know that simple-hearted men and women can eat of that fruit and enjoy God without any knowledge of the mystery of this universe, yet we also know that educated men and women who have devoted a vast deal of time and thought to the elucidation of the mystery of this universe cannot rest satisfied without some understanding of the creeds in which their faith was formulated.

There are a few who will agree with this but yet will say: "Why could not this faith have remained in the unformulated state in which the New Testament leaves it? But, as that was not done, why can we not return to those primitive days and discard the creeds which are unfamiliar and obscure?" The answer is that we cannot get rid of the history of the church, and begin our lives to-day as if that history had never been. What we ought to do is to ask ourselves what those men of old were trying to express, and then go on to ask if it be not possible, without breaking with the past, to hold the faith and at the same time rejoice in the larger knowledge which we have been permitted to acquire.

See, then, what it was which the church of the fourth century had in mind to do. It had to express Jesus' faith in God in a form that would satisfy the Greek mind, which was asking questions which the Jew would not have understood. Just as in the development of the ministry the church followed the road which the genius of Rome had built, so in its theological development it followed the lines already traced by Greek philosophy. We value the

organization because we believe it was developed under the influence of the Divine Spirit; we value the creeds because we believe that here too the spirit was making its influence felt. We do not feel that the organization is of such binding force that it may not be changed if in changing times another form is found better fitted to the days in which we live. That would be to deny that the spirit is still abiding in the church. In the same way we do not think the creeds are of such authority that the church is not at liberty to express its living faith in the intelligible language of this day; that would be to deny that the spirit is still leading the faithful into the truth.

If, however, we ask what form such a new creed should take, we do not hesitate to say that while the ancient creeds might with advantage be simplified, if we depart from the ancient faith in the Trinity of God we shall find that we have failed to satisfy the deepest longing of the soul.

For, far as we seem to have travelled from the fourth century, the problems of life have not essentially changed. The church of the fourth century found itself face to face with different theories of the divine. There was the popular belief in "gods many"; there was the Stoic belief in the one God whose will was omnipotent and in opposition to it man was helpless; and there was, coming in from the East, the Pantheistic conception of God which included all life, but was lacking in holiness of character. Each of these represented a truth, but no one of them alone satisfied the soul of man. The church believed that Jesus' revelation of God would satisfy, and it attempted to formulate its faith with these needs in mind. The result was the so-called Nicene Creed. Stoicism's demand for a God over all, who made and upholds the universe, was answered in the declaration that God is our Father and Creator. The polytheistic demand for a God who partook of the

likeness of man was met by the assertion that the man Christ Jesus was of the same substance as the Father. And Pantheism found something congenial in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit which is the giver of life. Are these demands obsolete? Do we not find to-day the same feeling manifesting itself in strange forms? Pantheism is a widespread belief to-day in America, even though some of its adherents have never heard the word. Stoic philosophy is the religion of many a noble soul to-day as it was of old; and William James, the most popular of modern philosophic teachers, has intimated that Polytheism is a living faith. Is this a time for the churches to say that the need for dogma has passed? There is need to-day for the church to state with authority what its faith is. But that authority must be more august than that of the councils. It must be the authority of Jesus, who spoke with authority because he spoke words that answered to the needs of the soul, and the soul responded to his message and verified it by experience.

I say that I believe that this truth is recognized by thoughtful men in every church, and that this faith in God as Trinity is the faith by which all, consciously or subconsciously, are living. I believe that the real difficulty lies, not in the faith, but in the popular misapprehension of the faith. This is the way the objection expresses itself: "We understand that the doctrine of the Trinity is that there is one God in three persons. Then if God be a 'person' he too is an individual. There cannot then be three individuals in one." But what has been overlooked in this syllogism is, first, that God is not an "individual." If he be, then we have the deistic God, in whom science is making it impossible to believe. "Is God, then, not a person?" The answer is: "No, if by person be meant a solitary being." The personality of God is greater than human personality. And that is what the fathers were trying to say when they spoke of the Triune Personality of

God.* In the second place, the word "person" has changed in meaning so completely that it means in common speech the very opposite of what the creeds affirm. An analogy to this is found in the changed meaning of the word "prevent." Every student of English literature knows that in the sixteenth century the word "prevent" meant "to go before in order to facilitate," whereas now it means "to go before in order to frustrate." Let us imagine an historical writer describing the battle of Antietam without explaining in what sense he used the word "prevent." See what the confusion of the modern reader would inevitably be on reading such a statement as this: "On the 17th of September, 1862, McClellan ordered Burnside to move promptly at eight o'clock and to march to the Potomac in order to prevent the capture of the whole Rebel army by the Federal troops." Would it not be supposed that McClellan was seeking to aid Lee's escape? But the

* "God is a personal being—'superpersonal,' if we like to say so, but at least personal—as a person making his will known to us, and demanding of us that we should deal with him as with a person, at once our unerring Judge and our loving Father."—"Belief in God," Bishop Gore, p. 134.

"Mr. Clement Webb ('God and Personality,' Allen & Unwin, 1918, p. 61) has recently said that 'it was in connection with the doctrine of the Trinity that the words *person* and *personality* came to be used of the Divine Being,' and that though personality *in* God is the orthodox Christian doctrine, to speak of the personality *of* God has a suggestion of the Unitarian heresy. Now, it is true that the *terms* for personality, whether in Greek or Latin, were only elaborated in this connection. But Christianity felt the importance of personality, both in man and in God, before it found a term to express the idea. And the personality of the one God was surely a central idea of the prophetic religion which Christianity inherited long before any question was raised about personal distinction in the Godhead."—*Ibid.*, p. 114.

Not a few devout souls are adverse to predicating the personality of God because they conceive personality only as a limitation. But, on the other hand, if the personality of God be denied, there is no possibility of communion between God and man. Therefore, it seems best to speak of personality in God, because we have no other term by which we can express that spiritual experience which we call the communion of the soul with God.

archaic writer would really be trying to say that the object of McClellan's order was to facilitate the capture of the Confederate troops. If the word "person" is to be used at all, it is essential that it should be clearly understood in what sense it is used. If it be supposed that in the ancient formularies of the faith the word "person" is used in the modern sense, it leads inevitably to tritheism.

Athanasius and the Nicene fathers would have been horrified had they been told that they had set forth a doctrine that stated that there were three individuals in the Godhead. They would have seen, as we do, that it would have been like saying that three disciples—Peter and James and John—were one Jesus! But is the substance of the Godhead personal or impersonal? If it be personal the objection has no force. Is it, then, impersonal? If so, it means that it is a mysterious life differentiated into three self-consciousnesses or minds. But how does this differ from polytheism except by the arbitrary limitation of the gods to three? "Monotheism was saved by Athanasius and the Council of Nicæa; and more and more, since that turning-point in the development of doctrine, Christian thought has abandoned the way of looking at the Persons of the Trinity as distinct minds acting in co-operation. The Catholic theory of the Holy Trinity—as formulated by St. Augustine, and in a still clearer and more philosophical form by St. Thomas Aquinas—represents that God is One Consciousness, One Mind—a Trinity of Power, Wisdom, and Will or Love—which together constitute one self-conscious Being." * If personality in the popular sense of the term be predicated of the Godhead, it leads inevitably either to tritheism or to Unitarianism. But the word is not so used in the creeds.

The modern study of psychology has shown that "personality is something not in essence singular but plural." †

* "The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology," Hastings Rashdall, dean of Carlisle (Macmillan & Co., 1920), p. 444.

† J. F. Bethune-Baker.

And that means that the "man in the street" has no clear understanding of the meaning of personality. If embryonic human personality is plural, how much more must this be true of the one Perfect Personality, which is God. Therefore it would be better to speak of "personality *in* God" rather than of the "personality *of* God."

As a matter of fact, the confusing formula does not occur in the Nicene Creed. It came into the liturgy from the so-called "Athanasian Creed," which is not a creed and was not written by Athanasius. The word "person" occurs twice in the services of the Prayer-Book. In the litany we say: "O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, Three Persons and One God." In one of the prefaces in the communion service for Trinity Sunday we say: "Who art one Lord, not only one person but three persons in one substance. For what we believe of the glory of the Father the same we believe of the glory of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, without any difference or inequality." This is a very ancient statement. It is taken from the Sarum Missal, which came from the Sacramentary of Pope Gelasius (450 A. D.) and was drawn by him from a still earlier Greek mass. No one can understand what it means who is not familiar with the Greek. How many of the laity have the time or inclination for such research? Therefore, in the American book, a second Preface was inserted as an alternative far better fitted for public worship:* "We give thanks unto thee, Holy Father, Almighty and Everlasting God, for the precious death and merits of thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, and for the sending to us of the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, who are one with thee in thy Eternal Godhead." Now, inasmuch as the American compilers of the book stated that it was not their intention to depart from the doctrine of the English Church, it must be as-

* See "The Holy Communion in Great Britain and America," J. Brett Langstaff, p. 239.

sumed that, in their judgment, the second Preface is the equivalent of the first. If they are right, then the word "person" cannot have the meaning in the liturgy which it has in common speech. And this judgment is justified by an examination of the Greek word which appears in our liturgy as "person." We get it from the Latin "persona," which means a mask, that is, the visible sign through which the sound of the voice of the actor came. These masks were put on by the actor to play a certain part—a father or a hero or a lover, as the case might be. But the compilers of the creed were careful to say that they did not think of these "masks" as being put on and off by the Divine Actor; that was the error of Sabellius. Rather they conceived them to be essential elements in the Divine Nature. "Persona" was a translation of the Greek word "hypostasis," for which there is neither Latin nor English exact equivalent. It means, as near as we can guess, first "reality," then "distinction," and then "manifestation." So that we feel justified in saying that what the ancient creeds meant to teach was that God must not be thought of as a solitary individual, having no present relation to the world, but that he is to be thought of as Eternal Spirit, from all eternity having distinctions which are manifested in the threefold revelation of God to man as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and that each of these manifestations is equally divine. Jesus, then, is not to be thought of as a "second God," nor the Holy Spirit as merely an influence —more or less diluted—but that when we commune with the Father or the Son or the Holy Spirit we commune with the Eternal Godhead.

The English Church deserves high praise for having taken the doctrine of the Trinity out of the mists of metaphysics and placed it where it was intended to be, in the atmosphere of ethics.

It would probably be more consonant with modern thought to speak of three "voices" rather than three

"persons" in the Divine Unity.* The voice of the Father is heard in the storm, indeed, but also in the salient setting of the sun, and in all the scenes of beauty which deck the earth and makes us feel that the mysterious power which often seems cruel is in reality love. The voice of Jesus, which few, indeed, heard, but an echo of which can still be heard in the words which those who listened to him have recorded, interprets to us that other voice which reproves and exhorts and comforts and inspires, bidding us "come up higher." Each is the voice of the One God.

To say that God must be identified with but one "person" or voice, which we call Father, leads inevitably to Agnosticism. To identify God with Jesus, as if he had never been revealed to the men of old, as the early Gnostics would have done, as some modern Protestants are doing, is to lose all sense of the majesty of the Eternal, and tends to the degradation of God to a cheap good nature, forgetful of what it has cost to redeem our souls. To identify God with that voice which indeed speaks to us as truly as it spoke to Abraham, is to separate the church into its component parts and lose all feeling of the "blessed company of all faithful people."

The English Church passed by the Nicene Creed and chose the "Apostles' Creed," as stating its terms of membership. This was significant. The English people are far more like the Romans than like the Greeks, and the practical value of the Roman creed appealed to them more than the more speculative Greek confessions of faith. So in the catechism the child is asked what it "chiefly learns from the articles of its belief," *i. e.*, the Apostles' Creed. And the answer is that it learns three things which are the essentials of the creed. First, to "believe in God the Father, who hath made me and all the world. Secondly, in God the Son, who hath redeemed me and all mankind; and, thirdly, in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me

* See "Christ's Thought of God," J. M. Wilson.

and all the people of God." On this faith the religious life of the child is built. So when it says,

> "Now I lay me down to sleep,
> I pray the Lord my soul to keep,"

it is prayer to God thought of as Father. When it says,

> "Jesus, tender Shepherd, hear me,
> Bless thy little lamb to-night,"

it is in communion with God as revealed in the Shepherd of our souls. When it says,

> "And when, dear Saviour, I kneel down morning and night in prayer,
> Something there is within my heart that tells me thou art there,"

it is communing with God as Holy Spirit.

This is not speculative, it is ethical. The child grows to maturity in the consciousness that protecting, redeeming, sanctifying love is with it from the beginning to the end of life. This is the glory of the "Eternal Trinity." To know that God is as near us when we pray as he was near to the earth when the "morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy," to know that in Jesus we see the Father as truly as did Philip, to be filled with the spirit and bring forth the fruits thereof, is to know God, not as a theory but as a sublime spiritual experience. God is spirit; seen in the glory of the universe, witnessed to in the life of Jesus, experienced in sanctifying prayer.

This faith has come to us through apostles, saints, and martyrs. It requires courage to hold it and confess it to-day as truly, though in a different way, as when the Mohammedan invasion threatened to overwhelm the world. We shall not be persecuted, only scorned by the half-

educated. We must bear the strain which comes when the ancient words seem in conflict with our incomplete knowledge. We can learn what the words mean if we will give the time to their study. But it requires no study to believe that the Eternal is revealing himself unto us as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and that each of these manifestations is equally divine. I say it does not require great knowledge, but it does require great faith, that is, the intense activity of our spiritual nature. But I venture to say that it requires no more to believe in the divinity of the Son and of the Holy Spirit than to believe in the divinity of the Father. If there be in this universe anything that answers to our thought of the divine power and goodness and love, it is not easy to find it in nature nor in the experiences of life. Our wisest plans are frustrated, our dearest hopes are disappointed, our tenderest feelings are lacerated, until it seems vain to hope that there can be both power and goodness behind and before, laying its hand upon us. It is the life of Jesus which keeps alive this faith. It is the witness of the spirit which leads us to feel that this faith is not vain. This, as I understand it, is the meaning of that sublime prayer which Cranmer wrote as the collect for Trinity Sunday:

"Almighty and Everlasting God, who has given unto us, thy servants, grace by the confession of a true faith to acknowledge the glory of the Eternal Trinity, and in the power of the Divine Majesty to worship the Unity; we beseech thee that thou wouldest keep us steadfast in that faith, and evermore defend us from all adversities, who livest and reignest, one God, world without end."

# CHAPTER XIV

## DOCTRINE

### *B.* The Catholic Creeds

In the preceding chapter it was asserted that faith in the triune personality of God is the fundamental doctrine of the Christian church. Yet it may be objected: "If the doctrine be so liable to misapprehension, as seems to be the case, would it not be better to abandon the ancient creeds and substitute for them some simpler form of belief, which, by stating the faith in modern language, would avoid such misunderstandings?" No doubt there would be manifest advantages in so doing, to which attention will be called a little later. I believe not a few of the clergy of the Episcopal Church would agree that it would be better if the Apostles' Creed were made the end rather than the beginning of Christian education. But whatever form a simpler expression of the church's faith might take, there would be a loss if there should be any weakening of the authoritative message of the church. That authority, however, can never be preserved by a traditional repetition of the words which once moved the hearts of men; it must be tested by the response of the deepest longings of the human soul to-day.

The dogmatic weakness of the churches arises not so much from the retention of the ancient formularies as from the uncertainty of their meaning. The pulpit is turning more and more to economics and politics rather than to the truth of the Being of God. These are matters which because they need to be sanctified by the message of the church may properly be referred to by the pulpit, but can

never be its supreme message. There are other voices which can preach industrial reform; but if the churches do not preach the doctrine of the truth of God, it will be left to those who are least fitted by character and learning to attempt to answer the question which is the most important in the world, and to which an answer is being demanded to-day with as great eagerness as at any time in the history of the world. One has only to glance at a Sunday newspaper to see how many are pretending to give an answer. How gladly the world would respond if the church had as definite a message as many of the Theosophists are advertising their readiness to give! Let a man of God lift up his voice in the pulpit and make it evident that he has something to reveal which he has learned by personal experience to be true, and people will flock to hear him, so anxious are they to learn about God.

Such a simplified creed as is sometimes asked for cannot be the means of unity; it must be the result of unity. Such a creed cannot be formulated till all the churches are given an opportunity to bear witness to the truth as each knows it. For one church to attempt to revise the Catholic creeds would be an offense to all the others, and be a fresh cause of disunion. But while no individual church would undertake to revise the ancient creeds, might it not be possible for some church—the Episcopal, for example—to substitute some simpler form than one of the historic creeds for use in its public worship. This would not be so radical an act as might at first be supposed. The first draft of the American Prayer-Book omitted the Nicene Creed. The English bishops made its retention a *sine qua non* for the consecration of Bishop White, and wished to have the American Church retain the Athanasian Creed as well. To the last, however, the Americans would not agree, and there was a compromise. Would there have been serious loss if the Nicene Creed had been omitted from our services? I doubt it. Nor do I think we should lose

if we were to have a section of our Prayer-Book devoted to confessions of faith, to serve as milestones to mark the road which the church has travelled. In such a creedal section there would be—as at present—the Thirty-nine Articles, showing the opinion of the Church of England on the subjects of controversy with the Roman Catholic Church in the sixteenth century; the Athanasian Creed, as witnessing to the faith of the early French Church in its conflict with the Saracens; the Nicene Creed, the protest against Arianism; and the Apostles' Creed, the Roman symbol in the dangerous times of the Gnostic heresy in the second and third centuries.

If it be thought that a confession of faith is essential to every public service, might we not find some simple confession which would serve the purpose better than a more ancient creed? I would suggest that such a creed should return to the ancient form, and instead of the singular personal pronoun which the Reformation compilers of the book used as expressing the individual's faith, begin with a proclamation of the corporate faith of the congregation. What should we lose beyond the sentiment of antiquity and the charm of archaic forms by the use of such a creed as this?

"We believe in one God: the Father, the Author of everlasting life; the Son Jesus Christ our Lord, our Redeemer; the Holy Spirit, our Sanctifier.

"And we pray God to keep us steadfast in this faith, and that it may be not only confessed by our lips, but manifested in our lives by a humble, holy, and obedient walking before him."

Such a creed would assert our faith in the Holy Trinity, and relieve us from the difficulties from which no ancient formula can be entirely free. In this way, by the confession of a true faith, we might be given grace to acknowledge the glory of the Eternal Trinity, that is, the threefold manifestation or shining forth of the one God who is

spirit, and "in the power of that Divine Majesty to worship the Unity." *

But there is a question connected with creeds which must not be overlooked, because it touches a deeper question than any so far considered, and that is intellectual integrity. It may be said, all that has been asserted as to the essence of the creeds may be true, and that the doctrine of chief importance may be the Trinity of God in Unity, but it must not be overlooked that this dogma is

* Since the above was written the whole question has been fully discussed in the "Modern Churchman's Conference" of 1921, a report of which will be found in *The Modern Churchman*, September, 1921. In this report will be found several suggested creeds; one of these offered by a layman, Douglas White, M.A., M.D., is as follows:

"I believe in God, the Father of all;
And in Jesus Christ, Revealer of God, and Saviour of men:
And in the Spirit of Holiness, which is the Spirit of God and of Jesus:
By which Spirit man is made divine:
I acknowledge the communion of all faithful people,
In beauty, goodness, and truth:
And I believe in the forgiveness of sins, the glory of righteousness,
The victory of love, and the life eternal."

Another, suggested by the Rev. R. J. Shires, rector of St. Andrew's, La Tuque, Province of Quebec, Canada, is a declaration of purpose rather than a statement of faith, but is worthy of serious consideration:

"That inasmuch as the real test of our Christianity is that our daily conduct shall harmonize with the will of God, as declared by Jesus Christ, through the power of the Holy Spirit, we therefore declare our intention of working together in a Christian spirit with all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity:

"To improve and intensify our personal experience of God by the regular and faithful use of every means of grace.

"To live in such a way that men everywhere shall be able to take note of us that we have been with Jesus.

"To follow the guidance of the Holy Spirit, who will lead us into all truth.

"To promote harmonious relations with all men.

"To seek that unity which shall make us all one in Christ Jesus.

"To promote effective Christianity in the endeavor to make the kingdoms of this world the kingdom of Our Lord and of his Christ."
—*The Modern Churchman*, November, 1921.

When these two suggested creeds are compared, it will be seen that the writers approach the problem from two different standpoints,

and to drive men who are humbly seeking to know the will of God into revolt against the church which should be the home and the school of all God's children. It is to turn the church from the witness to the divine life of Jesus into a philosophic society, whose mission is to repeat words but partially understood, like the Buddhist "Om mani padni Om," as if they had some magic power. The Catholic creeds should be an inspiration to a living faith, because they are the witness to man's belief that the spirit will lead into truth, and that that truth must in this day be expressed in language which to the former days would have seemed inadequate. How few of those who reverence Athanasius appreciate that he was a great "radical," a true "modernist"!

But so have been all the great teachers of the church whose doctrines are relied upon by the obscurantist of to-day. Such were Augustine and Anselm and Aquinas; such were Luther and Calvin. "*Cur Deus homo?*" was the one question they all tried to answer in the way their age could understand. And this was what was to have been expected from the disciples of him who was the most profound radical the religious life has known. "Ye believe in God," said Jesus; "now believe in me." How had they believed in God? In the conventional way of their past experience, and it was not vivifying. Jesus would have them enter into that knowledge of truth which he had learned by the things which he suffered. If they did that, then God would be to them what he was to Jesus, and to know God is to know the truth. Jesus knew nothing about what we now call the "immanence of God," but he knew much about the nearness of God. Not one poor little sparrow fallen from the nest and dying of cold and hunger perished without some sympathetic emotion on the part of God. How much more was this true of those whom Jesus called God's children! The world is not asking to-day so much "*Cur Deus homo?*" as "Does God care?"

Does the church know that truth? If so, it has a message which the world is eager to hear. The creeds may express in metaphysical language the method by which this truth was made effective, but it is the truth which the world asks for. To-day we think it can be better expressed in the language of psychology,* but it is not the philosophical expression which is of primary importance but the truth of God's care. Has the individual soul eternal value? Or does it, at the end, "slip like a dewdrop into the eternal sea"? Jesus knew, and sent his messengers to tell that truth to a discouraged world, and the world sprang to new life. Is there an eternal home to which the soul may look forward after the long wandering, where there will be pardon and love, recognition and peace? Jesus was in no doubt about it, and there were seen a "new heaven and a new earth." How was this great work done? Was it by creeds and councils? We know that it was revealed in the lives of simple folk who received it and lived in it, and so revealed it and convinced the world of the truth which not the learned nor the wise but the simple were able to understand. "Christianity rose and spread among men," says Carlyle, "in the mystic deeps of man's soul, and was spread by the 'preaching of the word' by simple, altogether natural and individual efforts; and flew, like hallowed fire, from heart to heart, till all were purified and illuminated by it." †

> "Simple faith still shows the way
> We lose by chart of creeds."

That the truth would be more effective if it were illustrated by the lives of "all who profess and call themselves Christians" is undoubtedly true, but to suppose that this would result from the corporate unity of the church is to misread history. Whenever the church as a whole, or any

* I think this was first said by Archbishop Temple.
† Quoted by Glover in "Jesus in the Experience of Men."

part of the church, has claimed that it was the possessor of the whole truth, there has followed a protest and a revolt from the organization which has been for the welfare of the church at large.

The classic illustration of this is found in the Reformation of the sixteenth century. But it has been repeated again and again since that day. The first effect was no doubt to shake faith in a certain expression of truth, which had been identified with truth itself, but that was a temporary effect. The lasting gain was in driving men to the heart of truth. We are seeing the same spirit at work to-day, and if we have learned the lessons of the past, we should see that what is needed to-day is not an insistence upon a return to any ancient statement as of permanent authority but rather to the manifestation of truth in life. That this is being recognized is seen in the fact that not a few ministers are losing interest in theology. Some are turning to poetry and others to economics and, in the Anglican communion, there is a strong drift toward sacramentarianism,* which many believe leads to a repudiation of the religion of Jesus.

It is not possible for the uninitiated to appreciate the appeal that sacramentarianism undoubtedly makes to many intelligent and devout men. It is essentially an esoteric doctrine, and can be understood only by the initiated. That it has profound effect upon character the history of the Roman Catholic Church shows. It has

* "I remember very well, when I was eight or nine . . . reading a book by a Protestant author—a Presbyterian, I think—entitled 'Father Clement,' about the conversion of a Catholic priest to Protestantism. . . . The book described confession and absolution, fasting, the Real Presence, the devotion of the Three Hours, the use of incense, etc., and I felt instinctively and at once that this sort of sacramental religion was the religion for me." ("Belief in God," by Bishop Gore.) Why Bishop Gore should have failed to find a home in the one church which has consistently followed the sacramental religion, we need not consider. The interesting point in this statement is that it is the heart of the Roman Catholic religion in which he has found peace.

proved a veritable refuge or "gourd" for multitudes of mystics who ignore the intellectual difficulties of dogma and the moral inconsistencies which have marred the life of the church, but find in it a means of mystic communion with God. The rationalist may be tempted to scorn it, but it cannot be denied that one of the causes of the weakness of Protestantism has been its intense intellectualism and its lack of sympathy with mysticism, and as a result it is in Protestant communities that the most modern form of mysticism—Christian Science—makes the strongest appeal, and that the most ancient form of mysticism—theosophy—is wide-spread in America. But this, I think, may truthfully be said, that while mysticism is an essential element in all religious experience, if it be not interpreted by the understanding and manifested in ethical life, it will be destructive of the truest communion of the soul with God, and therefore lead to the abandonment of the religion of Jesus. His appeal was primarily to conscience, the innate consciousness of God. He asked his disciples to pass judgment upon his message, that is, to exercise their intelligence, and the result of his influence was as has been stated by one of the earliest of the postapostolic writers:* "God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind." Paul knew the danger of unintelligent mysticism which in its earliest form appeared in the church in the "gift of tongues." He did not deny that this gift had "signification," but he did say that it tended to mystification: "He that speaketh in a tongue speaketh not unto men but unto God, for no man understandeth him. . . . He speaketh mysteries. If he pray in a tongue my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also. . . . I had rather speak five words with my understanding . . . than ten thousand words in a tongue." Sacramentarianism

* II Tim. 1 : 7.

would, I believe, be rebuked by Paul for the same reason that he rebuked those who were identifying the "gift of tongues" with the full manifestation of the spirit of God. To assert that any material means are essential for the manifestation of God to the human spirit is to become "entangled again in the bondage from which Christ has set us free." It has obscured the meaning of grace. In the New Testament grace is not only a beautiful and comforting word, but it is also a simple and natural word; it means help. The early Protestant teachers wrote tomes upon grace, but who reads them to-day? They identified grace with the mysterious effect of the atonement, but the sacramentarian is confusing it with the material which is the sign of a spiritual gift. Consequently the highest grace is impossible to those who do not receive the material symbol, but is this a fact or a theory? Sacraments are indeed means of grace because they are "outward and visible signs" of God's love, but the material symbol cannot be the channel of grace nor essential for the communion of the soul with God. That sacramentarianism is a comforting and attractive religion cannot be denied, but its identification with the religion to which Jesus called his disciples is without historical warrant.

Not a few who have learned the impotence of the sacramental theory as it has been proclaimed by the Roman Catholic Church and have repudiated it, nevertheless are interested in tracing its influence upon the early church through the "mystery" religions, which were coming in from the East at the time when Paul was preaching. This is not the place for a discussion of the mystery religions, even if I were competent to undertake it. But it may not be out of place to call attention to the fact that those who think that modern scholarship is showing a current toward a view of sacramentarianism which would prove that Paul and John, under the influence of Mithras and Isis, were laying the foundation of a "magic" religion, may find that

in escaping from the Scylla of a "naturalistic" theology they will be shipwrecked upon the Charybdis which will reduce Jesus to the phantom of Isis and Mithras. Already we hear voices proclaiming that Jesus had no historical existence, that he was invented as a rival to one of the many "redeemers" who were making their appeal to the superstition of the second century. The church has been so busy in flogging the dead body of Arius that it has failed to see the shadow of a more subtle enemy, Apollinarius. Unless the church can plant its feet firmly on the rock of the historicity of Jesus, it can speak with no authority. The world is not eager to hear about a deluded Jesus of eschatology nor of a rival myth, but it would respond to the Sermon on the Mount and the pure ethical teaching of him who spake as never man spake. There is a modern form of Docetism which "spiritualism" cannot combat nor sacramentarianism popularize.

The Anglo-Catholic sacramentarian can derive no comfort from the teachings of the "modernist" sacramentarian, for if modern scholarship should succeed in showing that the sacramental theory was introduced into the Christian church by Paul and glorified by John, nothing would have been done to link it up with the teachings of Jesus. On the contrary, it would simply prove that just as Paul in certain of his epistles had never succeeded in ridding himself of the dogmatism of the Rabbinic school, so he had fallen under the influence of heathen teachers and attempted to adjust the gospel of Jesus to the mystery religions, and, therefore, the breach between Jesus and Paul would be complete. The Anglo-Catholic sacramentarian believes that his theory of the sacraments was not borrowed from the mystic religions, but represents the teaching of Christ himself. Therefore any expectation on the part of the modernist that he will appeal to the Anglo-Catholic by trying to show an early origin of the sacramentarian theory, so far from conciliating, will embitter. To the

Anglo-Catholics the church is not primarily a philosophic school; rather, it is a means of salvation. They accept the theology of the past because it is believed to be the revelation to the church of the truth of God. Some of them seem neither to examine nor understand it, but simply accept it. The only thing which differentiates them from Roman Catholics is that they do not accept the supremacy of the pope, though they are willing to admit that he ought to be granted a "primacy."

One of the effects of a more efficient co-operation among the Protestant churches would unquestionably lead such men to cast off this remnant of Protestantism and find solace in the church with which they are really at one. But as long as they remain in the Protestant church they will be an alien element and hinder the unity which they believe they desire. They have the advantage of being able to state their theory of salvation in terms which can easily be understood. They read the words—as they believe, of our Saviour himself—in John's Gospel: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." "Can anything be clearer," they say, "than that this refers to the Eucharist? Then it must follow that if any man fails to partake of that sacrament, there can be no life in him—he is spiritually dead. What, then, can be more important in Christian practice than the means to spiritual life? And how can that sacrament be celebrated except by those whom the Lord himself appointed for that purpose?" They do not deny that the Lord's Supper as administered in the Protestant churches is a religious rite; they only deny that it is a life-giving sacrament. "If all that Christ wished 'on the same night in which he was betrayed' was that he be remembered in a simple love-feast, or, like a dinner of a club, as a sign of good fellowship, then any one chosen by the club might properly be appointed to preside at such a function. But if it be a sacrament, ordained by Christ himself and neces-

sary for spiritual life, it is of the first importance that there should be a priest ordained by those who had been authorized by Christ to administer it. Such are they and only they who have been ordained by those who can trace their authority back to the very men who sat at the table with Christ and heard him say: 'This is my Body; this is my Blood.' Those who have that authority are the bishops of the Catholic Church, whose ministry derives from Christ himself."

The theory is without a flaw unless it be in the assumption on which it rests, and, that having been already considered in that chapter which treats of the ministry, need not be repeated. As long as it is discussed as a theory, there is no probability that any agreement will be reached on it. There is, however, another way of testing it than by argument, and that is by the application of the scientific method. Does it explain the facts of life? Are those who fail to receive the sacrament in the way which to the sacramentarian seems essential, with or without the evidences of spiritual life? If they are not without the evidences of spiritual life, what shall we say of the theory, and if they are, why can they not see their loss and begin a new life? I suppose the answer to the second question is that most religious men and women who have grown up in some church which holds no such theory of spiritual life are convinced that not only are the premises on which the theory is based unsound, but that if they were true, it would not be the religion of Jesus to which they were invited, but to some other religion which is entirely opposed to all that they believe he taught. For when it is examined, what does this sacramentarianism mean but a religion of magic? A spiritual effect is to be produced by material means. The miracle can be wrought by a man who is without the first evidence of the spirit of Christ. It may be received by a man who is living in open sin. It is true that in the latter case he may receive it to his

"damnation," but the fact remains that the body and blood of him who said, "Not that which goeth into the man defiles him, but that which cometh out of his heart," is believed to be received by the mouth. But if the teaching of Jesus be true, that no material thing can corrupt man's spiritual nature, it must be equally true that no material thing can spiritualize him. If it be answered that it is not a material thing but a spiritual thing which is received, then the doctrine of Transubstantiation must be true. But we are justified in asserting that Jesus' teaching leads to the conviction that no spiritual life can be so incorporated into a material thing as to enter into man's spirit, except by magic.

It does not follow from this that the sacraments are without value, or that it would not have been better had the Protestant churches laid more emphasis upon them than they have done. They are means of grace, but not necessarily for the reason that is often supposed. Each morning there passes my door a stream of men and women and little children on their way to mass.* I do not believe that would continue year after year if the participants did not derive some conscious benefit from the sacred office. I think I can understand something of that influence by an experience which I had many years ago. I was in Milan, on St. Mark's Day, and had in mind to attend high mass at the great cathedral. I was late in arriving, and the office had proceeded to the part in the service where the incense in great clouds filled the sanctuary and began to float out into the choir and nave. At that moment, about twenty feet about the pavement, on the great pillar which supports the crossing on the south side, I saw the face of Christ! As clearly as I see the paper on which I now write, I saw the traditional face of the Man of Sorrows. The vision lasted several minutes, and when the choir sang, "Benedictus qui venit in nomine

* This was written at Pointe à Pic, in the Province of Quebec.

Domini," I understood something of the power of the mass. Every devout soul in the vast minster felt that Christ had come to them; they too saw his face and were blessed. The explanation of my own "vision" came to me later when I considered the experience. I had been for over an hour gazing at Leonardo's "Last Supper," till the face of the Saviour had been photographed on the retina of the eye. When I entered the dim cathedral and the incense filled the temple, blotting out the more evident things of sight, the photograph was reflected on the pillar, as if it had come there of itself. It was an illusion; but it was full of comfort. I believe this is true of the mass. It too is an illusion. Christ does not "come" when the priest pronounces the sacred words. He is there. He is in them "the hope of glory" and does not "come." They become conscious of the Presence which the "world" obscures, and are comforted for the struggle with poverty and pain and death. But the way in which the mass is expounded leads to a belief in magic, and has its roots in an ancient animism in which the "eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood" of the god is the supreme rite. From this early superstition the ignorant are less free than perhaps we sometimes suppose. We are now in a position to understand how sacramentarianism cannot exist apart from sacerdotalism; magic requires a magician. But this is not a Christian doctrine. Sacramentarianism and sacerdotalism both existed side by side centuries before the coming of Christ, and the effects then produced have repeated themselves again and again in the long history of the church.* But this does not mean that the mass has no modern value. It goes down to the root of our religious

* "Though your good works," says the interested (Persian) prophet, "exceed in number the leaves of the trees, or the sands on the seashore, they will be unprofitable to you, unless they are accepted by the *destour*, or priest. To obtain the acceptance of this guide to salvation, you must faithfully pay him *tithes* of all you possess. . . . If the

nature. Just as the creeds are a relic of anthropomorphism, so is the mass, and, to a less extent, the communion, a relic of animism.

Protestantism purified that early illusion by the doctrine of sacraments, which are means of grace, that is, helpful. The illusion is that the grace, or help, resides in the material which witnesses to it, instead of being a sign or symbol of that help. Life then becomes full of sacraments. My friend sends me a book or a poem, or even only a flower. It is a sacrament of his friendship. What do I need of that if I have my friend's friendship? It is a foolish question. I may have forgotten my friend, differences of opinion may have arisen between us, and I may have become suspicious of his true friendship, and then comes his gift! I know then that he has not forgotten me; I recall all the gracious acts of the past; my love for my friend is deepened by the sacrament which I have received. But if we analyze the experience a little further, we shall find that the essence of the experience is remembrance. The Catholic reproaches the Protestant with making the sacrament a mere remembrance. If he makes it a remembrance, he has used it as it was intended to be used. I remember my friend. That is all that is needed. If I remember my Saviour, it is enough. For remembrance is not exhausted by the recalling of a past event. It is a means of realizing his presence now. No doubt Protestantism has been too prone to limit the remembrance of Jesus to the Last Supper, and thereby has failed to experience that joy which the constant remembrance of his presence should bring to all who partake of the Lord's Supper as communing with one who is not far from us. He does

*destour* be satisfied, your soul will escape hell tortures; you will secure praise in this world and happiness in the next."—Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. VIII.

This is the true meaning of sacerdotalism, and it continues to be a power to this day.

not come to us. We come to him, whenever we remember what he is. Such thoughts as these would bring a unity in communion which the scholastic theories of "substance and accidents" have broken into bitterness of spirit where there should be love.

I have said that the Roman Catholic Church is the greatest sect known to history. Must we not add that the nearer the Anglican communion comes to the theories of that church the more sectarian it must become? Certainly that is what many Protestants of other churches believe. It must be so, not because the individual members of the Roman or Anglican communion are essentially blameworthy, but because their theories compel them to regard their brethren of other churches as if they were displeasing to Christ. The Roman Church is able to show a larger charity because it covers many sins with the mantle of "invincible ignorance," but we Protestants are debarred from that comfortable doctrine by a feeling of shame, lest we boast. The world cannot be divided into the two categories of knave and fool. Anglicans cannot pretend that those of other churches have not had the same advantages as themselves, and so there comes unwillingly a certain contempt for those who follow not with them.

Come back to the question with which we began: "How is it possible that those churches which are without a 'valid' ministry and life-giving sacraments *can* have the life of the Son of Man?" Well, the point is they have!

It is pathetic to see the difficulties in which good men are involved because of a preconceived theory. A good and learned bishop, known to me personally, and one for whose character I had high regard, was elected to a diocese where his church had never made much headway, but where for many years the religion of Christ had been followed as well as elsewhere. He began his ministry in this new field by writing a letter to the clergy of the diocese—which letter was, of course, published in the newspapers

with startling head-lines. In this letter he said that he hoped to establish a church in every town where at last the gospel of Christ should be preached. Not long after I was in conversation with a friend, the Congregational minister in one of those towns, and he asked me what I thought of the letter. I wished to be loyal to a minister of my own church and tried to change the subject with some trivial remark. But he would have none of it. He felt that an awful wrong had been done, not to his own church alone, but to the church universal, and he said: "This old white meeting-house has stood here for over two hundred years. Here children have been baptized, the young have been joined together in matrimony, the converted have been brought to the Lord's Table, the dead have been buried, and yet in all these two hundred years it seems that the gospel of Christ has not been preached! Well, in God's name, what *has* been preached?"

The bishop was not the heartless man my friend supposed; it was simply that he had identified the "gospel of Christ" with a theory of sacramentarianism. Had he had the mind of Paul, he would have said that the gospel had been preached, but that certain aspects of the religious life had not been emphasized. That it had been preached and would continue to be preached should have filled his heart with joy. Paul could not have written as he did about those who preached Christ "for envy and strife" and said that even so he rejoiced, had he identified the gospel with one aspect of the gospel.

There is another aspect of sacramentarianism to which it is painful to call attention, and yet, without so doing, its danger cannot be appreciated. The Protestant would gladly admit that the devout Catholic, in assisting at the mass, does enter into mystic communion with God, not because his theory of magic brings God to him, but because God is seeking him as Jesus sought for the Samaritans who worshipped on Mount Gerizim. Nor would

the Protestant deny the evident fact that devout men and women in the Anglican communion whose custom it is to participate frequently in the Lord's Supper receive a spiritual benefit, even though their thought as to the way in which the blessing comes is confused. Self-examination, confession of failure, prayer for pardon, and the remembrance of Christ's presence lead to peace of mind and renewed spiritual life. But, on the other hand, is not the Protestant right in saying that sacramental religion, with its "confession and absolution, fasting, the Real Presence, the devotion of the Three Hours, the use of incense, etc.," is essentially a mechanical religion, and is deadening to the conscience unless that be quickened by communion with God which has no necessary connection with these mechanical acts? While it is true that no church nor school of thought in any church is altogether free from unworthy members, has not sacramental religion more such than any other form of Christian religion; or, at least, are not the unworthy members in that more conspicuous, and, consequently, their lives more scandalous? The fact is too well known to require illustration by particular instances that in the Roman Catholic Church and in the Anglican communion there is a disproportionately large number of worldly men and women who are scrupulous in mechanical devotion but worldly in life. Who has not known men and women brought up in the strictest "sect" of that religion suddenly abandoning it all, and yet without such knowledge of Christ as would enable them to find a home in any other group of his disciples? The most astonishing thing is that frequently such a revulsion leads not to godlessness but to a more serious and earnest life, though a life separated from the communion of the church. I say it is astonishing, but only to those who have not analyzed the content of sacramentarianism. It is a mechanical religion and can be practised by the body without any enduring influence upon the spirit.

How little mention there is in Paul's Epistles of sacraments! How little, apart from the sixth chapter—and learned men have never been able to agree whether this referred to the Eucharist or not—is there in the Fourth Gospel about ecclesiastical sacraments, though it is full from beginning to end of the sacraments of life! Both Paul and John laid great emphasis upon faith and the power of the word. That is what the Protestant churches have done. If the Anglican communion has any message to the world, it must begin by acknowledging with joy this work of the other churches of the Reformation. It is of slight importance that the churches should be united into one visible body. The important thing is that each of them should receive from the others that which each individually has failed to value. In order that this may be done it is essential that there should be a truer fellowship among the churches, and, if that fellowship could be attained, then we might see the churches the living power which at present they are not.

It may be objected that the foregoing criticism of sacramentarian mysticism should have been accompanied by a criticism of the hard rationalistic spirit of Protestantism. That such a spirit did animate the Protestant churches for centuries cannot be denied, but it is evident that it is no longer the prevailing spirit in Protestant churches. Nevertheless, the objection is not without force and it should be frankly admitted that Protestantism would have been enriched if it had listened more attentively than it has done to its great mystic teachers. There probably can never be universal agreement on such a subject as this because men's thoughts are moulded by their temperaments. Nevertheless, I believe that not by theology but by psychology a path is being shown which may lead to a deeper unity of spirit than has been possible in the past. The importance of the subconscious has been emphasized in our day as never before; perhaps it has been

overemphasized. Certainly it has been too much identified with the abnormal. I believe that the truth in the sacramental religion which has persisted through all these ages and makes an appeal to saintly souls is that it is bearing witness to the fact that God's grace not only more widely abounds than sin but also more widely abounds than thought. How God's spirit influences man apart from his self-consciousness is one of the mysteries of life and probably can never be explained. It is well that this great truth should be borne in mind, but it is not well that the influence of God's spirit upon the unconscious mind should be identified with any rite or ceremony. "The wind bloweth where it listeth." The doctrine of baptismal regeneration witnesses to a great truth, which is that God's spirit is an essential part of the life of every human being long before the soul becomes conscious of that presence, but to assert that that influence begins at the moment when a priest sprinkles the head of the unconscious child with water which has been consecrated, turns the truth into a dreadful error. And what is true of the beginning is true all through life. God's spirit is influencing us, "preventing" us—in the words of the Prayer-Book—long before we become conscious of his grace; but to say that that unconscious influence begins at the moment when the priest consecrates the bread and wine is again to obscure a divine truth by a "magic" rite.

Any church which makes dogma the *sine qua non* of membership is in danger of becoming a philosophical school having no message for the "man in the street." Any church which exalts sacraments till they become the exclusive means of grace is in danger of sinking back into the magic-worship against which I believe a careful study of the New Testament will show that both Paul and John uttered an emphatic protest. Any church which thinks its mission is fulfilled when it has ministered to those who find themselves comfortable in its congenial surroundings

is in danger of becoming a religious club, and can make no appeal to those who are looking for the kingdom of God.

If, then, neither a philosophical school nor an esoteric society nor a religious club can do the work of Jesus, what church can do his work and save the world? It will be the church composed of the men and women and children in every denomination who are filled with the spirit of Jesus, and believe that that spirit will manifest itself more and more in the days to come; who believe that spirit cannot be confined to that body to which they are attached, or that its work is accomplished when individuals have been "converted," and thereby their salvation assured; but that the sanctification of the individual which must be the first work of the church is only preliminary to that ideal social order which will manifest itself in family, industrial, and political life, and will radiate until the nations of the world acknowledge Christ as Lord and King.

# CHAPTER XVI

## FELLOWSHIP

It may not be amiss, before finishing this study which we have called "The Crisis of the Churches," to review the path which we have followed. For it may seem as if there were a lack of unity in the treatment of the theme, though that, I hope, may be more apparent than real. In the Introduction there was an interpretation of an ancient parable—a parable which we believe has a profound significance for this day. It was suggested that the modern church, like Jonah, has received a great revelation, the revelation of God's goodness to all mankind. If that revelation be not received by the church and acted upon, it will lead to the spirit of sectarianism, which would rest satisfied with its own "gourd," indifferent to the welfare of the world. This spirit would lead to the destruction of the modern church as it led to the destruction of the church of Israel.

We then saw the attraction which the greatest of all churches has for many minds, but found that church also dominated by the spirit of sectarianism. We considered the philosophical doctrine of organic unity, and the various attempts to produce church unity, one failing because it identified the message of the church with the theory of the sacraments, which leads inevitably to magic and to sacerdotalism, the dominance of a caste. Such a church can never be the leader of democracy. We thought also of the superficial plans which seem to ignore the principles for which the various churches stand.

We then turned aside, as it may have seemed to some, to emphasize the value which we believe the Episcopal

Church has for the church of the future, and suggested that spiritual unity could be attained only by the recognition of the intrinsic value in each of the churches, which value can be interpreted only by those who have known the privilege and blessing of the particular church of which they are members. I know of no book which has so approached the subject since the appearance of Maurice's "Kingdom of God," but it cannot be denied that that illuminating book was the plea of an advocate who was convinced that the English Church not only had its own peculiar value but also provided a full recognition of the value of other churches. But much water has flowed under the bridge since the time of the great prophet Frederick Maurice. The story of the kingdom of God cannot be written by one hand, it will need the co-operation of representatives of all the churches, and the church of the future cannot be identified with any of the modern churches —neither with the great cosmopolitan imperialism of Rome nor with the constitutional comprehensiveness of the Anglican communion. But, in order that that story, when it shall have been written, shall be received by Christian men and women as the inspiration of a more glorious conception of the meaning of the "blessed company of all faithful people," it is necessary that we should realize the underlying spiritual unity which never has been broken, and cannot be broken as long as Jesus Christ is acknowledged as Lord of all.

The first effect of this conception of Christian unity would lead to fellowship, the sense of brotherhood, and the co-operation of all the disciples of Jesus for the salvation of the world and the spiritualizing of civilization. The underlying cause of the failure of the modern church to fulfil the task and mission committed to it by its Divine Master is due, I believe, to the fact that fellowship has not been the goal which it has sought to attain. It has been led to magnify the importance of mechanical unity,

forgetting that mere juxtaposition does not necessarily lead to unity, but, on the contrary, may frustrate it. This we see in those unhappy families where brethren are compelled to dwell under one roof long after they have begun to show different gifts which they are unable to develop in the atmosphere of the old homestead. The result is not unity but bickering and hatred. Only when each member has been able to establish his own home with congenial souls is there peace and joy. So only can true fellowship be attained between the different families of the common stock. But if such fellowship could be attained, it would follow that there would be a better understanding of the reason for the separations and a mutual respect which might lead to hopeful co-operation.

Fellowship is like a purifying stream fed from the hills above. But, as it descends to the plain below, there is danger lest it lose its power through spreading over the plain and so becoming a swamp. To accomplish efficient work it must be banked in. Fellowship may degenerate into mere sentimentality and so lose its force. There are two great emotions which will act as banks to the stream and conserve its power; the one is fear and the other love. The power of the former is seen in some great crisis like a shipwreck. Then the girl who had looked down with indifference or contempt on the poor third-class passenger will stretch forth her hands in hopes of his aid in the time of need. And he, in turn, who may have cursed her for her wealth and luxury, will now, when the end seems near, rescue her. Those who had held aloof from one another in the prosperous days of the summer voyage will be drawn together by the force of a common fear. So would Christian men and women be if they were to face the facts of life and consider what may be the end of our present indifference to one another. I have already spoken of the danger that confronts Protestantism in our own land by the domination of the Roman Catholic Church. But how

much greater is the danger of a revival of paganism! For when we speak of materialism we really mean paganism. Back of all the allurements of material things is a spiritual need which must in some way be satisfied. It will attempt to find satisfaction in one of the many forms of superstition which we supposed science had made unbelievable. But man has longings of which science knows nothing. If the soul of man turns from a reasonable or spiritual religion, it will take to table-rappings, to consulting of wizards, or to some other form of magic; so dreadful is the loneliness of a soul without any spiritual communion with life greater than its own! There is need of full fellowship among those who are followers of Jesus if effective witness is to be borne to the power of the gospel.

But fear alone will not suffice; there is need of a nobler emotion, which is love. So John felt when he wrote that if we had fellowship, the "blood of Jesus Christ would cleanse us from all sin." No doubt the words have become so associated with certain theories of the dogma of the atonement that they fail to move us as they moved those who first heard them. But surely the underlying thought should not be hard for us to grasp. It is the thought of gratitude to a redeemer. Think of men taken captive in the days when John wrote, or think of those taken captive in the late war; we may imagine three of them, differing in temperament, education, and material advantages. But their fate is the same. To them comes one who, at the risk of his life, sets them free. They come forth from their dungeon and start on the way home. They know that he who set them free has died. He died for them; he paid for their freedom with his blood, he redeemed them; they are now his, and must devote their lives to the work which he had most at heart. Their temperamental differences will not have been changed by this great experience, but they will know that they were redeemed because he who died for them loved each of them for himself as he was. Their

differences will not divide them; they will be bound together by the memory of what he has done for them.

Is there need to amplify the thought? It should be the prevailing thought whenever Christians think of one another. And if that were the prevailing thought, there would inevitably be fellowship.

Fear—and who can fail to fear who sees the signs of the times?—and love—and who can fail to love who remembers what it has cost to redeem his soul?—will lead to co-operation, that the work of the Saviour may be accomplished.

Such thoughts go to the root of the matter, and could we continue in that mood, I doubt not that a great revolution would be effected. But on reflection, both Catholic and Evangelical will protest that something of importance has been overlooked. The one identifies the gospel with the decisions of the council, and the other with the dogmatic theology of the Reformation period. "Are these," it will be asked, "to be abandoned?" They need not be abandoned; all that is necessary is that it should not be insisted that they are the final statements of truth. Why is there such enthusiasm for truth in every department of life except in religion? Men and women are devoting their lives to it as truly to-day as in the days of the apostles. They are denying themselves the prizes of the world in order that they may learn. If the church were to set truth as a goal to be won rather than as an end from which there can be no advance, there might be a revival of the love of truth which the churches seem to have lost. What did Jesus know about God? What did he know about himself? What did he know about man? These are the things men are interested in. It is well to remember what the great teachers of the church in the past have said, but it is better to know what Jesus was. Those who suppose that the day will ever come when all men will agree upon infallible formulas as expressions of the truth of God are

deceiving themselves and wasting time already too short. There is but one infallible test of truth, and that is life. "By their fruits shall ye know them." "If any man will do the will of God, he shall know of the doctrine." So said Jesus. When the churches are willing to say the same there will be a revival of enthusiasm.

"But will not this be the destruction of unity?" It will be the destruction of uniformity, but it may be the beginning of unity. For there is unity in search as well as in possession. There was unity of search in the Middle Ages when students from all parts of Europe flocked to Paris and Oxford and Padua and Bologna. Had there been uniformity of teaching, the students would have remained at home. There was no uniformity, but there was the unity of search, which was an evidence of faith that truth might be known.

As the pragmatic test was applied to the theories of the different teachers, the ones that failed to meet the test were outgrown. And as a result of that process of elimination there is to-day a firmer conviction of those truths which have stood the test than there could have been had they been accepted on authority. There is less freedom of thought in some of the modern churches than there was in the mediæval church when the great universities were thronged with students. Into the great melting-pot of the universities went the seekers after God and out of it came the great teachers of the churches.

What is true of dogma is also true of discipline. One of the reproaches most frequently made against the Protestant churches is that they are without discipline, and that this is due to their divisions. It is not due to their divisions; it is due to their sectarianism. There is great need of unity of discipline, but discipline must be the effect not of prejudice but of the mind of Christ.

Fellowship is a deep spiritual experience. It is a divine emotion, and it leads to a desire for companionship and

co-operation. I may be far from wishing to live in the same house with my friend and adjust my life to all his peculiarities, but if he is indeed my friend, I love him and desire to know him more and more; I long for his companionship and listen to his counsel, and rejoice in his prosperity and suffer in his sorrow.

This is the spirit which should animate the churches. Each is too ignorant of what the other is doing; they look at one another from without, and do not enter into the spirit of one another. If they did, then indeed we might see the unity for which our Saviour prayed. When we experience it in those fellowships which we already have, with intelligent, devout Roman Catholics, with earnest and reverent Methodists, with Unitarians, who cannot say as we delight to say, "Lord, Lord," but are doing the will of the Father in Heaven, we know what fellowship means. But it is exceptional. There are many Christian men and women who simply cannot enter into spiritual fellowship with any save those who agree with them in the statement of their faith, in the manner of worship, and in the form of ministry without which they cannot believe that the spirit of God can dwell with man. The archbishop in the Letter of the Lambeth Conference has well said that the first thing needed is "repentance." But if by "repentance" is meant the acknowledgment on the part of the various Protestant churches that they and their fathers have sinned in departing from the historic order, then those who think that they have held to it must also repent the separation from the Church of Rome. But that means that we are to say that for four hundred years the spirit of God has not guided the hearts of his faithful people. This would not be repentance; it would be blasphemy! Repentance is indeed the one thing needed. But it is repentance in the sense in which the word was first used. It means a change of mind, to set before oneself a new ideal. We should repent our unfaithfulness, not our

separations. We should repent our lack of fellowship. This might be the beginning of a new way, a way that would lead to that spiritual unity for which our Saviour prayed, which would manifest itself in co-operation for the accomplishment of the work to which the church in this day is called. Such co-operation would be the means to manifesting the inherent power of the church.

There is wide-spread scepticism of the power of the church. When, therefore, it is suggested that the great work, which all admit must be done, in the evangelization of the world, the pacification of the nations, the sanctification of patriotism, the purification of politics, the humanizing of industry, the salvation of the family, and the Christianizing of education, depends upon the church, there are not a few who will say that this is to put too great a burden upon the church; that the work of the church is the conversion of the individual, and that all these needed reforms must be left to other agencies. "The church has not the power to do what it has here been suggested it should do; such suggestions only serve to discourage when what is needed is encouragement." But how is courage engendered? Is it by making light of the task, or by showing plainly the immense difficulties to be overcome? The latter was the faith of Garibaldi when he set out on his desperate campaign for the freedom of Rome. "Come" (said Garibaldi to the men of the Valtelline).* "He who stays at home is a coward. I promise you weariness, hardship, and battles. But we will conquer or die." He set before his men the dangers to be encountered and the difficulties to be overcome, and thus stirred their hearts to noble deeds. So were the hearts of the American troops stirred when they were called upon to face the machine-guns in the Argonne. Is the courage of Christians less? It may be said: "Their courage is not less, but they are

* "Gambetta and the Thousand," George Macaulay Trevelyan, p. 107.

not called upon to do these things to which attention has been called. These should be left to experts." The details should be left to experts, but it is the church which must arouse the country to the need, or it will be left to those who have some sinister motive which may prevent the accomplishment of the great reforms. How often have we seen good men arrayed against a reform because they have been persuaded that its success would interfere with the hopes of the party with which they are allied.

Some may be found to say that the Christianization of the world must be the result of the gradual advance of civilization, but that need not be considered. It rests upon an assumption which will not bear examination, which is that civilization itself is Christian. Nor can the peace of the world be left to diplomats. That has been tried and we all know the result. Disarmament, which perhaps is the most important and the most immediate step to be taken for the establishment of peace, must indeed be left to those who are fitted by training to deal with the details, but unless the followers of the Prince of Peace are instant in season and out of season it will be found that this attempt, like the Congress of Vienna and the Council of Versailles will end in disappointment and increased suspicion. But who can doubt that if all the churches were to unite in preaching a crusade against the savage arming of the world, the governments of the world would be compelled to obey? We sometimes hear it said that the reason why so many efforts to establish peace have failed is because the voice of the people has not been heard. But what people? The notion that the "people" can be trusted to keep the peace is not justified by the facts of history. The "people" reigned in France after the Revolution as they do in Russia to-day, but did that bring peace? No; it is Christian people to whom the world must look if it would not be engulfed in a new war.

The same truth appears when we turn to the industrial

war. No change in the economic methods of conducting the business of the world will avail to bring peace at home, for covetousness is too strong a passion. It is only the church which can convince the world that its misery is the result of the violation of the fundamental law of human brotherhood. The same is true of the purification of politics, and the education of the young, and the sanctification of the family. All these depend upon the application of the principles revealed by Jesus, and only the disciples of Jesus can convince men that these are essential. And this leads to a recognition of the importance of a revival of the primary work of Jesus' ministry, and the appreciation of what it means in our day. Conversion may not be a popular word in the churches to-day, but it is a fundamental word. The kingdom of God cannot come until men have changed their minds, without which there can be no conversion. The first step must be in the change of mind concerning personal holiness or, rather, personal sin. In that work the churches have not been slack, but that is only the beginning. The converted man must be converted in every activity of his life, and such we know is too often not the fact. If that could be brought about, there is no one of the things we desire for the welfare of the world that might not follow. Here, then, lies the opportunity of the churches. They have the opportunity to influence men and women which no other institution has, and to the effect of that influence we can set no limits. The one hopeful sign in all the shame and misery which has followed the war is the recognition on the part of some of the true work of the church to-day, as it was seen by the men and women, the names of a few of whom have come down to us, who saw the work to which the spirit of Jesus called them in the second century, and so saved the world from utter destruction.

But we must beware of one mistake, a mistake which the church has made more than once, which is that while

there is nothing in our modern life which is not the concern of the church, on the other hand, it is not the business of the church to dictate to state or capital or labor or legislatures or school committees, nor any of the other agencies for the effective operation of our complex life, as if the church had received a mandate to supersede these agencies.

No, the work of the church to-day, as it always has been, is to deal with individuals and to quicken the conscience and inspire the heart. If it can do that its influence will be felt in every department of life. When Jesus said to the man who came to him with some trouble about the estate of his father, "Man, who made me a judge?" he was apparently indifferent to one of the most important of human interests, property. This was not the fact. He turned the settlement of the particular dispute over to the courts, and, turning to his disciples, said: "Beware of covetousness." And that word of Jesus has been more potent than all the codexes of the lawyers. For it is a living word and to-day causes men, if they be Christians, to ask themselves in each case whether their interest is in justice or in the abundance of the things which they possess.

This should give the key to the labyrinth in which the church finds itself to-day. Its power is proportionate to its influence and its influence is determined by its faith.

Is not the scepticism of which we have spoken due to the fact that we are identifying power with force? The power of the mediæval church, as well as the power of the English Church under the Stuarts, and of the Calvinistic Church of Geneva and Scotland and New England, has indeed departed and can never be revived. But the power of the Apostolic Church, which was sufficient for the conversion of the empire, and the power of the Roman Church, which saved the world in the barbarian invasion, is with the churches to-day. They have, but, alas, do not use to the full, the power which Jesus gave to his disciples. "All power," we read, "is given to me in heaven and in earth; go ye therefore and preach the gospel." The power of

heaven and earth was given them—the power to *persuade.* No doubt, to the "natural" man this seems inadequate. But to the "spiritual" it is nothing less than the power of God himself. To bring to the soul of man a word which will awake in him the response of his divine nature is to set free a force compared with which the powers of nature and human governments are but as nothing. It is this mighty power which is being silently exercised by good men and women day by day in home and school and business. They "do not strive nor cry, nor cause their voices to be heard in the street," but their influence is as universal as the law of gravitation and as effective as the tides which rise and fall without the notice of men. The persuasive influence of word and example is a power which belongs to every Christian. It therefore belongs to every group of Christians. But it is true that it is not being exercised with full power so as to influence the lives of men in their relations to one another nationally, nor industrially, nor socially. It is not being exercised to the full for the conversion of the world. But that it exists and might be utilized so as to affect the life of nations is not a dream but a reality. We have only to consider the great revolution produced in this land in the last few years as the result of the concurrent action of the various Protestant churches in the control of the liquor traffic to see what might be effected if there were full co-operation for the accomplishment of other reforms. It is not necessary for our purpose to consider whether this reform was brought about by methods which meet the approval of all those who desired to see the abolition of the saloon, nor whether the embodiment of specific legislation in the Constitution was the best means of dealing with the question; still less whether the enactment and enforcement of the Volstead Act meets with the approval of all good men and women. The point is that the churches have immense latent power and that that power needs the direction of the best minds in all the churches. If, through the lack of wise co-opera-

tion, the needed reforms are left to the fanatics, it will be found that we shall be in danger of falling into the old Puritan error of exalting a prejudice into a principle, and so preparing the way for inevitable reaction.

In this work there must be leaders, and the leaders who have been appointed by God are the ministers of the church. The problem of democracy is to find wise, interested, inspired leaders, and it is the glory of the Christian church that it dares to say such leaders can be found only in servants. "He that is great among you let him be the servant of all." The day was when the highest ambition of the youth of this country was to be ministers of the gospel. The natural ambition to excel was baptized into the spirit of Christ and became a passion for service. All the Protestant churches are lamenting a falling off in the number of ministers. May that not in part be due to the fact that the ministry seems to offer no adequate field for the energies of a live man? The multiplication of churches leads to ministerial inefficiency. There is not enough to occupy the minister and he recognizes that his work does not require the same energy as that of the physician and the schoolmaster and the social worker. The feverish activity of the minister is wasted in numerous undertakings which he soon learns have no spiritual value. The experience of one such man known to me is not, I fear, unknown to many. On a certain Monday morning he failed to appear when breakfast was on the table. His wife called up the stairs: "John, breakfast is ready." To which he replied: "Yes." "Aren't you coming down?" she said. "No," he replied. "Are you up?" "No." "What's the matter?" "Nothing." "Why don't you get up?" "What for?" If the church could show its ministers how great the task is, how great the need, how sublime the call, could such a spirit of despair take possession of them? It is the pettiness of the ministry, not its poverty, which chills the enthusiasm of the youth.

The question, then, which we should ask ourselves, and so bring to an end this study, is: How is that power to be generated and maintained? There can be but one answer. It is the result of communion with God which is experienced in prayer or worship. But how seldom we worship! The individual Christian prays for the things he most desires, and the congregation gathers for the public prayer and to listen to a sermon. But how seldom we worship! For worship is the acknowledgment that there is but one Life in the universe worthy of the adoration of mankind. Surely, if that were remembered, the prevailing atmosphere of every church would be one of awful reverence. Can it be said that that is the characteristic of the average Protestant church?

We smile at Dr. Johnson's dictum, when, speaking of a certain man who was not approved by the company, he said: "Sir, he is a good man. He lifts his hat when he passes a church!" But is there not a truth in it? Is our pragmatic test of goodness fine enough for the spiritual life? Is not the "reverence of God the beginning of wisdom"? The "fear" of God is the enemy of worship, for it paralyzes the energies of man. But the reverence of God would find expression in praise. This the instinct of the church has always recognized. And it is significant that in praise we find a spiritual unity which has not been attained in any other way. Our hymns are drawn from every church; but who remembers that "Lead, Kindly Light," is the song of a Roman Catholic?* Or that "Nearer, My God, to Thee" was written by a Unitarian? Every church can join in the familiar words,

> "All people that on earth do dwell,
> Sing to the Lord with cheerful voice,"

* It is true that when Newman wrote this hymn he was still a minister of the English Church, but as we read the story of his life we perceive that he was already a Roman Catholic at heart, though he himself had not discovered the fact.

because in such hymns there is brought home to us the remembrance that he hath redeemed us "out of every nation and tribe and kindred and tongue." (Why can we not add church?) "We are his people and the sheep of his pasture." It is in such moments that we believe the worship of God is most acceptable to our Heavenly Father, as we know it to be most helpful to us.

Now every congregation, whether it be large or small, which so worships, we believe worships in "spirit and in truth." "God is spirit." That means that God is life, and that life is in communion with persons. But we are truly persons only in so far as we are truly *human*. The first step in the establishment of personality is the unification of individual experiences. But full personality would be the unity of universal experience. It is worship which exalts personality, first by bringing it into communion with the One Person in the Universe, and, second, by enabling each individual to enter into an experience of life with which he has had no personal acquaintance. The family of God includes more than those who are conscious of that relationship. The heathen, the fallen, the tempted, and the struggling, are members of the family, and any worship which ignores them is defective. An objection is sometimes made to the ancient liturgies on the ground that they are "unreal." It may be that they seem unreal to us because we are lacking in humanity. But it does not follow that they were unreal to those who remembered what they had been before they heard the good news, nor what their brothers still were. To the respectable man who has kept the commandments from his youth up there may seem something unreal in a prayer which implies that he may fall into the shameful life into which he has never yet fallen; but to the mother whose son is a drunkard and who knows, as the son does not know, the horror of drunkenness, a prayer that neither she nor any she loves may fall from grace into the degradation of the drunkard does not seem an unreal or an unnatural prayer. It does not mean

that she is in danger of intemperance; it means that she is suffering vicariously for the sin of her child, and that by his sin her soul feels the defilement of sin. He is as truly a part of herself as when she carried him in her womb. For "all sorts and conditions of men" the church must pray, whether in the language of the ancient liturgy or in the words which come to the lips of the minister at the moment. Otherwise the individual experience of minister or worshipper will limit the expanding love which should embrace all the children of God. Only in proportion as this is done does the soul attain to the measure of the stature of Christ.

Now there is such a thing as corporate experience. That is to say, there is individual experience which is influenced by association with those who are of like mind with itself. And while that is natural and helpful as a beginning in Christian fellowship, if it be not expanded by a larger association in worship with those who have been led by other paths, the result will be a sort of provincial personality, which is what the Catholic rightly protests against. A worship, then, which would at least from time to time unite all those who love the Lord Jesus Christ would be the most potent means for the accomplishment of that unity of the spirit which generates and preserves the power of the church.

Conferences and congresses no doubt have a value by bringing many men of many minds into touch with one another; but unless Christian people can join together in prayer and praise, unless they can receive together the symbols of the death of their common Redeemer, there can be no real unity of the spirit. Here questions arise which it ought not to be difficult for men of good-will to answer. "What sort of service would be most acceptable, that is, most helpful?" "Who is to administer such a service?" And lastly: "By what means could such a communion of Christians be brought about?"

I venture to suggest that such a service as we have in

mind should be largely liturgical, not because I believe that is necessary, but simply because I believe it would be found most practical, that is, most helpful. For those who are used to a liturgy find it difficult to take part in a service in which there are no printed directions. Without such it would not be easy for those who have a formal habit to be freed from an embarrassing self-consciousness. The fact is that the former prejudice against a liturgy has largely disappeared. As soon as men found they were not compelled to conform, they began to use their liberty as it seemed best to them.* As a result many of the non-liturgical churches are using a liturgy, not as a bondage but as a means of grace. The marriage service of the Episcopal Church is frequently used by other churches, and so is the burial office. This is done in no spirit of imitation but with a freedom which is illuminating and helpful. These services are often enriched by the prayers of the minister who is restrained by no rubrics. Why might not the communion service be so used in such an occasional service as we are now considering? Numbers of those who habitually worship in other churches partake of the communion in the Episcopal Church if they happen to be present on the first Sunday in the month. This they can do, because they now feel that the Puritan objection to the reception of the Sacrament kneeling has lost its force. They know that when the Episcopalian kneels at the reception of the elements he does not intend thereby to imply that he is adoring them, but is simply perpetuating an ancient custom which appeals to the spirit of reverence to-day.† On the other hand, those who have been from

* At one of the great universities it is the custom for the preacher to wear the "Geneva" gown. When a distinguished minister of one of the non-liturgical churches was asked by the pastor if he would wear the gown, which it was not his custom to do, he asked: "Is it required?" And when he was told it was not, he replied: "I will gladly wear it."

† It cannot be denied that not a few sacramentarians will not admit this, but those who are interested in the authoritative teaching of the

their youth familiar with the service of the Prayer-Book do not feel equally at home in other churches because they are not familiar with the custom. There is, of course, danger that it might be supposed by some that if such a service were the one used when Christians of various churches gathered together, it was implied it had a sanctity which is denied to the more spontaneous worship of the non-liturgical churches. But if we turn to our second question, "Who is to administer such a 'union' service?" the answer to the objection will be found. If what has been said in an earlier part of this book be true, that every ministry which has approved itself to any part of the church is of equal validity with every other (and if that be not admitted, then there is no object in considering Christian fellowship), it will follow that the service contemplated should be administered by the minister of the church in which such service is held, or by one designated by the different ministers who took part in such services. He then would not be bound by rubrics, but might return to the custom described in the "Apostolic Constitutions," and add to the formal liturgy such prayers as the spirit would have him utter.

Such a union of Christians might not seem to have great value if we are looking to immediate results, but if our vision is "afar off," if we believe in the Catholic Church, not as an historic reality which has been attained in the past, but rather as a sublime ideal toward which we press, then it will be found that such a service as we have been contemplating would do more than inspire the worshippers who took part in it; it would testify that we have come at last to believe in the validity of the ministry which has not alone the "apostolic" but the "prophetic" or the "pastoral" succession as well. And when that day comes the

Anglican communion would do well to read the declaration which was omitted from the Prayer-Book in 1559, but replaced in the revision of 1661. See "The Holy Communion in Great Britain and America," J. Brett Langstaff, p. 85.

chief difficulty in the way of the full co-operation of the churches will have been overcome.

No doubt, there are not a few in the Episcopal Church, and perhaps in other churches as well, who would feel that they could not conscientiously take part in such a service; not that they are lacking in love, but because they are convinced that they would be doing that which their Lord would not approve. Well, their prejudice must be respected. Those who are familiar with the history of the church are convinced that these hold a theory of the church which the larger knowledge will, in time, show to be untenable, and wait in patience until the truth appears to them. We believe that all the forces of life are against them, but we also believe that they are filled with a true love of Christ and of his brethren. But while all this is recognized, it must be remembered that there is work for the church to do which must not be delayed, because, like certain of the tribes of Israel, there are those who will not pass over Jordan. In time they will feel the need of fellowship and the isolation of separation from the brethren of the promise. "In my youthful zeal," says Principal Moton, "I preferred being an ignorant Baptist rather than a cultivated Presbyterian, and this (declaration) never failed to bring forth much approval and applause from the colored people of the community." * Alas! the same sort of declaration—with a change in name of the denominations—will bring forth applause to-day from those who would be ashamed to have it thought that they had made no advance from the condition of the poor black folk who in their zeal identified sectarianism with Christianity.†

* "Finding a Way Out," Robert Russa Moton, p. 38.

† This modern and perhaps grotesque illustration of the sectarian spirit can be matched by an incident in the history of the early church: "Acesius," said the Emperor Constantine to one of the Novatian bishops at the Council of Nice, ". . . take a ladder and get up to heaven by yourself." Gibbon adds: "Most of the Christian sects have, by turns, borrowed the ladder of Acesius."—"Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," chap. XXI.

But supposing a form of service were agreed upon, and the question of the ministry settled, there would still remain the thorny difficulty of doctrine. But here again, if there be a will, there will be found a way. If any object to the use of the ancient formulas of the faith—and many do—would it not be possible, if it be thought indispensable, to state our faith explicitly on each occasion of public worship—simply to repeat the Gloria Patri or to sing the Doxology? But, indeed, I am inclined to think that it might be well, certainly at first, to avoid any attempt to find a formula which would explicitly set forth the church's faith at such a time. The thing to be remembered is that there is implicit unity of faith, and so it might be sufficient to join in saying "Our Father," and the apostolic blessing, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all." To these all "who profess and call themselves Christians" could say "Amen."

There is an opportunity here for the Episcopal Church to take the lead which none of the other churches enjoys. In some of the great cities there are now cathedrals, which at present seem to not a few to be anachronisms. But here is an opportunity to use them for a forward step in the Christian life of America. The cathedrals alone are large enough to contain such a congregation as could be gathered for a united service of all the Christians of the city. The throwing open of such vast buildings for a service in which the churches of every name would be recognized as having equal value in the sight of God would not only justify the great cost of the buildings but would do far more to bring about the unity of the spirit than all discussions of "faith and order." It would be an outward and visible recognition of the "spiritual reality" of the ministries of the different churches to which the letter of the archbishop of Canterbury calls attention.

The suggestion that a bishop could be found who would

be willing to use the cathedral of which he is the head for such a purpose may seem too improbable to deserve serious attention. But time has done wonders and greater wonders are yet to appear. Who would have believed ten years ago that prohibition could be made the law of the land? Who would not have been laughed to scorn who ten years ago had prophesied that compulsory military service could be made a law and accepted by the American people as the natural way of meeting a supreme duty? Is it to be believed that the church alone is unable to respond to the voice of the spirit because it speaks a new message? Already one bishop has taken a step in this direction.* Some day there may appear a bishop who will prove himself a true leader—not backward, but forward—and when such appears, the whole church will feel the effects of his leadership.

But the churches are not dependent upon the Episcopal Church to show the way. Nor need we wait for the movement to begin in one of the great cities. Still less are we to wait for an ecumenical council. To the average American there seems something unreal to read in an English book that an ecumenical council will some day deal with the problem of church unity. To him an ecumenical council is as unthinkable as the restoration of the Holy Roman Empire. But to men whose church is closely associated with the state it seems a natural thing to have great problems affecting the relation of one state to another—and therefore of one church to another—settled by a diplomatic corps. But to us the "town meeting" seems the natural way of dealing with the interests of the community. It is true that the town meeting cannot deal with world-wide problems; but, on the other hand, it can try experiments which, if they succeed in one community, can easily be adopted by others. If, now, in any small town an effort were made by the ministers and chosen

* See *The Churchman* for June 4, 1921, p. 20.

men and women from the different congregations to emphasize the spiritual unity which exists but has not been utilized, it might be found not only that the spiritual life of that particular town was vivified, but that the influence would spread to other communities, and in time would receive the sanction of the churches. Then we might expect to see the American methods of standardization and consolidation which have revolutionized our industrial life made effective in our ecclesiastical life without the loss of individual liberty.

Through fellowship in the light of God, by worship in spirit and in truth, by co-operation in good works, lies the pathway to that spiritual unity for which we daily pray—"unity of spirit in the bond of peace and in righteousness of life." This is the immediate, practical, and inspiring unity which is attainable to-day among those who "love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity." We are not called to organize an ecclesiastical kingdom of this world, but to follow Jesus and "let the kingdom come." How are we to follow him? We must join ourselves to all those who in our day and generation are seeking to live in his spirit. The first thing is to rewrite Paul's radical declaration of independence, so that it will read not "There are no more Jews, nor Greeks, barbarians, Scythians, bond nor free," but, rather, there are no more Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists—or other denominations—"but Christ is all and in all." This would not mean that we ignored the facts of life any more than Paul ignored them. The Jew and the Greek, the barbarian and the Scythian, the bond and the free, continued to exist, but to Paul these names described only their superficial differences. Their unity consisted in the fact that they were all the children of one Father. So must they seem to the men and women of the churches to-day.

The churches should be ashamed to continue longer in the spirit of Jonah, the spirit which fails to see good else-

where than in the little company of which he forms a part; the spirit which, on the eve of a great revelation of God's wide-spread mercy and redeeming love, is angry because the little system which helped us is about to be destroyed, but cares not if the whole world perish provided that can be perpetuated. There is not one of the churches which is not suffering from the general scepticism of the systems in which they have put their trust, and unless they can unite on some basis which will endure, they shall see as surely as the Jewish Church saw the vineyard taken from them and given to others.

We have been thinking of the effect of spiritual unity upon those who are already united with the various churches, but think how wide-spread might be the effect of such spiritual unity upon the lives of that vast multitude of earnest men and women who are "waiting for the coming of the kingdom of God," and yet can find no home in any of the ecclesiastical organizations. The power of the church can never be effective until it recognizes and provides for the unchurched disciples of our Lord. Such a disciple was Abraham Lincoln. He is reported to have said that "he had never united with any church because he found difficulty in giving his assent without mental reservation to the long, complicated statement of Christian doctrine which characterized their articles of belief and confessions of faith. 'When any church,' (he said) 'will inscribe over its altar as its sole qualification of membership the Saviour's condensed statement of the substance of both law and gospel "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor as thyself," that church will I join with all my heart and with all my soul.' " * We

* Henry Champion Deming's eulogy on Lincoln before the General Assembly, Hartford, Conn., quoted in "Latest Light on Abraham Lincoln," Ervin Chapman, p. 430.

may think that the great-hearted President had but inadequate knowledge of the full message of the church, but we must admit that here as so often he laid his finger upon the one thing needed. When the prophet Elijah was sunk in despair as he thought that when he died the religion of Jehovah would die with him, we are told that the "still, small voice" revealed to him the existence of thousands who were with him in spirit and had been as heroic in their undistinguished lives as he had been when he faced the prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel. When Jesus was told of those who were casting out devils in his name, but did not follow with his disciples, he joyfully exclaimed: "All who are not against me are with me." The great teachers of the early church declared that the philosophers who had purified the spirit of Greece were as truly God's messengers as the prophets who had spoken to Israel. St. Augustine, who had been prepared for the message of Ambrose by the great teachers of Greece, as translated by Latin writers, humbly acknowledged his debt to them and spoke with sublime hope of all who are "Christians by nature." It is these souls that the church needs; it is these souls which need the church, and could the church so present that life which is the same "yesterday, to-day, and forever," its power would be enormously increased by the recruits who would flock to the standard of the cross.

We are not called upon to discredit our past, nor to dilute the message of the church, nor to say that we are willing that what has blessed us shall be thrown away without its incorporation into the larger religious life which we hope is to be manifested in this land; but we are called upon to present that message in such a way that it can be accepted by intelligent and devout men and women who are repelled by the obscurantist dogmatism of the church, and its insistence upon the eternal value of temporary forms and expressions of belief. But what each

feels about his own church he should have imagination enough to see that others feel for their churches. Then the next step might be taken: men and women of goodwill might come together to quicken their spiritual life by common worship, and in the spirit received from communion with God consider the spiritual condition of the community in which they live, and set themselves to the great work: the conversion of the world, the peace of the nations, the rescue of politics from the hands of unworthy men, the purification of the family, and the bringing of the spirit of brotherhood into the industrial life of the nation. It is a great and glorious work. It can be done by none of the churches alone. But it can be done by the Christian fellowship.

Christ is the way, and what is necessary for communion with Christ is necessary for communion with his church; and what is not necessary for communion with Christ is not necessary for communion with his church. This is so obvious that it has been overlooked. The purpose of this book has not been to say anything original, but to call attention to things that have been forgotten or overlooked. This humble task was not deemed unworthy of the Master himself. Jesus recognized the value of the obvious when he said: "How is it that ye cannot discern the signs of the times?"

A few of the more evident signs of the times might in conclusion be profitably considered. First, the failure of the scientific prophecy of the inevitable improvement in a godless world. Science has done so much to make the conditions of life on this planet interesting, healthful, and prosperous that for a while it seemed as if the soul might be satisfied with the things which can be seen and touched. But the devastating war has shown that man's highest aspirations cannot be satisfied by prosperity; the soul is athirst for the living God. Man had become sceptical of

metaphysical speculations and turned in hope to the realities revealed by science. He is now turning with new hope to the study of psychology, where it is believed the conflict between metaphysics and science can be reconciled. This hope may be justified, but it will only be through the experience of the psalmist who found that when he woke up he was present with God.

Second, the impotence of Protestantism as shown in its failure to spiritualize life and to appeal to the highest intelligence and satisfy the ethical aspirations of mankind. Third, the renewed vigor of the Roman Catholic Church as revealed by its gains in Germany and its renewed influence in France. The temporal power of the pope, which it had been supposed the war between Germany and France in 1870 had weakened and the fall of the Hapsburg dynasty had finally destroyed, is again emerging through the agency of the democratic movements directed by the Vatican.

These are some of the evident signs of the times, but there is one not so evident but equally real, and that is the spiritual unity which the divisions of the church have not destroyed. If that spiritual unity could be realized, first by the recognition of the evidences of spiritual life in individuals in all the churches, the way might be opened for a fellowship which would convince the world that God is with his people.

It is sometimes said that there is need of a new Reformation, but this I believe to be an error. Great as were the benefits of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, it failed to fulfil its promise by entangling the spirit in the machinery of organization and preventing its expansion by dogmatic limitations. What is needed is not a new Reformation, that is, a new form, but a restoration of the primitive church by the manifestation of the spirit of Christ. Of all the churches of the Reformation period, it

was the Anglican Church which most clearly perceived that need.* But the entanglement of the English Church with the state made it impossible to realize this hope. The revolution produced in the Anglican communion by the Tractarian movement re-emphasized the importance of faith and orders, and led to a misunderstanding of the meaning of Christian unity. If now we could seek for the unity of the spirit, recognizing that forms of government and creedal statements have only relative value, and consequently may take different forms at different times and in divers places, spiritual unity might be attained and as a result the influence of the churches be made more effective.

The first step, it has been suggested, is to seek for the realization of the spiritual unity which already exists among the Protestant churches, first in America and then throughout the world. If that could be accomplished a united Protestantism could not fail to influence in the twentieth century the Roman Catholic Church as did the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Too often we think of the Reformation as a purely Protestant movement, but as a matter of fact it led to the reformation of the Roman Catholic Church, to the need of which the reforming councils of the fifteenth century had called attention but were unable to effect. There are thousands of Roman Catholics whose allegiance to the august organization cannot be shaken by any protest, but who would respond to the influence of a spiritual fellowship which revealed the presence of God outside what they have been taught to believe is the visible church of Christ. They would not become Protestants, but they might become more enlightened Christians. But the gain would not be confined to the Roman Catholic Church; it in turn has treasures by

* See "The Reconstruction of the English Church," by Roland G. Usher, Ph.D., vol. I.

which Protestantism might be enriched. Protestantism has been too exclusively self-conscious. The power of the Roman Catholic Church lies in its influence upon the unconscious, the mystical element in man's nature, which cannot be expressed in words but is ministered to by symbolism.

There will open also before the next generation an opportunity to come into touch with the spiritual life of eastern Christendom, not by the path of faith and orders but by the infiltration of the spirit. It has lately been said by one who knows the facts in Russia that the one hope of Russia to-day lies in the church. It is the only organization which the Jewish leaders of the Soviet government have been unable to destroy, and to it plain people are again turning with renewed hope. It may be that the ecclesiastics are filled with the vain expectation which characterized the Roman Catholic Church in France at the time of the Revolution, of restoring the monarchy, but we are assured that there is no such intention on the part of Christian people, taken as a whole, in Russia. They are looking for a democratic state which shall be spiritualized by a democratic church. To such Protestantism has a message. The dreamy Orient needs to be guided by the practical wisdom of the West. But, on the other hand, how much has the West to learn from the East! Martha has been the patron saint of Protestantism, but her bustling activity needs to be purified by the loving adoration of Mary. Protestantism has spoken "with the tongues of men and angels"; the Roman Church has "bestowed all its goods to feed the poor"; it may be found that the Eastern Church, in its apparent inefficiency, has kept alive the greatest gift of all, which is love. If, in the far future, Christian people could unite practical wisdom, merciful service, and adoring love the world would know that God had sent them. Two things are needed, vision

and patience, but the vision must be drawn not from the past but from the future, seeing the city of God coming down from heaven. It cannot be realized in our lifetime; "the vision . . . is for many days to come." But nothing less will inspire us to lift up our hearts and in patience possess our souls.