



BV 4019 .Y34 1922
Yale University. Divinity
School.
Education for Christian

EDUCATION FOR
CHRISTIAN SERVICE

✓
EDUCATION FOR
CHRISTIAN SERVICE

BY
MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF
YALE UNIVERSITY

• •
•

A VOLUME
IN COMMEMORATION OF ITS
ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY



NEW HAVEN
YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS
MDCCCXXII

COPYRIGHT 1922 BY
YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

PREFACE

The Yale Divinity School was established in October, 1822. It has therefore rounded out one hundred years of honorable and useful history.

During that period three thousand six hundred and eighteen men have studied in the Divinity School. They have come from all the various branches of the Protestant Church and they have gone out into all the states of the Union and into all the lands of earth to invest their training in unselfish service. The great majority of these men have engaged in the work of the pastorate in this country. Two hundred and fifty men have gone to the foreign field as missionaries; over six hundred have become college professors, and more than one hundred have been elected as presidents of colleges and universities. In all these varied fields of Christian activity the graduates of this School have been showing forth the results of the training received at Yale.

In connection with the celebration of our One Hundredth Anniversary it has seemed fitting that the members of the Faculty should publish this Centennial Volume. The various chapters in this book have been written with the thought of indicating to the popular mind the particular contribution made in the courses offered by each chair to the work of "Education for Christian Service."

We regret that Professor Kenneth S. Latourette of the Department of Missions was unable, because of absence

PREFACE

in China, to make his contribution. The Chair of Practical Philanthropy is at present vacant and we have therefore no chapter covering this important field in the training of men for Christian service.

This volume is offered in the hope that it may have value for all thoughtful men, ministers and laymen alike, who are interested in the education of men for future leadership in the work of the Kingdom of God.

CONTENTS

The Training of a Minister	3
CHARLES REYNOLDS BROWN, D.D., LL.D., Dean of the Divinity School and Pastor of the Univer- sity Church.	
The Historical and the Spiritual Understanding of the Bible	19
FRANK CHAMBERLIN PORTER, PH.D., D.D., Profes- sor of Biblical Theology.	
The Modern Approach to the Old Testament	51
GEORGE DAHL, PH.D., Associate Professor of Old Testament Literature.	
New Testament Science as a Historical Discipline	77
BENJAMIN WISNER BACON, D.D., LITT.D., Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation.	
The Literary Qualities of the English Bible	113
CHARLES ALLEN DINSMORE, D.D., Lecturer on the Spiritual Content of Literature.	
Theology in a Scientific Age	135
DOUGLAS CLYDE MACINTOSH, PH.D., Professor of Theology.	
Training in Worship	165
HENRY HALLAM TWEEDY, D.D., Professor of Prac- tical Theology.	
The Importance of the Aesthetic Consciousness and Its Bearing on Religious Education	209
E. HERSHEY SNEATH, PH.D., LL.D., Professor of the Philosophy of Religion and Religious Education.	

CONTENTS

Church History and Progress	245
ROLAND HERBERT BAINTON, PH.D., Instructor in Church History and New Testament Greek.	
The Function of the Theological Seminary in the Enterprise of Missions	269
JOHN CLARK ARCHER, PH. D., Assistant Professor of Missions.	
The Educational Service of the Christian Churches in the Twentieth Century	301
LUTHER ALLAN WEIGLE, PH.D., D.D., Professor of Christian Nurture.	
The Study of Christian Evangelism	329
HENRY BURT WRIGHT, PH.D., Professor of Christian Methods.	

THE TRAINING OF A MINISTER

CHARLES REYNOLDS BROWN

THE TRAINING OF A MINISTER

CHARLES REYNOLDS BROWN

THE young man who chooses the work of the Christian ministry has the best there is. In my judgment there is no other calling open to men which can bear comparison with it for one moment. I say this not because it is the proper thing for the Dean of a Divinity School to say—I say it because twenty-two years of experience in the active pastorate and eleven more years of experience as a college preacher and as a teacher of Homiletics, have led me to believe it to be entirely and profoundly true.

In the full chance for self-realization on the higher levels and in the deep and satisfying relations into which the ministry brings a man with his fellow-men, in the rich and varied rewards which flow back to the minister who is doing his work well and in a certain sense of intimacy with the favor and co-operation of Almighty God, there is no other calling in life which yields so much. The rewarding contact which I have enjoyed with forceful and successful men engaged in all manner of work, law and medicine, education and engineering, business and farming, has only served to deepen and confirm this conviction. Among all the good things in life the minister has the best.

It is only just that he should give value received by matching this high privilege with an equally high measure

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

of character and trained efficiency. Privilege means responsibility. To whom much is given, of him will much be required. If he were an ashman, a street sweeper or the stoker of a furnace, the world would not expect so much from him. In making this bold choice of the best room in the house the young minister has by that very act assumed certain exacting obligations. The Divinity School exists to aid him in meeting those obligations in a straightforward, manly fashion.

The great Apostle named two prime requisites for a vital ministry—"I pray that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment." Love and knowledge, character and efficiency! The driving force is to be found in an honest love for God and a warm, real and constant love for man. Along with that love there must needs be an ever growing measure of knowledge and good judgment, an acquaintance with the facts and real discernment in the use of materials. This is needed to make the love effective.

The basis of all effective ministry is to be found in a personal heart experience of religion. The young man will study religion as it has found expression in two great literary documents, the Old and the New Testament. He will study religion as it has found added expression in the long and checkered history of the Christian church in all lands and times. He will study religion as a profound philosophy of life undertaking to ground his faith in the universal reason and to discover its fundamental agreement with the constitution of things as they are. He will study religion as an ethical program to be followed by those who would find the sense of peace and worth and

THE TRAINING OF A MINISTER

would by their conduct achieve worthy results. He will study religion as a social aspiration, a dream of better things for the toiling and struggling millions, the vision of a veritable kingdom of heaven at hand and capable of realization.

Each one of these lines of study will claim his time and will have great value in making his ministry useful. But above them all and beneath them all, before them and after them, he will know religion by certain personal experiences at once the most sacred and vital experiences in his life.

The young man comes to the Divinity School to do laboratory work in Religion. In the chemical laboratory the wise instructor is not content to stand before his students giving them learned discourses on the history of chemistry or imparting to them tons of accurate information as to chemical law or performing before their astonished eyes interesting and instructive experiments. He insists that each student shall enter the laboratory and standing there on his own two feet shall take the tubes and materials into his own two hands and with his own particular share of blunder and breakage incident to instruction in chemistry, perform experiments in his own right. If the student would become a chemist he must do this until he knows the various actions and reactions by experiences altogether personal.

The student in Divinity School deals with the materials of religion in the same direct and personal fashion. The "oratory," the place of prayer, is to be the "laboratory," the place for personal experiment with spiritual reality. He there takes the materials of religion into his own heart

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

and soul. He there makes the transcendent values of religion more completely his own by a deepening experience of them. He there learns so to think, to feel and to strive that when he goes forth to speak about faith and hope and love, about reconciliation or renewal or spiritual invigoration through divine grace, he will be talking of that which his eyes have seen and his hands have handled, of that which he has experienced in his own heart. The note of reality in his utterance will spring from that personal knowledge.

There are young men who fail to make advance in religious life in Divinity School. They sometimes slip back. They grow cold; they become less conscientious; they lose something of the fine awe and reverence they once felt in the presence of holy things. They become so terribly used to it that the Bible is a text-book like a Trigonometry. The activities of the church in various ages are matters of historical inquiry upon which they are presently to pass an examination. The appeal of prayer, of the communion service and of the hymns of trust and aspiration is lessened because familiarity dulls the sensibilities of the student.

It need not be so. The theological school which does not impart religion as well as knowledge is falling short. It did not please the Lord to make Horace Bushnells or Henry Ward Beechers or Phillips Brooks when he made most of us. Those men were possessed of rare and surpassing gifts. To each of them was given ten talents when we in the same distribution come in for only one or two apiece. But no one of those men had more direct access to God than is possible to any one of us. The supply of that grace

THE TRAINING OF A MINISTER

which gives insight and sympathy, fidelity and patience, courage and devotion, is as open and inexhaustible for us as it was for them. The young man in Divinity School or in his first pastorate in some lonely rural parish is just as near to the stars as he would be were he standing in the pulpit of some Fifth Avenue church, New York, or in City Temple, London. If he is bent on bringing those gifts of his up to their best by an earnest and consecrated use of them, he can make steady progress in his own Christian life.

The preacher goes forth to make religion real to men. He cannot do this simply by talking about it or by explaining it. People are not greatly disturbed by mysteries. The blowing of the wind, the growing of the grass, the flight of a bird, the development of a tiny germ of life into a child who may in his maturity awe and bless the world—all these commonplace things are full of mystery, yet the people are not troubled. What they want beyond all else is that religion should be real. If we can set any man face to face with spiritual reality he will be introduced into experiences which cannot be uttered. His religion will fire his heart with visions and dreams which do not contradict though they do sometimes transcend reason. The world expects the minister to make religion real and he can only do this by being a profoundly religious man himself.

There must go with that deep religious experience a large measure of trained efficiency. Man's love for God and men must abound in all knowledge, in sound judgment, in moral discernment and in the ability to shape means to ends.

There are men in the ministry who are good men—good

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

enough so to speak, so good that their people would scarcely care to have them any better for fear it might embarrass the less worthy. These men may be possessed also of a certain facility of speech, the ability to pour out a steady, showy stream of pious words. They may aspire to posts of leadership in this intricate modern world. They wish to interpret the ways of God to men and to furnish a satisfying philosophy of life to those who are groping for something fundamental.

But it may easily be that all the while they have scarcely a bowing acquaintance with anything that could be called thorough and accurate scholarship touching the matters in hand. They do not know their Bibles. They have a certain glib familiarity with the more common passages, the Twenty-third Psalm, the Fourteenth Chapter of John and the Thirteenth Chapter of I Corinthians, but to know the life which found expression in that varied literature; to know the relation of part to part and the deeper meaning which does not lie on the surface; to be able to meet the modern difficulties and doubts as to the value and authority of this literature; to be able to separate that which is local and temporary from that which is universal and abiding and then apply its real meaning intelligently to modern conditions—all this they do not know.

They do not know how the religious spirit has organized itself for worship, for the propagation of the faith and for humane service in the history of the church. They do not know those blunders of belief and of practice which have been thoroughly tried out and, therefore, need not be repeated in every parish of the land.

They have never done any hard thinking in philosophy.

THE TRAINING OF A MINISTER

They have taken over a certain system of theology as one might receive a dry goods box without inquiring as to the varied contents of it or as to the worth and inter-relation of part with part. The result is that people of pious habit and resolute in their church attendance may receive the ministrations of these untrained men but great numbers of thoughtful, discriminating people will pass by on the other side. The indifference of strong men to our preaching is criticism which may well be heeded. The absence of certain elements in the community from the services of the church is criticism. The inability of any minister to meet the deepest needs of mind and heart is a criticism which should sting him into an effective effort to make his preaching more adequate.

When we think of all the weak, inefficient preaching that is being perpetrated on a patient, trusting public, we marvel that the Christian religion has stood up under it without being annihilated. If our faith had not been divine in its origin and essence it would have collapsed long ago.

There are hundreds of men preaching who are steadily pushing the thoughtful and discriminating, the robust and aspiring, the men of exact and thorough knowledge, farther and farther away from organized religion by their own method of presenting the Gospel. They are also loading young minds with false Biblical interpretations and with unsound ethical notions which will have to be unlearned later when the inevitable awakening comes, to the confusion and hurt of the young people who have been thus misled. Worse than all, those men are making it more difficult for other preachers who really can preach to secure a chance at the people whom they desire to reach

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

and influence. These people have been already repelled by the discredit and reproach brought upon the work of preaching by those bunglers.

The law of cost has to be observed—it is omnipresent and unyielding like the law of gravitation. No pains, no gains! There is no saving of life without the losing of it in faithful service. There is no remission of sin without the shedding of blood. The redemption of these personal, social, industrial and political interests calls for the investment of sacrifice. All things which have value must be paid for by other values. It is only by the patient, steady, persistent putting forth of effort to gain certain high ends that the necessary mental and spiritual equipment for useful preaching is attained. If any man expects to learn to preach so that his message will be with power and his words will be "spirit and life," he must pay the price and the price is large.

We find good men preaching with great facility in utterance who to all intents and purposes might as well be preaching in the Fifteenth Century or in the First. They have never taken pains to acquaint themselves with the civic and economic conditions under which their people live. They know nothing in any thorough, accurate way about the charities and corrections of the community. They are strangers to those sociological truths which underlie the present industrial unrest. They have no means of making a real approach to this modern life or of establishing connection between that mass of need and the message they bring. This knowledge cannot be acquired overnight. It is not dropped down suddenly into the mind of the man who means well. It comes only by long, hard,

THE TRAINING OF A MINISTER

patient study. The love for one's fellows must be made to abound in knowledge and in all judgment.

The man who does not know and does not know that he does not know and is not willing that any one should tell him that he does not know, had better not enter the ministry—he had better raise sweet potatoes. The real work of the world is not being done in these days by rule of thumb or by clever guesses on the part of kind-hearted people whose intentions are good. It is being done by men and women who know how because they took pains to learn how. In no calling is this more true than in the high and hard task of leading the minds and souls of men out of darkness into light, out from the bondage of evil into the freedom of righteousness.

The Gospel of Jesus Christ can be made as fresh and modern as the morning paper in its phrasing, its accents and in its adaptation to current needs. It can be made as winsome as a June morning by clothing it in the finest literary form possible and by giving to the presentation of it all the possible graces of public speech. But if we should rob it of that age-long something which renders it awe-inspiring, mysterious, divine in its power to search out and remedy the moral weakness of the human heart, then we would not be declaring the whole counsel of God.

The message the minister brings to this modern world must have in it large and varied content. It will not be made up, for example, entirely of compassion. I should say from a somewhat careful and extended observation east and west that this country is in danger of making compassion an overworked virtue. Pity is a sacred and a beautiful thing, but one cannot build states on compas-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

sion alone. One cannot conduct business on the basis of compassion alone. One cannot run a university with nothing but a lovely sense of pity at the heart of it. In all these fields of interest men must get down to that which is basic and fundamental. They must undertake to live by all the great words which proceed out of the mouth of God—by justice and truth, by honor and fidelity, by prudence and high resolve. And the minister is not declaring the whole counsel of God unless he makes that fact as clear as daylight to a generation more or less drunk on what it is pleased to call "love and charity."

The world, wearied and saddened beyond measure by the tragedy through which it has passed, has learned lessons which it will not easily forget. It has learned, as some one said recently, that "there is something radically wrong with human nature which the advance of intelligence and the refinements of Twentieth Century civilization have not been able to remedy." There were many fine people in the world in 1914 who had become so knowing that they no longer believed in the devil or in any moral equivalent for the devil. They regarded that whole conception as "an error of mortal mind," a mere bogie conjured up by the theologians to frighten the unthinking. So the Lord took the world into the Wilderness with the wild beasts for four years and showed it the devil. The evil in this human nature of ours is a very real and terrible thing. The silly people who thought that they could shoo it away with a few intellectual flourishes as one might shoo some neighbor's hens out of the garden have become wiser and sadder men.

The people to whom the young minister in these days

THE TRAINING OF A MINISTER

is to preach have been made aware of the mysterious power of evil when it is let loose in the world to work its will by treachery and by frightfulness. There are devilish possibilities in this human nature of ours even when it has been trained to efficiency under the leadership of the highest sort of intelligence. The world has seen that if the right is to triumph men will have to work for it and live for it and if need be die for it. We have been forced out of the shallow superficial views of human nature which had begun to prevail in many quarters. We have walked again beneath the shadow of the Cross and have seen that without the shedding of blood the evil of the world cannot be put away. This whole mood is vastly more promising than was the fat, sleek, sordid content of those generations which felt so secure in their belief that "the progress of civilization" and "the spread of intelligence" and "the spirit of an enlightened self-interest" had made forever impossible the old disasters of past centuries.

The world has also learned that in a stand-up fight for the mastery "material efficiency cannot overcome moral reality." It is widely believed to-day as one of our own prophets has said, "that the successful issue of the struggle in the great war was largely due to the power of moral principle over intelligent self-interest and material efficiency." The morale of those individuals and of those nations which believe that in the long run right is the only dependable might, will wear down and wear out those individuals and nations which undertake to live by the contrary view. The men of high moral purpose have the wind and the tide with them in a world which was created and is sustained for moral ends. They have the great moral order,

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

which enfolds us all whether we believe or disbelieve, fighting on their side as the right arm of the Omnipotent.

What an hour for the consecrated, well-trained preacher of righteousness! There is opened unto him a wide and effectual door and there are many adversaries. Here in our own land the stream of personal desire, of private ambition and of class consciousness is running much more strongly than is the sense of the necessity for that social discipline and that ordered activity which are imperative if we are to abide and prosper as a nation whose God is the Lord. The call of the hour is for men who have eyes to see and hearts to understand that they may serve as spiritual pathfinders in a genuine advance.

Are we going back or are we going on? Are we to return to the old materialistic ambitions which ruled so many hearts before the war and all but wrecked the white civilization of the race? Are we to organize these marvelous resources placed here within our reach mainly with reference to animal needs and comforts, or are we to use them as furnishing the necessary physical basis for a life worthy to be called human?

“The mandate of the dead,” to use the solemn, effective phrase coined by President Woodrow Wilson, calls upon us to live for the same great, high ends to which those brave men who died in France gave “the last full measure of devotion.” They died to make the world “safe for democracy” and here in this land as in other lands it must be a more real and a more thoroughgoing democracy than anything which we have yet seen if it shall not be that those honored dead shall have died in vain. There must come a more searching application of those great social

THE TRAINING OF A MINISTER

principles which lie embedded in the Sermon on the Mount and a more complete bringing of all our organized activities under the sway and rule of reason and conscience, if we are, indeed, to justify the sacrifice which has been made on our behalf.

In this long, hard task of reconstruction, the people will be called upon to exhibit seven days in the week and fifty-two weeks in the year the same unselfish purpose and the same sacrificial enthusiasm which were poured out in a steady stream for the winning of the war. And if the people of this country are to be held up to that style and manner of action, the preachers of religion will have to uncover to them steadily the deeper sources of motive and stimulus. They will have to unveil the more august sanctions for righteousness and the more potent deterrents from evil. They will have to point the way for the reinforcement of the human will by its sense of agreement and co-operation with the Infinite Good Will of the Father in Heaven. In a word they will have to furnish the world religion that it may do the will of Him who sent us this hard task.

The modern minister is not sent to save a few souls here and there out of this present world and incorporate them into some religious sect for its particular aggrandizement. He is not sent to collect a choice array of monks and nuns standing quite apart from the domestic, the industrial and the political activities of the race in a detached and private sort of saintliness. He is sent to save men and women in this present world and to train them for intelligent, competent, conscientious action in saving the world itself as an object of divine interest and the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

subject of a divine redemption. He aims at the moral renewal and the spiritual strengthening of all those plain people who are to bear the heat and burden of a long, hard day as participating members in this intricate modern life. It is to equip him for this exacting duty that the Divinity School exists.

It is a great hour to be alive at all, and to be alive and young with all those splendid years of opportunity just ahead is Heaven itself. For a thousand years other men and women will turn back to study with deep interest the significant events of the last eight years and the no less significant events in that period of history immediately in front of us which you and I are helping to make a day at a time, an hour at a time, an act at a time. The call of the hour is for that trained, competent, devoted spiritual leadership which will be able to stamp this wonderful period of history more clearly and more deeply with the likeness and image of the Son of God.

THE HISTORICAL AND THE SPIRITUAL UNDER-
STANDING OF THE BIBLE

FRANK CHAMBERLIN PORTER

THE HISTORICAL AND THE SPIRITUAL UNDER- STANDING OF THE BIBLE

FRANK CHAMBERLIN PORTER

TO modern men the understanding of the Bible means fundamentally its historical understanding. The historical in distinction from the dogmatic study of the Bible is that which appeals to the modern mind. It is what the scientific spirit and method mean when applied to documents and events and persons of the past. This historical interest leads especially to the study of the causes and influences that determine movements and explain their genesis, direction and outcome. These modern problems and the way in which it is natural for us to look for their solution may well seem at first, and do seem to many people, to be at variance with the Christian way of regarding the Biblical books and the persons and events of which they tell. The assumption of Christian faith is that these persons and events are unique and do not belong to that order of human life which historical science traces out; that questions of sources and influences and tendencies involve a naturalistic and unreligious view of these exceptional and divine persons and events, of Christ himself and his teaching, of his death and resurrection, of the Pentecost experience, and of the nature and value as truth of the theology of Paul and of John. There are two main reactions against historical study in these

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

regions. One is that of the conservative who for the sake of the religious values which he knows these books to have excludes historical methods altogether from the study of them. To him the natural and rational order which the historian assumes does not apply to these documents and to the events of which they tell. The events and the writings are supernatural, and are to be understood only on the assumption that they are direct interventions of God in human life. Then there are also the mystical natures whose reaction is in the direction of detaching religious experience from everything outward, including even the externalities of Biblical history and the intellectual formulations of their religious experiences by the Biblical writers, which are necessarily in terms of their own age and in accordance with their knowledge of the world.

But it is not only from the side of men's religious interests that difficulties of adjustment are felt between the rights of historical study and those of the religious use of the Bible. The historical spirit is after all the spirit of truth. If its assumption is that order and reason, causation and progress, are to be looked for in Biblical history as everywhere else, this assumption itself has a religious meaning and value. It is not only to the scientific mind but to the religious also that contra-natural interventions of God are no longer the expected and desired evidences of his presence and activity in the world. The miraculous does not appeal to us, not because it is impossible to God, but because it is not God's way as we ourselves see and know it. Furthermore there is a religion of truth which is within its range truly a religion; and to it every genuinely scientific student gives allegiance. For the sake of truth

UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIBLE

the historian is anxious to avoid self-interest, the prejudicing influence of traditions, inherited feelings, and emotional interests and desires. There are no doubt historians who are mere investigators of facts and treat ancient documents merely as chronicles. Their disinterestedness in regard to the spiritual significance of the books and persons of which they write is not a virtue. But there are many who are conscientious and self-denying in their fear and avoidance of all spiritualizing interpretations. To many a modern historian modernizing is the great temptation and deadly sin of the historian's calling.

The scientific conscience is, indeed, truly a religion. But truth is something far more than fact; moreover it remains only one of the three realities which constitute that other world to which we belong, and to which it is our religious duty to be loyal. To accept the facts, especially when they go against our desires and seem to be contrary to our higher instincts and interests, is, indeed, a demand of our minds, but it is also a recognition of God and an act of obedience to him. But there are other realities of the unseen realm besides Truth that claim equally our unselfish devotion. There are Goodness and Beauty; and each of these three has its own independent right apart from the other. It is true of the Bible more, one is inclined to say, than of any other literature that the perception of Goodness and Beauty, and feelings of love and devotion toward them, are as indispensable as loyalty to Truth for any real appreciation of what the book contains and is meant to impart. It is, of course, also true that these three are properties and possessions of one mind, and that the mind always works as a unity and under the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

conditions and limitations of its quality. One who is deficient in his appreciation and enjoyment of beauty will not perceive some of the most important matters in such literary documents and in such human lives as the Bible sets before us; and one who is of less than the normal human concern for righteousness, or has less than man's usual sense of another world invisible and eternal, from which he comes and on which he depends, will not give to the evidences of these interests and the operations of these motives in the Bible the place which really belongs to them. To such a historian truth will have a narrow definition; and the antagonism which he will be inclined to set up between truth in this limited sense and the appreciations and interpretations of the philosopher, or the man of letters, or the reformer, or the mystic, may be due rather to his deficiencies than to the disinterestedness and self-renouncement of his devotion to truth. From of old it has been recognized that historic fact and poetic truth may stand in a certain contrast to each other; and those who recognize the contrast between the two always give to the second the higher right and value. The Biblical literature contains far more than records of past facts. In all its greatest parts it is inspired by a desire for righteousness and a love of God and joy in him, and it moves so much in the region of man's deepest and highest nature that it can be understood only by one who adds to knowledge and intellectual capacity a sensitive insight into all sides of human experience, and a satisfaction and joy that are greater in proportion to the heights and depths into which the mind is led. The historian simply as a historian ought to be as fully rounded a person as possible, and should not

UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIBLE

be possessed beyond what is reasonable with the idea that his interests and wishes are to be sacrificed at whatever cost to the facts. What if our interests and desires were also those of the men of old? In that case they may be an indispensable help toward our understanding of these men and of the nature and direction of the life and movement in which they belong, rather than an obstacle to be avoided or overcome. Modernizing, that word of evil omen to some modern historians, may be after all a virtue and not a sin if it means that spiritual men can only be spiritually discerned, and that only at the heights of our own religious experience can we apprehend in our measure the experiences of greater men of religion than ourselves. For it must be confessed that there are writings of modern Biblical critics which seem meant to leave the impression that only one thing is important, that is, to realize that the Biblical writers were men of their own times. This is, of course, an important fact, the recognition of which brings with it radical changes in traditional interpretations, and does make impossible the older dogmatic use of the Bible. But the great actors and writers of the Old and New Testaments were not only or chiefly men of their own times; they were great men, creative spirits, great men of religion, whose thoughts and feelings belonged in that region of the eternal which is beyond time and change.

It follows that Beauty and Goodness have their place by the side of Truth in the equipment of the reader of the Bible. It is not a matter of secondary importance that the language of the Biblical writers is almost everywhere the language of emotion. Except through emotional speech the realities which these writers possessed and wished to

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

impart could not find expression. It is by their style, by their way of putting things, that these writers add emotion to their thoughts, and enable us not merely to see the facts they describe, but to feel about them as they felt. The power of their writing is the measure of the depth of their feeling, the energy of their conviction and of their will to impart it; and the beauty of their language is an expression of their delight and satisfaction in the objects of their thoughts, their sense of the worth of these objects, and their joy in the contemplation of them. There can be no doubt about the depth and power of the emotion that inspires most of the Biblical writings; nor is there any doubt that the feelings that prevail are not those of fear, or depression, or despair, but those of hope and trust, of grateful wonder and exultant joy. It can almost be said that Yahweh, Israel's God, is never the subject of mere reflection, never an intellectual problem and never a bare fact. He is always spoken of, or spoken to, in the language of loyalty and adoration, of enthusiasm and of love; always, therefore, with words of power and of beauty, in language fitted to elevate the reader's mind and give him a like joy in a like vision of God. When one undertakes to change such language as that of the prophets or the Psalms into intellectual terms, to analyze the conception of God involved in their language in terms of fact or intellectual truth, he not only converts poetry into prose, but he misses that which the poetical form itself contains. Such interpretations are not an understanding of the ancient writer, but a substitution of a different attitude of mind and a different kind of reality. In the interpretation of a religious literature of this kind there is always more

UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIBLE

danger in externalizing the spiritual than in spiritualizing the external.

The intellectualizing tendency is not, however, new and distinctive of modern historical science. A genuinely historical study should, indeed, prove helpful to the correction of the one-sidedly intellectual interpretation of the Bible by the older theologians. Dogmatic theologies certainly often missed the main thing in their prosaic renderings of the Biblical language about God. Piety, through the ages of dogmatism, must have nourished itself on the words of the Bible, with the instinctive sense that it could get possession of the reality, the vision of God and communion with him, without the help of the doctors. Religious feeling could no doubt find itself justified in its use of the Bible by theological formulas which affirmed the absolute uniqueness and divine authority of the book. But on the other hand dogmatic formulations always meant divisions and enmities, which were contrary to the interests of religion, and especially to the fundamental spirit and purpose of Christianity; and besides this it became increasingly evident that the dogmas affirmed on the authority of scripture things which were not in accordance with men's growing knowledge of the universe and of the human mind.

After some very early beginnings and many attempts that seemed to miss the mark, it became gradually evident that the dogmatic use of the Bible was a mistake even from its own intellectual standpoint; that the dogmas of the church, though they rested on scripture, did not at many points interpret scripture in accordance with its real character, and that by the same literalistic method of

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

interpretation, with a different selection and emphasis, very different doctrines might equally well be proved. It was out of the discovery of deep-lying differences between scripture itself and the doctrines of the church that the science of Biblical Theology arose, and separated itself from the Doctrinal Theology, of which it was at first a part. When various rival creeds, both conservative and liberal, set forth their Biblical proofs, it became gradually clear that the Bible did not, in the strictest sense, confirm any one of them. The Bible arose out of different times and contained many different and contrary conceptions of religion. The New Testament and the Old could not be regarded as teaching the same theology; and within the Old Testament, at least, it was easy to see that there were not only varieties but movements, a growth or development which is in part evident, but in part concealed, because the Old Testament books were finally collected and edited by the scribes of the post-exilic age in a way that reflected their own conception of the Jewish religion. The Old Testament is, indeed, the canon of the Jewish church; but it is in its origin and actual character a collection of the documents of a history. It is to the historian, therefore, that the task must be referred of the separation, dating and interpretation of these documents, and the recovery of the historical process, the development, which lies beneath them and of which they are products and records.

So Biblical Theology came into being with the word "historical" as the definition of its character and purposes, in contrast to dogmatic or doctrinal. Its outcome is a history of the religion of Israel during the Old Testament

UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIBLE

period, or until the rise of Christianity, and a historical account of the beginnings of the Christian religion; a history not of outward events but of religious thoughts and of religious life. It has in part the same character and involves some of the same dangers that belong to Dogmatic Theology. It is an intellectual study and understanding of the Bible, with the great advantage that it substitutes a truer for a fundamentally mistaken intellectual approach and method. But the question of most importance, and the one with which we are now concerned, is that of its effects on the religious use of the Bible and so on religious faith and life. No doubt at first the impression of the religious soul may well be one of doubt and perhaps of positive peril or loss. The old intellectual foundation, the dogma of an authoritative and infallible book, and all that this brought with it of clearness and certainty about God and the world unseen and about man and redemption, was beyond doubt one on which could rest the structure of a genuine and strong religious experience. What now are the effects, and what in the end will they prove to be, of the substitution of the historical view of the Biblical books and of historical aims and methods in the study of them, upon men's faith in God and life with God?

This historical method and aim has for the modern mind the compulsion of necessity, and it is impossible for us to question its right, or to return to views and uses of the book which it has set aside. It involves difficult problems and a radical reconstruction of the intellectual formulation of our faith, and even in some measure of the nature of our religious experiences. That these changes will prove to be for the advantage of religion itself must

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

necessarily be the conviction of every one who believes in God and in the unity of his universe, and in the equal rights and necessary harmony of the different sides of human nature.

Let us point out, first, in regard to the Old Testament and then in the more difficult field of the New, some of the advantages to religious faith which historical study brings. In part these effects might be called negative, or might better be described as a freeing of the mind and a removing of obstacles that have stood in the way of our natural and full enjoyment of the book. Although not all historians show appreciation of the beauty and emotional power, the high unconscious art, the soul, of the Old Testament literature, yet historical studies do really remove barriers that have stood in the way of such free and inward appreciation. The Old Testament is a library of richly varied and deeply human writings, and its greatness cannot be freely recognized and fully enjoyed if its variety and its humanness are denied by the theory that it has only one author, and that one divine. The Biblical books were written by men who had a living sense of God and of his nearness and in a real sense the human quality of his love and purposes toward men; and it has been a mistake and a loss to think of these writers as men so different from ourselves that we cannot share their sense of God and nearness to him.

The Greek rhetorician Longinus described men's natural response to greatness or sublimity in literature as consisting first of wonder and then of transport. We are filled with wonder and reverence because we recognize in the book something greater than ourselves; but the greatness

UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIBLE

of a work of literary art is of such a sort that it calls forth not only wonder in the reader, but, following this, a quickening and elevation of his mind, such that he feels the thoughts of the writer to be his own. We are lifted up when we read great books to the level of the writer's own vision, and find ourselves endowed with something of his creative energy, so that we not only feel that his thoughts are our own, but are sent forward and upward by the impulse he gives to thoughts that reach out even beyond those which he has expressed. The dogmatic view of the Bible rests upon and has increased men's sense of wonder and reverence, but has stood in the way of the experience of transport, which so much of the literature of the Old Testament as well as of the New is fitted to create. The Bible is meant, we may even venture to say, to bring God near and to call forth in its readers a living sense of God and a closer walk with God; and the book is in a measure shut off from its true task, closed and sealed against its true reading, robbed of its natural character, when it is so separated from normal human life as to become only an object of worship. Historical studies do not, indeed, assure this higher use of the Bible as great literature, having the quality of the sublime. Historical researches, indeed, seem often to have the effect of dulling men's sense of wonder, rather than helping them to add to wonder the experience of transport. It is because historical students sometimes seem to be without reverence for the literature they study, seem to be merely analyzers and even "critics," that religious people have been so suspicious or resentful of their work. Nevertheless it cannot be doubted that historical studies free the mind; and that following after the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

understanding of the Bible, which is for us necessarily a historical task, there may and should come a quite new and elevating enjoyment of this literature, a greater inwardness and intimacy of spiritual communion with those who first gained those insights and convictions as to things unseen which are our greatest inheritance, the creative sources of the highest values of our own inner life.

But there are certain directions in which the results of historical research contribute evident and positive gains and advantages to the religious use of the Old Testament. Two great realities come into view as a result of historical study, which have in them great power not only to instruct and enlighten but to guide and further, to spiritualize and vitalize, religious thought and life. Historical science has recovered in good measure the actual course of the religious history of Israel, its origins, its movements, the influences that shaped it, its progress toward certain ends. If this were thought of as the substitution of a natural development for the divine initiative and purpose, the thought and the working of God in the life of this people, then the religious spirit would not welcome it. But religious faith is surely as free in the region of history as in that of nature to interpret orderly and rational connections and developments as the mode of the divine operation. The conception of God as one who can work his will in the world which he made only by occasional interventions from without, forcible interferences in the course of nature and of human events, is one which is not only contrary to knowledge, but also defective from the religious point of view. As a matter of fact the tendencies and movements in the religious history of Israel, as historical

UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIBLE

science has brought them to light, are in a high degree enlightening, and help as nothing else does, except, indeed, a living inner contact with God, to distinguish relative values in thoughts and things religious, and to put the emphasis not only in our judgments of the past but in our present choices and estimates upon the things that are of true and enduring reality and worth. As the Old Testament stands, that is, as the scribes of the Jewish church understood God's ways with his people, the greatest things in religion were God's choice of Israel as his peculiar people and the hope of its final dominance over the nations of the world; the ritual of the temple, the cultus in which the peculiarity of Israel came to expression and was guarded and made secure; and the law, the divinely given revelation of the divine will. Historical studies have resulted in giving to the prophetic movement a new place and a creative and decisive significance in Israel's religious life. In the light of the judgments of the great prophets it has become evident that it is not the idea of a peculiar people but the conception of universality that is the greater thing even in the Old Testament, although the expression of it is exceptional and represents a radical departure from the ruling views; that the priestly ritual is secondary in value to the ethical and spiritual elements in religion, to righteousness, kindness and humility; and that even the great conception of the Law, the conception of a revealed, final and authoritative book of the will of God, is not so high and true a conception as that of inwardness and freedom, of each man's independent inward knowledge of the will of God, and each man's experi-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

ence of a new nature created by the spirit of God (Jer. 31:31-34, Ezek. 36:25-27).

The historical student not only gives more value, as, indeed, every disciple of Christ and follower of Paul must do, to the prophetic than to the priestly and popular judgment, but he finds positive evidence in the movements of history itself that newness and distinction belong to the prophetic rather than to the popular religion. Even the great conception of Israel, the peculiar people of God, has not only the deep defect of exclusiveness, but is also essentially a common characteristic of primitive tribal and national forms of religion. So that, although nationalism is characteristic of the Old Testament religion, the heights of that religion are reached only where nationalism is denied, or is brought into subjection, as it is in the great figure of the Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah, to the ideal of one God, and of humanity as one in its worship of him, and of Israel as the prophet of that oneness. The Old Testament ritual has not only its parallels but certainly also at many points its sources in primitive usages of indefinite antiquity, and especially in the cult-practices of the Sinaitic wilderness and of the peoples of Canaan whom Israel displaced and whose culture they partly absorbed. Not sacrifices and offerings, nor sacred days and seasons, nor rites of purification, were peculiar to Israel and expressive of its genius. Peculiarity and originality appear when justice is put above sacrifice. The ethical and spiritual, which may seem to us natural and human, are in fact the rare and distinguishing quality in Old Testament religion. So also the conception of a divinely given book, to which nothing can be added and from it nothing

UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIBLE

taken away, is by no means a new and distinctive feature in the religion of Israel. For newness and peculiar greatness we have to look within the law itself for points in which legalism is surpassed, and in the prophets for intimations of inwardness and freedom. Historical studies, then, help us to see the higher points in Old Testament religious history, rightly to distinguish between the old and the new, and to see that the underlying tendency, the true purpose and goal of the movement, and so the nature of the life of this religion, are to be found in the region of the spiritual, the universal, the humanly natural, and not in the region of the exclusive and the external.

The other value which history gives to religion is the knowledge of the great personalities of the Old Testament. The prophets Amos and Hosea, Isaiah and Jeremiah, stand out with a definiteness and individuality such as they could not have possessed when no critical analysis of their writings was possible, and when their significance as discoverers and creators in the realm of things spiritual was obscured. It is almost as true in the Old Testament as in the New that the truths of religion are expressed and the powers of religion are operative chiefly in great personalities; and that to come into contact with them is to come nearest to the heart of things religious. And to this living personal contact with great men of God, men who not only opened up the paths in which we are still walking, but are themselves the revelation of the truths they discovered, modern historical study has greatly opened and widened our way.

When we turn to the New Testament it is natural to find much greater reluctance to let the historian have his

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

way and a greater difficulty in recognizing that the gains here also may be greater than any losses which may come because of what he may find or may fail to find in this source-book of our religion. The attitude of Jesus toward the law and ritual of Judaism, the judgment of Paul as to Israel's claims and prerogatives, as to the purpose of legalism in the divine order, as to the freedom with which Christ sets free, and the inwardness which is the effect or the meaning of his spiritual indwelling in the Christian,—all this should make it easy for us to recognize that the inversion of appearances and transvaluation of values which historical study effects in the Old Testament is a true interpretation of the real purpose of Israel's history. But is it so clear that historical criticism can lead, and seems actually to be leading, to better things for religion than the old doctrinal study discovered, when it enters the New Testament, and especially when it seeks for the historical Jesus behind the Gospels, and looks not only in Judaism but in Greek paganism, not only for analogies but for sources of the thoughts of Paul and John as to the person of Christ and the nature of his redemptive work?

There can be no doubt that the historian finds the same problems here as in the Old Testament, and finds the same methods applicable and necessary for their solution. Here as there we see variety and movement. Though the time covered by the New Testament literature is short and the religious movement to which these books belong is fundamentally one, flowing from one source, the character and life work of Jesus, and having one distinctive spirit, yet the movement is by no means uniform. The dogmatic interpretation of the New Testament meets the same diffi-

UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIBLE

culty that confronts it in the Old. There are real differences in the interpretation of Christ, of his death, of his redemptive work, and these seem to have made their appearance from the very first. There is a difference between the Messiah of the Synoptic Gospels and the Logos and Son of God of John's gospel. Neither of these is the same as Paul's interpretation of Jesus as Lord and as Spirit. In Hebrews Jesus has still a different nature and task; and in Revelation the difference is equally great. A Christological dogma can hardly be devised which will provide a place for all these qualities and functions in one figure. Furthermore these various interpretations of the nature and meaning of Christ and of his work are not without relationship to Jewish and even to heathen conceptions of the period; so that here, as in the Old Testament, history has been following two main lines, the effort to discover an order of movement in early Christian thinking, and the search for analogies and for possible sources and influences in the surrounding world. A problem peculiar to New Testament study is that of the relationship of these vital and various and revolutionary ideas and movements to Jesus himself, to the religion which he taught and to the conception which he had of the significance of his personality in the revealing and the imparting of his religion.

We must recognize at the outset that a like danger lies in wait for the historical student to that which we found besetting him in the Old Testament: the danger that he may lose the sense of wonder in the presence of supreme greatness. The true task of the historian, here as there, should be at least to remove the obstacles which have stood in the way of adding transport to wonder in the reading

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

of the book and in the presence of him by whose spirit the book throughout is created. The New Testament breathes everywhere the spirit of wonder, of worship and of love toward Christ. As the Old Testament writers do not speak of Yahweh except in the language of emotion, so is it with the New Testament language about Christ. The effort to discover fact and truth about him and to formulate or defend Christological doctrines has been a barrier in the way of the appreciation of the living spirit which gives power and beauty to all that is said about him. Historical study, through its freeing of the mind from the dogmatic interest and assumption, should at least clear the way for a reading of the New Testament which is more in accordance with its actual character. Paul and John experienced not only wonder but ecstasy in the presence of Christ. Wonder the older reading of the New Testament no doubt produced; but the emphasis of church doctrine on the uniqueness of Christ, and its understanding of the nature of that uniqueness, made it hard for later Christians to repeat Paul's experience of being lifted up by the vision of Christ to his side, transformed from one stage to another into his likeness, made conscious that Christ was being formed within him, until he could speak of his life as "in Christ," and of his no longer living since Christ lived in him. This natural movement of Paul's mind from wonder to transport at the thought of Christ is what gives its form and inner emotional quality to all that he says about him. Christian doctrine has accepted the wonder, but by omitting the transport it has changed the wonder itself into something different, something formal and intellectual, in place of the vitality and passionate quality of

UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIBLE

Paul's experience. Historical criticism cannot, indeed, be counted upon to cure this defect. But it does leave the whole man with all his human interests and his deeper spiritual desires free to make his way as he is able to the real heights of the New Testament literature, and through its heights to the experience of God.

The positive results for which the historian is seeking and which, as fast as he finds them, he turns over to the religious spirit, his own, or his readers', to put to its own uses, consist in the New Testament as in the Old of certain tendencies or directions of movement, in the light of which values can be newly reckoned; and in certain great personalities brought more fully to our understanding by a better knowledge of their environment and whatever light the analysis of literary sources and comparative studies within and outside of the canon may throw upon them.

In the case of the New Testament it will serve our purpose better to look at the factor of personality first. Two great creative personalities stand out clearly in the New Testament, that of Jesus and that of Paul. Paul would have us understand that his personal quality has been re-fashioned into conformity with the character of Christ, so that he is to all his converts a real embodiment in his own new nature of the mind of Christ. There can hardly be any question more fundamental for the understanding of Paul himself, and even for the understanding of Christ, and of the nature of the Christian religion, than the question in what sense and in what measure Paul's conviction is true that his thoughts, his acts, and his inmost self are dominated and determined by the actual character of the actual Jesus. It has often been said that Paul neither knew the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Jesus of history nor cared to know him, but had substituted for him a heavenly being, the sight of whom was his conversion, whose features were not those of Jesus, but those of the divine Messiah of Paul's Jewish tradition. It would carry us too far to test the measure of truth and show the fundamental error of this position. That the Christ whom Paul believed to be dwelling in him and to have transformed his character was the historical Jesus seems to me to be beyond question. The new nature which Paul experienced, the new person he found himself to be, was one in whom flesh was subject to spirit and self to love. Paul found that sin in his members had died. He knew himself to be freed from self-seeking and from the desires and feelings that divide men from each other and create enmity and strife. The mind of Christ as Paul characterizes it is the very same as that mind which meets us in the Gospels. The fruits of the divine spirit which every Christian experienced, which was the spirit of Christ, or Christ himself, were the qualities of Jesus. Spirit is the word for the way in which this character, this person, works as a divine energy in human life, transforming all things into his own likeness. Love is the word which more adequately than any other suggests the quality of that character; but love needs to be interpreted by Jesus, and will not be rightly understood nor powerfully experienced if it is separated from him. One of the most striking achievements of Paul's thought is his subjection of the conception of Spirit to the character of Jesus (I Cor. 12-14). He refuses to interpret Christ by the traditional conception of Spirit as the power of God working miracles in human life, and insists on understanding the miraculous

UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIBLE

itself in the light of Jesus, as the power of divine love, seeking not its own, but working always toward mutual helpfulness and upbuilding. Paul brings the conception of knowledge, or wisdom, into a like subjection to the character and purposes of Christ (I Cor. 1-2). The title Lord expressed for Paul the unique place and authority of Jesus, but even this word is so interpreted by him that it means in effect the Lordship of humility and love (Phil. 2:5-11). That it is the real Jesus to whom Paul brings every thought into conformity and every impulse into subjection is evident by the description of love in I Corinthians 13, which cannot be accounted for except as the creation of the character of Jesus; it is Paul's greatest sketch of that character. It is evident still more in the actual character of Paul as it discloses itself often unconsciously though often also in needed self-defense against those whose misjudgments of him imperilled his work. But there is another reason for our certainty that it is the real character of the real Jesus which Paul felt to be dominating and re-creative in his own life. It is to be found in an altogether extraordinary characteristic of Paul's Christology. Paul elevates Jesus to the side of God in a way that seems to separate him absolutely from men, and yet he conceives of Christians as so united with Christ that they share with him everything that he is, and repeat in their own experience every experience of their Lord. There is here a strange union of opposites, a remarkable paradox of thought, for which we can find no explanation except that to Paul the character of Christ was the Divine Love. Love is the only quality which both separates and unites one who is ruled by it and all other beings. The more love

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

rules the more does it impart itself to others and break down the separation that rulership seems to imply. To Paul everything unique about Jesus is also universal. It is the expression of absolute truth. It is the symbol of what is, or is to be, the common human experience. Paul does not balance the uniqueness of Christ over against the reproduction of Christ's nature and experience in the life of every Christian; for these two do not seem to him to be opposite and contradictory. It is one and the same thing for love to be dominant in Christ and to set him on high by the side of God, and for his love to impart itself in its fulness to all who would receive it. Paul himself, separated as he is by his apostleship and above others in authority, nevertheless desires and values no experiences that cannot be shared by others. The vision which Paul had of Christ was that of one who sought not his own and would have nothing for himself but would share with others and spend for others all he had. This vision came to Paul not from Jewish tradition, for it has no parallel either in the expectations of Judaism or in the ideals of the Greek world. It is the creation of the Jesus of history. Paul himself would have said nothing but this, and historical study leads us to no other conclusion. I do not mean to say that there is nothing in Paul's thought that has not been subjected to the character of Jesus and re-interpreted by him. But that it was Paul's purpose to think in accordance with the mind of Jesus, and that he carried this purpose through with greater consistency and boldness and in a more radical and revolutionary way than any of his followers and interpreters, is, I believe, beyond doubt and is one of the most significant facts in the New Testament.

UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIBLE

That the Christ whom Paul would make dominant is one who wills not to remain above and apart, but to become the real self of every disciple and of all men, is an idea that we can understand only because Jesus himself was what he was. That Paul interpreted the mind of the Master truly in this, the Gospels give unmistakable evidence. Jesus resisted and rejected from the first the claims of special favor from God and the desire for special gifts and powers which are so characteristic of the piety of the Old Testament. Sonship was not his exclusive prerogative but was offered to every one on the sole condition of likeness to the Father. Paul gives striking evidence that to use the word "Abba" as Jesus used it was the fundamental miracle of the Christian experience, and meant man's entrance into a sonship fully like that of Christ himself. The personality of Jesus dominates Paul, and the personality of Paul bears witness to and re-incarnates the personality of Jesus. It is the actual character of Jesus which explains its power to impart itself and reproduce itself in human lives. These two facts, both of them facts of history, the character of Jesus, and the new life of his followers, in Christ and according to Christ, contain in themselves the explanations of the beginnings of Christianity and give us the clue to every fundamental difficulty which the New Testament literature and history present.

Perhaps the most fundamental of these difficulties is the very problem which the title of this essay suggests, the problem of the relation between the Christ of history and the Christ of spiritual experience. It is because the character of Jesus was what it was that Paul when he looked upon him saw in him not only the image and glory

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

of God but also man as he really is and can now become. Paul saw Christ as every man, and not only as the unique man from heaven. He thought of him as the representative and creator of a new human race, to be seen therefore himself in every man in whom his spirit dwells. This means that the historical Jesus is fundamental to Paul's Christianity, and yet that this same Jesus has an essential independence of history, and is an ever present fact in human life. Paul means what he says when he declares that the Lord is the Spirit, and when he says for himself and for every Christian that Christ lives in him, that Christ is "our life." The historical and the spiritual are blended in Paul in a way that we can only appreciate if we make the real character of Jesus dominate our thinking in the manner and measure in which it dominated Paul. Christ was for him not only a fact of history, the most individual and personal of human beings, but he was also the Divine Love, the Spirit of God, as it dwells in the human spirit. There is a universal quality in the individual character of Jesus which made it possible, not only for Paul, but for other Christians who stood close to the realities of his human life, to identify him with the Wisdom and with the Logos of God.

Christ was to Paul wholly unique, for he was that hoped-for coming of God into human life which made all things new. His death and resurrection were the supreme and unparalleled facts in human history, by which a divine redemption was once for all effected. Yet Paul speaks much more often of the death and resurrection of Christ as involving, and in their deepest sense signifying, every Christian's death to sin and rising to newness of life; and

UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIBLE

it is a fundamental mistake to suppose that Paul meant this language to be taken only figuratively. To the end of his life Paul looks at the sufferings of Christ and his death, not as a doctrine needing to be interpreted and accepted, but as an experience which we must share, with which we must have fellowship, to which we must become conformed; and to his resurrection, not only as a historical fact, not chiefly as needing to be established by evidence, but as a power to be experienced, and as a goal of effort to be attained (Phil. 3:10-14). Again, it is fundamentally that which Jesus actually was, rather than any native peculiarity of Paul's mind, which made this language natural to him. It is because the character of Jesus was the manifested fulness of Divine Love that it was natural for Paul to think of men's likeness to him as at the same time his gift and their moral achievement. Indeed the whole fundamental problem of religious thought and life, the problem of the relation of the divine to the human and of the human to the divine, is put in a new light by the character of Jesus, and a clue is provided to the contradictions which confront both mind and will in the effort to separate and yet unite God's part and man's in religious experience.

We are already in the presence of those tendencies and movements in the New Testament literature which the historian discovers and which the religious mind may well use as helps to a true valuation of the various and sometimes conflicting conceptions which the New Testament contains. Our problem here as in the study of the Old Testament is that of distinguishing things new from things old, and in the light of that distinction, dividing things

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

greater from things less. It is evident that the distinctive thing in the New Testament conception of Christ is to be looked for not in the sources, whether Jewish or Hellenistic, of the conceptions of Messiah, Son of Man, Lord, Wisdom, Logos, important as an understanding of the origin and character of these conceptions is. The vital question both for the historian and for the religious reader of these books is the manner in which these traditional conceptions were applied to Christ, and especially the manner and degree in which they were interpreted by him, rather than he by them. We are certainly justified in saying that the tendency or movement represented by Paul and in a somewhat different way by John, the tendency to bring these conceptions into subjection to Jesus, rather than substitute them for him, is the one of greater significance, the one distinctive and creative. It is especially suggestive to see how the Logos doctrine of the prologue of John is so used by the writer that it is evidently dominated by the historical person of Jesus and his power to impart to others his own oneness with the Father. It is surely because of Christ himself that the doctrine of the Spirit in the end takes the place of the doctrine of the Logos, as it also interprets or displaces the common apocalyptic expectation of the outward return of Christ. In the last discourses the promise and the prayer of Jesus are that the Spirit will more than make good the loss of his physical presence, that it will be in reality his inner and permanent presence, and will impart power, and truth, and oneness of life with him and with God, making the disciple more and more fully one with him. So the universality of the

UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIBLE

Logos doctrine is not allowed to separate Christ from us, but has its outcome in an almost incredibly close nearness and even identification of the disciple with the Master. The tendency which is most distinctive of the New Testament is that which can be traced from its source in the mind of Christ, through Paul and the Fourth Gospel; and this is a tendency away from all exclusiveness toward universality, from all externality toward inwardness, and from all bondage toward freedom.

No simple summary can do justice to the richness and variety of the thought and life that flow through the New Testament. Historical studies constantly open the mind to new aspects of this abounding life, and bring us new treasures out of this storehouse of spiritual wealth. Historical studies do no doubt sometimes tend to put more emphasis on matters external and temporal and local, and to give the impression that the principal condition for a true understanding of Jesus and of Paul is the recognition that they were men of their time and not of ours. But the correction for this one-sidedness lies close at hand within the sphere of history itself. One of the historians who has contributed most to the illumination of the Hellenistic side of Paul's inheritance and environment has shown that insight may go hand in hand with learning when he remarks that in all history of the mind we must start from the personality, and must always give it a double explanation, from itself and from the environing world; and that in religious history it is peculiarly true that nothing can be of effect which finds no preparations in current thinking, but that nothing can be vital which in its essence is

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

not new; that a great religious personality never really borrows but always creates, and that a religious idea that conquers the world must in the final sense be new. It is historical judgments such as these that may well assure us that historical science will bring positive help to religion in its Christian task of making Jesus live and rule in the present.

“Christianity,” writes Dean Inge, “is essentially a struggle for an independent spiritual life.” We need a religion which is not contingent upon any particular events whether past or future, and we are not inclined to intercalate acts of God between the eternal and the temporal worlds, but desire the independence and security of a faith in absolute values. This is the judgment of one who calls himself a Christian Platonist; but it is interesting to see that when he describes that other world of values he says not only that it consists of the eternal ideas of Truth, Goodness and Beauty but also that for a Christian absolute value and love are the same thing; and it is altogether in Pauline phrases that he characterizes that religion of the spirit and of freedom from historical facts and their uncertainties which he desires. It may occur to some to question whether it would not be better for religion to leave the New Testament altogether to the historian, and find foundations for itself in regions that science cannot disturb. The answer to this question should be that the New Testament on the whole, in its greatest personalities and in its most distinctive tendencies, is a book meant to give man freedom and not to bind him even to itself. “The Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is there

UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIBLE

is liberty." The Christ of the Gospels and of Paul and John is not one who commands us from without, but one who interprets our own conscience and reason, and controls us only as he becomes our truer selves. Jesus knew that no one could follow him outwardly; and Paul knew that the new religion was in no sense external or legalistic.

"If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is. . . . Set your mind on the things that are above. . . . For ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God. . . . Make dead therefore your members which are upon the earth. . . . Put on therefore a heart of compassion, kindness, humility, meekness, longsuffering." So, Christ-like character constitutes that world above, on which the Christian should set his mind, in which he really lives, since Christ, his life, is there. Passages like this show how completely to Paul the external, both the past and earthly, and the future and heavenly, have become inward and present, and that this radical change takes place because of the working whereby Christ is able even to subject all things unto himself. Dean Inge ends his essay on Paul by saying that "there has been no religious revival within Christianity that has not been, on one side at least, a return to St. Paul"; and that "the reason, put shortly, is that St. Paul understood what most Christians never realise, namely, that the Gospel of Christ is not *a* religion, but religion itself, in its most universal and deepest significance." Of religion in this sense the historical student need not be afraid as if it might tend to produce a modernizing influence which is against the interests of truth. But on the other hand one

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

whose Christianity has this Pauline inwardness and freedom need not fear the work of historical students, but can only welcome any closer approach which they can make possible to this apostle of spirituality, and to the mind of Christ.

THE MODERN APPROACH TO THE
OLD TESTAMENT

GEORGE DAHL

THE MODERN APPROACH TO THE OLD TESTAMENT

GEORGE DAHL

WHAT is his dominating motive?" is perhaps the most searching question one could ask concerning a person. In the long run this major purpose will infallibly shape his conduct. It is the driving force behind action. Men do not "gather grapes of thorns nor figs of thistles"; no more does the tree of corrupt or even indifferent purpose bring forth good fruit. Unless the motive is fundamentally right it is useless to hope that the results will be worthy.

Taken over into the field of Old Testament science our query assumes the form: "What motive dominates the modern approach to the Old Testament?" It is conceivable that the motive might be purely intellectual; that one would study this ancient collection of books because of its inherent interest. The Old Testament is a veritable treasure-house of absorbing information—geographical, archaeological, historical, philosophical, literary, doctrinal. Men have always been richly rewarded for their pains when they have approached it from these varied angles. Nevertheless the satisfaction of intellectual curiosity does not yield the true secret of the book.

It is only when one comes to the Old Testament with a distinctly religious purpose that he really understands it.

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

This is because it is first and last a religious book, the product of men's experiences with the Unseen. As well expect a blind man to appreciate a sunset, or a deaf man a symphony concert, as expect an irreligious man adequately to interpret the Bible or any portion of it. Discoveries in this realm are confined to those who themselves know religion at first hand. Appreciating this fact, modern scholarship has increasingly placed the emphasis on the religious approach to and interpretation of the Old Testament. This religious motive has proved the golden key to unlock this storehouse of spiritual truth.

But, of course, the necessity for rigorous intellectual method is not dispensed with by putting the religious motive in its rightful place of supremacy. Neither good intentions nor religious zeal can take the place of ideas. It is through the medium of ideas that religious growth normally comes. The interpreter must, therefore, avail himself of all the light that modern scholarship has furnished for the illumination of the text. Geography, archaeology, sociology, history and many more sciences are summoned into service as handmaids to the religious interpretation of the Old Testament. It is the observation of a very shallow brain that the Bible needs no interpreter or commentary save itself. The very fact that we are removed from its scenes by thousands of miles and from its events by thousands of years should warn against despising any legitimate means of thinking ourselves back into the actual environment in which these dynamic ideas first found expression. The modern scholar accordingly seeks such knowledge of the background of the heroes and events of the book as will enable him to appreciate more truly their

APPROACH TO OLD TESTAMENT

significance in the history of religion, and help him to appropriate their values for the religious life. The reinforcement of the religious motive by reverent and thorough intellectual processes constitutes his equipment for his task.

Of interest in this connection is the history of the interpretation of the Old Testament. Despite sporadic attempts to combine sound exegesis with the religious spirit, the Christian Church has in the past frequently followed methods of interpretation that do not commend themselves to the modern trained mind. Where the plain and obvious sense of a passage seemed to them too mundane or unspiritual for their purposes the Fathers, like their predecessors in the Jewish Church, resorted to uncontrolled allegorizing. In addition, a great deal of misdirected ingenuity was devoted to the search for "types" of Christian life and doctrine. Again, some have degraded the Bible, including, of course, the Old Testament, into a book of magic, the random opening of which would give infallible direction on any problem. Others have believed its chief function to be a mystical unveiling of future events. Or it has been regarded as a fixed legal code, valid for all time, and with every individual part equal in value to every other part. These practices made the Old Testament as wax in the hands of its interpreters. Each moulded and arranged it to suit his own purposes. In the attempt to prove dogma, verses were wrenched out of their context and forced to render service in fields where they were not at home. Elaborate systems of doctrine were evolved in utter disregard of the plain fact that the Old Testament represents many opposing points of view. The natural

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

result of all this was to discredit these types of interpretation in the eyes of thoughtful men. At length the inevitable reaction toward more rational and defensible methods came.

Modern interpretation of the Old Testament may be said to date from the year 1680, when the French priest Simon called attention to the striking phenomenon that many events in Genesis were recorded two or even three times. Seventy years later (in 1753) another Frenchman, Astruc, published his *Conjectures*, in which he suggested the thesis that Moses had availed himself of various memoirs in writing the book of Genesis. Since then a tremendous amount of scholarly acumen has been devoted to unravelling the secrets of the Old Testament. Especially have the last seventy-five or one hundred years witnessed notable progress. Among the great names that stand out in this field of scholarship are those of Ewald, Stade and Wellhausen in Germany; Robertson Smith and Driver in Great Britain; and Briggs and Bacon in America. Each step taken by these scholars has been the subject of the keenest and most searching criticism. No position has been taken hastily. As a result, their work has commended itself almost universally to scholars of liberal mind. It may be added that, despite insignificant differences in detail, the main conclusions are in practically unanimous agreement.

In the United States modern Old Testament science was rather late in gaining a secure foothold. The traditional fourfold exegesis, literal, tropological, allegorical and anagogical, long held sway. It is true that in 1843 Theodore Parker blazed a trail toward better things by translating De Wette's *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Un-

APPROACH TO OLD TESTAMENT

fortunately this work was practically ignored. Only after another twenty-five years did modern study succeed in implanting itself. Then it was largely due to students who had taken courses in English and German universities. During these last fifty years progress has been so rapid that the modern approach to the Old Testament is now a commonplace in all our leading educational institutions.

This method of study may best be described as historical. It involves, as already suggested, the attempt to view Old Testament life and literature in the light of its background. The various books are recognized as the product of a religious process extending over many centuries, each inevitably reflecting the time and conditions under which it was written. Realizing that spiritual experiences are never detached from the rest of life, but are a vital part thereof, the historical student labors to discover how the great experiences described or reflected in the Old Testament were related to their own age. More than this, he draws near to these inspired records of the past in a humble and teachable frame of mind, not seeking to clasp upon them any ready-made dogma or theory of his own, but allowing the books themselves to bear witness to their origin, purpose and message. To keep his mind sensitive to the truth and constantly to correct mistaken conclusions in its light is his first aim.

Three adjectives have been used to describe the historical method: It is said to be critical, comparative and evolutionary. The word *critical* is used in contradistinction to traditional. During two thousand years Jewish Rabbis, Church Fathers, Schoolmen and other devoted students of Holy Writ have established certain

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

traditions of interpretation. One might be tempted to rest in the confident belief that, after so many years and so much effort, nothing new exists under the sun so far as Old Testament study is concerned. Certainly the books themselves remain unaltered. It would be a grave error, however, to suppose that, simply because the materials remain the same from age to age, a science based on these materials must mark time. The heavens change but little; nevertheless astronomy has made enormous strides forward in recent decades. The same is true of chemistry, biology and all the sciences, including the study of history. Advance in these branches of learning is conditioned upon the application of improved methods of study to the facts. In like manner, Old Testament science progresses only as its followers break traditional fetters in order, with open mind and the most approved methods of historical science, to re-examine the data.

Critical study involves, then, nothing more than the careful examination of the facts upon which a science is based. It seeks to know things as they really are. The term connotes, not depreciation, but appreciation; its spirit is not destructive but, in the truest sense, constructive. It simply means the application to Biblical study of methods that have been productive of most happy results elsewhere.

This critical method may be directed either toward events or teachings. When applied to events it frankly inquires whether what the writer thought happened actually did happen. For example, is the late priestly history of the Chronicler, so amazingly different in spirit and content from the earlier records in Genesis to Kings, an

APPROACH TO OLD TESTAMENT

accurate portrayal of the real facts? Was the tabernacle constructed along the elaborate lines described by the priestly historian? How are we to deal with the inconsistencies of Old Testament chronology? These difficulties raise the question whether we are justified in demanding of these inspired authors of writings designed for religious edification the training and equipment of skilled modern historians. A careful survey of many passages would make it appear that they generally failed to appreciate, as the merest tyro in writing history to-day would do, the necessity for making allowance for the lapse of time between the event and their own age. This resulted in gross anachronisms. Furthermore, they were inclined to accept as absolutely true all that tradition had handed down from antiquity; at least they felt no call to raise the question whether certain narratives belonged to the realm of fact or fancy. Now we know that there exists a constant and decided tendency for tradition to supply the omissions of history. Devout and loving reflection is apt to weave a rose-colored web of legend about the leading characters and events of the remote past. In fact, this process begins sometimes while the hero is still alive. The recognition of this tendency may destroy for us some beautiful illusions. Nevertheless, honesty compels us to seek the facts; and they are often essential to the discovery of the truth. And legend itself usually contains at least these two elements of historical value: first, it bears faithful witness to the original greatness of the hero or the event, as the case may be; and second, it shows how the life and imagination of later ages were affected. In short,

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

it furnishes a spiritual interpretation and background. And this is no mean service.

When, on the other hand, critical method is brought into contact with the teachings of the Old Testament, what is its attitude? It reverently asks whether certain doctrines enunciated by the ancient writer are still entirely valid in the light of later more advanced teachings, especially as these are found in the New Testament. Job's practical denial of real immortality, for instance, is unhesitatingly put down as representing an incomplete stage in the unfolding of religious truth. In view of Jesus' contrast of his lofty ethics with those of the past, the Mosaic law is recognized as inferior to the New Testament revelation. In all this the aim is to build up a conception of Old Testament religion which is true to the facts, and to develop an appreciation of the highest ethical and spiritual values.

Does this critical study seriously modify traditional views of the various portions of the Old Testament? Let us first examine the Pentateuch. Here we find that an important literary discovery has been made: these first five books are not, as tradition claims, the product of a single mind, but of four principal schools of writers, denoted usually by the cryptic symbols J, E, D and P. This is the so-called documentary theory. Its beginnings date back to the observation, already referred to, that duplicate and even triplicate accounts of the same event are given. It was also noticed that the narratives are distinguished from one another by consistent differences in vocabulary (including the divine name), literary style, point of view, dominating interests and theological conceptions. The

APPROACH TO OLD TESTAMENT

ancient Rabbinical tradition of the Mosaic authorship of the completed Pentateuch had finally to go by the board. Not one lone author, but the literary effort of at least four centuries (850-450 B. C.) was seen to be represented in these books. In common with other ancient literatures the Pentateuch is a composite work. The editors who, at successive stages, wove these documents together seem to have worked like some of the Arabic historians. These often give several discrepant versions of the same event and allow the reader to take his choice. Naturally the Hebrew writers, widely separated in point of time as they were, differ in skill and historical accuracy. Legendary embellishments such as are found in early Greek and Roman history are not absent, being especially evident in the earlier chapters. The necessity is, therefore, laid upon every student to acquire in some measure at least that prime requisite of a true historian: the ability to distinguish between degrees of probability. At the same time the literary and religious value of the narratives is not impaired. On the contrary, the removal of repetitions and obvious inconsistencies vastly enhances their usefulness.

When we turn to the historical books from Joshua to Chronicles, we find that they are built up in much the same way. In fact, Kings explicitly asserts the use of sources, and mentions some of them by name. Joshua is of a piece with the Pentateuch and employs the same documents. Judges and Samuel likewise show unmistakable evidences of compilation, including the presence of numerous duplicate narratives. Both Judges and Kings are cast in formal literary moulds, the contribution of an editor of the Deuteronomic school. Chronicles, Ezra and

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Nehemiah are a re-writing, with additions, of the preceding history by a pronounced ecclesiastic, who sought to correct what he considered the faults and omissions of the earlier books. He employed several independent traditions and documents, notably the genuine memoirs of Nehemiah. Thus in the historical books, as in the Pentateuch, the need for critical method is obvious; its employment clarifies the narratives and increases their literary interest and their usefulness for religious instruction.

What about the prophetic books? Practically without exception, they contain what is termed secondary material; that is, they have been added to by later generations of writers. It would seem that the oracles of the earlier prophets were limited almost exclusively to the exposure of evils, exhortations to repentance and threats of coming punishment; that these men were too great and wise practically to nullify their messages by unrelated and unconditional promises of blessing and prosperity. Here again the criteria of vocabulary, literary style, religious attitude and background in time and place furnish incontrovertible evidence that the messages of hope are, in general, later than the original book. After the stroke of divine wrath announced by these earlier prophets had fallen, there arose new prophets who declared that this was not the end—that Jehovah, who had punished, would now restore. Some of the oracles of these anonymous later prophets were attached to the original collections, thus making the books more usable for the times. In all this there was neither desire nor attempt to deceive. Furthermore, it appears that occasionally a floating fragment of prophecy was added to a book for no more profound reason than

APPROACH TO OLD TESTAMENT

that there happened to be space left at the end of the roll. The most notable example of the addition of secondary material is found in the book of Isaiah, more than half of which is by later writers. Chapters 36 to 39, to give an example, are historical narratives borrowed by a late editor from Kings; the incomparable poetry of chapters 34, 35, 40-66 is by an unknown genius, commonly referred to as the Second Isaiah, who prophesied several generations after the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C. In general, Messianic prophecies—despite certain elements of truth in the contention of Gunkel and Gressmann that this style of prophecy must have been known in early times—are late. The literary study of the prophets thus results in modifications of traditional ideas concerning authorship, date and circumstances of writing. It is seen that individual passages in certain books must be transferred to contexts entirely different from their present ones in order to be understood. In many cases, this does not in any way impair their religious value—often, indeed, it is enhanced. For example, the poems of hope and cheer carry far more conviction and inspiration when we know how bravely they were first sung out of the night of national disaster and chaos.

It would carry us too far afield were we to consider in any detail the bearings of critical study on the poetical and story books. Suffice it to say that a great deal of new and welcome light has come from the careful, untrammelled study of this important literature. It becomes evident that books like Daniel and Esther belong to the last centuries of the old dispensation. Psalm titles, such as "to David," seem to signify dedication or source rather

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

than authorship; in its present form the book of Psalms is comparatively late, and served as the hymn book of the second temple. The book of Proverbs itself acknowledges diversity of authorship. Job is evidently in the main a product of the distressful period of national subjugation and disintegration after 586, and belongs with those other wrestlings with the insistent problem of suffering, the Servant Songs of the Second Isaiah.

Another important result of the application of critical method to this last group of books is a new realization of the great variety and diversity of tempers contained in them. For example, Esther and Ecclesiastes are not at all on a par religiously with Job or the nobler Psalms. The Song of Solomon can no longer be treated as a deeply spiritual book; no method of allegorizing can possibly justify this age in singing these frankly sensual love and wedding songs as hymns of Zion. Their intrinsic value lies elsewhere. In all this the distinction between more and less valuable has resulted in a truer appreciation of those books or portions of books which attain to the higher reaches of Israel's faith.

To summarize the bearings of criticism on traditional views of the Old Testament: it has altered some opinions as to date, authorship, composition, historicity and even the religious nature of certain books. It has also made it increasingly impossible for men ever again to regard the Old Testament as an inerrant text-book of science or history. On the other hand, it has immensely strengthened the fundamental conviction that these books contain a genuine revelation of divine truth. And it has had the very salutary effect of emphasizing the fact that the primary

APPROACH TO OLD TESTAMENT

value of the Old Testament is religious—that it is full to overflowing of religious inspiration.

But modern historical study of the Old Testament is not only critical—it is in the second place *comparative*. It does not segregate the Hebrew religion as though there were no other religion in the world, or as though it bore no relation to other religions. It recognizes the relationship of Hebrew civilization to that of the Semitic world in general. The geography, archaeology and history of this larger world are diligently scrutinized in order that their influence upon Hebrew life and thought may be traced. The literatures of the surrounding nations are summoned into court. These bear testimony to the surprising fact that the ancient Babylonians possessed Creation and Deluge stories unmistakably related to those in Genesis. The law code of Hammurabi, king of Babylon eight centuries before Moses' time, contains remarkable parallels to the earlier Hebrew legislation. Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian and Moabite inscriptions bear irrefutable witness to the intimate relationship between the Hebrews and their neighbors. Almost without exception, the basic Hebrew institutions—Sabbath, circumcision, sacrifice, priesthood, prophecy, prayer, feasts, fasts, menhirs, cromlechs, consecration of the hair, distinction between clean and unclean—existed among other Semites long before the Hebrew nation had any being. Messianic prophecy flourished both in Assyria and in Egypt; probably this was related in some way to the same development in Israel. These important bits of evidence go to show that Hebrew religion did not grow up in a vacuum but in closest contact with other Semitic religions. This does not imply,

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

however, that we reduce all religions to the same monotonous level of mediocrity. The fact that one recognizes good in other religions does not involve disloyalty to one's own, any more than the recognition of excellent qualities in other nations makes one a traitor to his own government. It is well known that missionaries in closest contact with heathen religions are the first to acknowledge the good points of these faiths; at the same time they maintain with all the more conviction the unrivalled superiority of the Christian faith. Modern scholarship asserts that the Hebrew religion towered far above and beyond all neighboring religions. What peculiarly marked and distinguished it was the extraordinary way in which it took institutions common to all the Semitic faiths and ethicized and spiritualized them. Its pre-eminence was not because it was different in kind, but because it was of superior quality.

Besides being critical and comparative, the historical method is in the third place *evolutionary* or *developmental*. In line with modern scientific thought, it holds to a universe of law and order characterized by the unfailing sequence of cause and effect; not a universe in which happenings are spasmodic or catastrophic, resulting from violent intrusions upon its order of a providence from outside. Some of the Old Testament historians, especially the later ones, thought of the universe in terms of such direct interventions of God. They start with a miraculous act of creation which culminated in the twin disasters of the Fall of Man and the Flood. Again, Abraham is made to begin a new era, which in turn goes to ruin with the fall, first of Israel, and then of Judah. For these writers his-

APPROACH TO OLD TESTAMENT

tory consists of an intermittent series of divinely initiated revivals followed in each instance by woeful backsliding. But historical study has demonstrated that this is hardly an accurate portrayal of the course of Old Testament history. Development and ascent are clearly traceable. Of course progress is not without interruption; there are frequent setbacks, and at any given time survivals from more primitive ages will be present. But over any considerable period advance is clearly discernible. A comparison of the crude theology of David, who believed that Jehovah's realm was limited to Israel, with the practical monotheism of the prophets Amos and Isaiah, or with the sense of Jehovah's omnipresence in the 'Davidic' Psalm 139, will demonstrate the reality of this process of development. The finished law, too, is the result of growth, the important stages of which are clearly marked. The evolution of such conceptions as individual responsibility, monotheism and real immortality can be traced from meager beginnings to the full doctrine. Many individuals and influences contributed to the unfolding revelation. When Jesus appeared, it was, therefore, in the fulness of time. His message was the result, not only of his own peerless spiritual insight, but also of the quiet centuries of preparation that had gone before.

We have seen that the modern approach to the Old Testament is historical in method, and that its operations may be described as critical, comparative and evolutionary. It is above all regardful of spiritual interests and values, never forgetting that the books under consideration are religious documents. An attitude of thorough sympathy with the underlying purpose of the writings is

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

regarded as an indispensable condition of Old Testament interpretation.

So much, then, for the spirit and characteristics of the modern approach to the Old Testament. Is the application of the historical method justified by results? The one valid test is still that of Jesus: "By their fruits ye shall know them." In view of that test, what answer shall we give?

It ought to be said at once that nothing of vital value is lost. It is, indeed, simply unthinkable that genuine facts reverently sought and found can possibly hurt the truth. What if some changes do take place in our modes of thinking? The great foundations of faith still remain absolutely unshaken. It is reassuring to reflect that such a story as the Fall of Man, for instance, teaches practically the same lesson concerning man and God and sin whether one views it as history or as parable. Generally speaking, the religious value of a given book is independent of such questions as date, authorship, place and even historicity. A case in point is the book of Psalms, which is fitted to voice the hopes and longings of every age, no matter when these hymns were written or by whom. It is, after all, the great personalities and lofty teachings of the Bible that have supplied men with inspiration in all ages; questions such as we have considered do not affect the inspirational value of these. And the modern method has this distinct advantage: it supplies a point of view which makes possible the effective use of Old Testament material of every kind in a scientific age and in dealing with educated people. Values are thus conserved, not lost, for our times.

But the historical method renders a decidedly more positive service than that of preserving certain Old Tes-

APPROACH TO OLD TESTAMENT

tament values intact. It has actually enhanced the value of some books for our generation. Chief among these are the prophetic collections. Of course the prophets have always been regarded as important members of the Old Testament dispensation. But it has been the habit of both Jewish and Christian scholars to treat them as subordinate to Moses; in fact, as little more than commentators on the Old Testament legislation. It was argued that, inasmuch as God's perfect will had been revealed once for all through Moses, the principal function of the prophets was to echo and re-enforce, as eloquently as they could, the laws in which that will was contained. The towering personalities of these men were considerably obscured by this attitude of mind. Now modern scholarship has made its most significant and revolutionary contribution in the discovery that, broadly speaking, the greater prophets came before and not after the law. Instead of being supplementary to the law, they were the great creative geniuses whose utterances led to the law's gradual formation. They were literally *seers*, discoverers and revealers of new truths in the sphere of individual, social and national life, leaders in the forward movements of ethics and religion. Nor were they the passive and mechanical 'channels' of divine revelation. They were heroic souls who, despite dangers without and doubts within, fought out and wrought out the sublime faith that has made them forever great. Again, the common notion that the prophets were primarily predictors of a Messiah who was to appear in the distant future comes wide of the mark. It is evident that the greater prophets were much more concerned with the vital, living message of God for their

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

own age; as a matter of fact, they continually opposed the false optimism of those who predicted peace and prosperity. To quote a common play on words, they were not so much *foretellers* as *forthtellers*; they were the spokesmen of the divine will. Call the roll—Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Jeremiah, the Second Isaiah and the rest—and the prophets will be found to be all of them men who met and satisfied for their own generations the age-long cry for adequate leadership. To degrade them, as many have done, to the position of hewers of wood and drawers of water in support of theological dogmas is obviously unfair. It has been the high privilege of historical study to free the prophets from their irksome bondage and restore them to their true status as the noblemen of the Most High.

Besides re-discovering the prophets and revealing them in their unique majesty, the modern method has this to its credit: it has demonstrated that the Old Testament as a whole was a living, growing organism. The law, it is clear, was never complete; the presence of three separate codes—Covenant, Deuteronomic and Priestly—indicates a constant effort to bring legislation up to the needs of a developing civilization. The repeated editing and revising of the histories, prophetic books and Psalms is proof positive that the ancients conceived of God as one who constantly added new revelations to old truth. The prophets pre-eminently believed that Jehovah spoke in fresh and living accents to each succeeding generation. Truth was for them not static but dynamic. Religion was never something to be handed down mechanically, but a progressive achievement. The work of the historical

APPROACH TO OLD TESTAMENT

school has been largely instrumental in enforcing this larger view of the Old Testament and its religion.

Historical study has made another considerable contribution to the correct interpretation of the Old Testament by demonstrating that the "four silent centuries" between Ezra and the opening of the Christian era are not silent at all. These four hundred years have now become vocal with fears and hopes and panting aspirations after God. To mention only a few instances, Jonah, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Chronicles, many Psalms and numerous Messianic passages are now generally acknowledged to be the products of this period; some of them belong as far down as the Maccabean age. These late documents cast a veritable flood of light upon the hitherto obscure centuries after the traditional closing of the canon in Ezra's time. The richness and variety of this literature is really amazing. The two main types of thought are easily distinguishable: the legalistic, which is represented especially by the Chronicler; and opposed to this, the prophetic, as shown in the missionary spirit of the book of Jonah and the earnest piety of many Psalms. In Daniel and the appendices to Zechariah we witness the metamorphosis of prophecy into the strange and baffling phenomenon of apocalypse; of this type of literature we find numerous representatives in the extra-canonical writings. Modern Biblical science has thus enlarged our appreciation of the divine economy by demonstrating how, through the barren desert of late Jewish legalism, God was preparing this prophetic highway for the coming of Christ.

But it is in its reaction upon the intellectual and religious life of students that the historical method best dem-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

onstrates its claim to recognition. The method demands of the student and develops within him a certain balance and sanity of judgment. Each man is required to come to his own conclusions, and is encouraged to think through for himself the grounds for his faith. Nothing is commoner than for a teacher of Old Testament to urge his students not to accept too readily the statements made in class. This apparently paradoxical attitude arises from the intense conviction that absolute conformity to another's opinions is fatal to the integrity of the intellectual life. No group of men, provided they honestly think for themselves, can possibly arrive at conclusions that are always identical. On the other hand, it must not be supposed that the modern approach leads to a state of intellectual anarchy and chaos. Experience demonstrates that it tends toward a combination of healthy diversity of opinion on minor details, on the one hand, with fundamental agreement on major issues on the other.

The acquisition of the power of independent judgment saves men from the extravagances of certain types of theological thinking. One of the many unfortunate consequences of the World War was the resuscitation of certain dormant and discredited dogmas. Well-intentioned and earnest men are to-day insistently demanding that the church go back to modes of thought that belong in the Middle Ages. These self-styled "Fundamentalists" are carrying on a modern Holy Inquisition against all who do not profess adherence to their peculiar tenets. Other groups are leading many astray with confident assertions that the Second Coming of Christ will take place within two or three years. Whether one ministers on the western

APPROACH TO OLD TESTAMENT

prairies or in China, he will be exposed to the contagious religious enthusiasm of these controversialists. In all this confusion those who have been trained in the historical methods are able to keep their feet on the ground of solid and tried experience. Avoiding hysteria and vagaries, they are left free to devote their energies to the real, workable tasks of life. Withal they are endowed with an intelligent and vital faith that holds in the storm and stress of modern life and thought. In the presence of science they have no need for apology or evasion. Theirs is the only kind of belief that is communicable to the thoughtful youth of our day.

As a sufficient and more satisfactory alternative to the impossible expectations of the literalists, the modern student cherishes a simple faith in God that makes him view the future with calm confidence and radiant hope. He believes that God will lead in the future as in the past. He shares the assurance of the Pilgrim Pastor Robinson that "God hath more Truth and Light yet to break out of His Holy Word." That truth and that light he continually seeks in his humble place among the prophets of the new day. He is, furthermore, convinced that in the modern emphasis on Israel's prophets, with the resultant awakening of a keener social conscience, the light has already dawned in part. The study of these same prophets has also shown him that religion has always been the mainspring of real and lasting reform in the past. And because he is firmly anchored to prophetic principles he is kept from nebulous vagueness and futile experiment in the building of the kingdom that is to be.

Every teacher of the Old Testament receives frequent

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

testimony, whether by letter or by word of mouth, to what amounts to an experience of conversion to the historical point of view. Students bear witness to having been saved from doubt and despair caused by the attempt to hold impossible views of the Bible. Their experience is not only an intellectual but also a spiritual awakening. It involves the rebirth of intense religious conviction and zeal as they find they have won a faith they can always and everywhere hold fast.

If the modern Christian Church needs further warrant for the employment of the historical approach to the Old Testament, it is to be discovered in the example of its Founder. On the shores of the Sea of Galilee Jesus founded the first Christian theological school. He was the teacher and the Twelve made up the student body. The Old Testament was the only text-book. For commentaries he referred to the oral traditions of the scribes; these, however, were hardly ever mentioned except to point out their glaring defects. In this outdoor school traditional methods of interpretation were almost entirely discarded. This first and greatest Christian critic was far more radical in his treatment of the sacred books than any of his followers have ever dared to be. Refusing to be bound by the dead hand of the past, he independently and with inerrant insight chose what was permanent and rejected the passing. His was the confident faith that the spirit of God was leading him and would still lead his disciples into new vistas of truth. "Ye have heard that it was said . . . but I say unto you"—this was his boldness.

His early followers, according as they were able, imbibed his spirit and adopted his methods. Paul, for exam-

APPROACH TO OLD TESTAMENT

ple, despite the fetters of Rabbinic training that impeded him, was oftentimes surprisingly free in his interpretation of the Scriptures of the early church. In the centuries since, every great era of spiritual re-awakening has been accompanied, as under Luther and Calvin, by similar freedom in interpreting the Bible.

One can hardly doubt that here as elsewhere Jesus has broken paths for us to walk in. If we are to meet the needs of our generation the old truths must again be phrased in new terms. While we cannot hope to equal the Master's spiritual insight, we can, at least, adopt his productive method. Like him we are not to be bound by the letter of these books, but filled with their dynamic power. The combination of religious spirit and intellectual integrity will surely advance the cause of true religion in the future as it has done in the past.

Pressing forward in this high mood, our generation unflinchingly finds the Old Testament more valuable than ever before. No longer regarded as an arsenal of proof-texts, the Old Testament is to-day effective as a "literature of power." Relieved of the incubus of a mechanical and impossible theory of inspiration, it is again free to speak directly to the hearts and minds of mankind. Even an age impatient with the musty past and obsessed with ideas of "practical efficiency," is coming to realize that we cannot dispense with the spiritual values of this larger half of the Bible. In the theological curriculum it will, because of the variety of its inspired literature and its intrinsic religious value, hold place as the companion of and necessary complement to the New Testament. Pastors, missionaries, social workers, educators,—all who

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

devote their lives to the service of others,—will not remain satisfied with a mere passing acquaintance with this matchless literature, but will seek a knowledge of it that is at once intelligent, loving, intimate and in the truest sense religious.

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE AS A HISTORICAL
DISCIPLINE

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE AS A HISTORICAL DISCIPLINE

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON

THE great ambition of Jonathan Edwards was to sum up his theological system in a History of Redemption. It was the thought of a master mind. It showed also the insight of a religious genius into the essential nature of Christianity.

Noble as it is by birth and heritage the term Redemption may be deprived of its larger connotations, or debased in the phraseology of religious cant, to a sense which if not distinctly selfish is at least individualistic and other-worldly. This was the tendency of Pharisaism, that latest born of Jewish sects which in the time of the later Maccabees drew apart from their all too worldly leadership of the national destinies on the issue of the new doctrine of resurrection and the 'world to come.' The later Maccabees diverted the forces of the splendid uprising of the Chasidim (literally "the men of grace," or "loving-kindness"), which won freedom to worship God from Seleucid tyranny, into channels of dynastic self-aggrandizement and national domination. The Pharisees reacted toward a quietistic ideal of other-worldliness. The kingdom of God was still their watch-word, but the mode of its attainment was to be solely religious. Obedience to the Law would secure by divine intervention that which the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

sword of the Chasidim had seemed to win, only to have it made the booty of a selfish and worldly class. Jehovah, in his own good time, would grant to a repentant and obedient people that eternal kingdom which would otherwise be sought in vain. In the train of Pharisaism came that revolutionizing new development of Judaism marked by the Apocalyptic literature, which transferred the struggle from earth to heaven, made the enemies of Israel no longer flesh and blood, but the principalities and powers in the heavenly places, and achieved universality for the old national religion by making redemption cosmic instead of national. For the world-order of its time Apocalypse has only the deepest pessimism. The Gentile nations are under the domination and direction of the powers of darkness. Individuals may be rescued from the doom that is to fall upon a rebellious world by speedy repentance and admission to the numbers of the people of the saints of the Most High, but as a whole humanity is utterly corrupt, unto it is reserved the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah.

The leader and counterpart of the Pharisee is the scribe. If Redemption had come to mean for the former "a share in the world to come," the method of its attainment was defined by the latter. The scribe sat in Moses' seat. He held the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever would enter in must do so by obedience to the written Law. Hence the institution of the Synagogue, to which the center of gravity of the national religion was more and more displaced in proportion as the temple in the hands of the worldly Sadducean aristocracy lost touch with the masses, and Israel became more and more a Church rather than a nation, its religion a "religion of

the book." The process reached its climax with the final overthrow of the temple and its ritual in the generation after Christ, and the rebuilding of Judaism on the basis of the Synagogue. Henceforth scribe and Pharisee were supreme. The Sadducee was no longer even remembered save as a sectarian and heretic, that unworthy son of Abraham who had refused to accept the doctrine of resurrection and the world to come, and believed neither in angel nor spirit.

With the final extrusion of Christianity early in the second century the meaning of the term Redemption as used in the Synagogue, and with it the character of Judaism as a religion, became fixed once for all. Judaism knows the terms in three senses. There is "the first Redemption" which it celebrates annually in its national feast of independence, the Passover, commemorating how Jehovah with an outstretched hand and a mighty arm brought Israel forth out of the house of bondage and established them in his holy mountain. There is "the second Redemption," when Jehovah as it were raised his people from the dead. For the return from the Exile was indeed no less than a restoration of national life, and in the splendid poetry of Deutero-Isaiah, the poet of the Return, this figure recurs repeatedly. Jehovah burst the gates of brass and broke the bars of iron in sunder. Overshadowed by his presence as in the pillar of fire and cloud, they should go up to Zion with singing, the cliffs re-echoing their songs, while the leaves of the forest rustled a gentle applause. This new deliverance should make the old too light a thing to be remembered, because Jehovah had restored his people in order that they might be his salvation

unto the ends of the earth. Not conquest, not even peaceful domination of the world should be their destiny. They were to be Jehovah's witnesses, a missionary people proclaiming his Law of righteousness and peace to all nations. Nay, more, by their suffering they should be the saviors of humanity, a kingdom of priests by whose death and rising again, to intercede on behalf of the rebellious, all nations should be won to the everlasting covenant. Such is "the second Redemption" as the poet-prophet of the exile saw it afar off and proclaimed it as his "gospel of peace," his "consolation" of Israel.

The third Redemption, as seen by the Israel of to-day, is not a nobler one. It has elements that recall the vision of the greater Isaiah. There is a conversion of the Gentiles, and Israel is still a martyr people. But they are martyrs (witnesses) in the passive rather than the active sense. The missionary calling has passed into other hands. There is to be a restoration, according to some a literal restoration to the national home. But the Redemption of the world means to the Synagogue of to-day less rather than more than it meant in the days when the greater Isaiah thought of Israel as "a light to lighten the Gentiles, Jehovah's glory unto the ends of the earth." In the more tolerant atmosphere of Alexandria the Isaian ideal flourished for a time. The Graeco-Jewish 'Wisdom' literature still reflects it in some of its nobler lyrics, such as the Wisdom of Solomon; but in the homeland there was the desperate battle to be fought with Seleucid tyrants for the very survival of the religion of Jehovah. Judaism was thrown back upon itself. An intensive culture of the written law became the necessary refuge of the devout. As we have

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE

seen, the Messianic hope lost connection with this present earth and became a kingdom in the clouds. Redemption became universal only as it became individualistic. Acceptance of the Torah, the written commandment of Moses, was the yoke under which every Gentile must pass in order to escape the general doom. Revelation came no longer outside the letter. Israel had become the people of the book.

Islam has the same conception of Redemption as the later Synagogue. And no wonder, since it is a reaction toward it from a debased and idolatrous form of over-Hellenized Christianity. Mohammed was the author of the first great 'Unitarian schism.' He borrows from the Synagogue its conception of the world-order as a benevolent despotism and its sacred history. Ishmael now receives back the birthright and inheritance of Abraham, and a new revelation through the "Prophet" eliminates those elements of Judaism which events had already made obsolete, the sacrificial system and a nationalistic Messianic hope. But in substance Mohammed gives us no more than a reformed Judaism of the Semitic instead of the Christian type. There is the same extreme and mechanical conception of verbal inspiration, the same substitution of a religious bond for all nationalism, the same offer of Paradise, "a share in the world to come," as the reward of obedience to a written commandment delivered through the chosen interpreter. In Islam the Redemption of the world means its enslavement under the Koran, exactly as in Judaism it would mean enslavement under the Law.

Here are two great religions which share with Christianity its conception of world redemption as the goal of

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

religion. In Islam, if not in Judaism, racial and nationalistic bonds have given way far more completely than in Christendom to the social bond of a common faith. Devotion to the one God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob proves stronger than any ties of caste or kin. But world redemption has a meaning for the Christian beyond that of Moslem or Jew.

Each of the two great Semitic world religions which have thus grown out of the ancient stock of Israel's national faith, has achieved its universal appeal by the substitution of individual for national redemption. It is true that Judaism has lost much of that missionary spirit which even in Jesus' time made it "compass heaven and earth to make one proselyte"; but this is due to the antagonism arising out of the quarrel with the Church rather than to any obstacle inherent in the faith itself. Judaism like Islam has become a religion of biblicism. Nothing remains of the old national religion of the temple. Its only inheritance from the past is a system of ethics lit up by emotion, belief in one Father of mankind, whose will has been revealed in the writings of Moses and his successors in the canon, and who mercifully accepts the repentant. There are not wanting 'liberal' Jews who are ready to add the teaching of Jesus as a true summary of the Law, looking upon him as the last and greatest of the prophets. The Moslem adds two to the Hebrew succession. Jesus is to him a greater prophet than Moses, and Mohammed a greater than Jesus. In both of these Semitic faiths the background is the same as in our own, the History of Redemption as viewed in the Old Testament. Both are "religions of the book." Both employ this

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE

background of history for the same purpose. They achieve their universal appeal (for one is the most aggressively missionary of all religions, and the other at least potentially so) by the same method. The sacred history serves one purpose only. It stamps with a divine authority a system of individual redemption by obedience to the religious and moral precepts of the revelation. God is the benevolent despot of a rebellious world, from whose doom those may be saved who turn in season from their disobedience. These two book religions have become as completely denationalized as Buddhism or Confucianism. The end in view is no longer in any true sense world-redemption, but rather redemption out of a lost and ruined world. For Judaism and Islam Paradise is the reward of obedience; for Buddhism it is Nirvana. The individual is not so much a fellow-worker with God for the salvation of the world, as he is a subject for divine salvation out of this sorry scheme of things.

Christianity has had a different history and gives a different meaning to the word Redemption. It springs from the same inspired stock of the religion of Israel as Judaism and Islam, but from an earlier date, while something of the old prophetic feeling of a national calling to the redemption of the world was still alive. In the time of Jesus the temple was still standing, in ideal a house of prayer for all nations, though sadly debased in actual practice by a worldly-minded hierocracy. Embers were still glowing of the old fires of devotion kindled by the Chasidim, the heroes and martyrs who gave their lives for the religious and national ideal. The great paradox of Jesus "He that would save his soul (or life) shall lose it,

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

and he that will lose his soul for my sake and the gospel's the same shall save it" remains an eternal protest against a merely selfish and individualistic ideal. Redemption is the victory of God's cause, not the salvaging of individuals from the wreck. Jesus' ministry was a struggle against the book religion of scribe and Pharisee, his death was a martyrdom to the ideal of a world-wide kingdom of God.

Paul took up the struggle where Jesus laid it down. Still, even in the Christian brotherhood, there were "certain Pharisees who had believed," who had not left behind them the Pharisaic ideal, a "yoke of the law" for world-wide obedience. For them Jesus was the "Prophet like unto Moses," the gospel a new and improved edition of the ethical code. Paul understood it otherwise. To him the sacred writers are witnesses of an eternal redemptive activity of God. God's creative Wisdom is also the agency of revelation and redemption. God was in his world from the beginning, and the activity of God in his spiritual creation is the central theme of history. All that was taught through Moses and the prophets, and all the relations of Israel to the Gentile world, belonged to this story whose issue is to be "the manifestation of the sons of God." For this the whole creation had groaned and travailed in pain together, and the culmination of the struggle was the cross. For in this story of Calvary was the supreme self-manifestation of God. Paul also thinks in terms of world-redemption. To him also that which enables us to see what God is doing to this end is divine revelation. But world-redemption is not a mere emission of ethical codes.

In a widely different sense from that of either of the

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE

great religions which share its Hebrew ancestry Christianity is the religion of world-redemption. It takes this idea from the Judaism from which it sprang, but it carried with it from its birth the vigor of the ancient faith in its ripest development and prime. The evil days of reaction and enfeeblement had not yet come to the mother-faith. Christianity builds upon the Law and the Prophets, but not as ultimate. They are for it utterances by divers portions and in divers manners preliminary to the revelation of God through a Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom also he made the worlds.

The teaching of Jesus reveals a righteousness higher than that of "old time"; but even this does not constitute the message of the faith. The message is "the word of the cross." Mere historical criticism (apart from the indignant protests of Paul) should have taught the framers of the 'liberal' Christ that such a being, if he could ever have existed, could not possibly account for the origin of Christianity. Judaism knows many teachers whose radical utterances and efforts at religious reformation have incurred suspicion and dislike; but it does not put them to death. Still less do their disciples afterwards offer them prayers and worship as intercessors "sitting at the right hand of God." The origin of our religion was something very different from the preaching of sermons, even such as the Sermon on the Mount. The Pauline Epistles would not be what they are if such had been the essential nature of the message. Neither would the oldest of the Gospels be that of Mark, which has neither Sermon on the Mount nor Lord's Prayer. For Mark has practically nothing to say of Jesus' teaching, save as it was held to foretell the doom

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

of unbelieving Israel and the overthrow of the temple. He has everything to say about the power of God which came upon Jesus in his baptism, and the eternal life which those may share who become partners in his death.

Legal religions teach what man should do for God. The gospel teaches what God has done for man.

Paul is the classical example of the Christian missionary who realizes that his message is neither ethics nor philosophy, but the testimony to a historical fact. Acts tells us he found but barren soil at Athens, where he crossed swords with "certain of the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers." At Corinth, on the contrary, his next missionary station, the Lord stood by him in a vision, encouraging him with the assurance, "I have much people in this city." Paul's letters to the Corinthian church establish the greatness of this contrast in results. But it is possible to draw a further inference from Paul's statement as to the beginning of his ministry at Corinth "in weakness and in fear and in much trembling." Under this sense of profound discouragement the missionary determined to proclaim his message "not in persuasive words of wisdom, . . . that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." He "determined not to know anything among them, save Jesus Christ and him crucified." The result was "demonstration of the Spirit (outpouring of the 'gifts') and of power" as never before.

What Paul meant by this limitation to "the word of the cross" is made unmistakable in the further course of the correspondence. Later there came a grievous crisis in the history of the Corinthian church. Paul was compelled to

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE

defend his own apostleship before his converts. They who should have been themselves his living testimonials, sealed as they were by unique gifts of the Spirit under his ministration, demanded of him "letters of commendation." Paul indignantly refused, and brought back the church to its loyalty. But before the matter is finally dismissed he sums all up in the noblest definition of the Christian minister's commission that was ever penned. He compares it to the ministry of Moses when he returned from making intercession on the Mount for the sin of the people, bearing his message of forgiveness, his face shining with the glory reflected from the vision of Jehovah. But Paul affirms that the ministry of the "new covenant" has an infinitely greater, yes, a continually increasing glory; so that while that of Moses' face faded away, that which has shined in the hearts of those who have seen the glory of the forgiving God in the face of Jesus Christ grows ever brighter, transfiguring them into the same divine image, preparing them thus for immortality with him. For ministers of the new covenant are conscious of an embassy from God. Under his safe-conduct they pass through every peril, looking not at the things which are seen, but at the eternal things above, where Christ is gone before. For God had reconciled them to himself through Christ, and had given them this "ministry of the reconciliation, to wit, that God in the person of Christ was reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses." God had committed unto them this "message of the reconciliation."

Paul indignantly refuses to take anything less than this as the significance of his apostleship. He is "an am-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

bassador from God on behalf of Christ" offering to men conscious of guilt these divine terms of peace. The Corinthians, whom he had before reminded that from the beginning he had made this "word of the cross" his only philosophy, should have realized better what Paul meant by his "gospel" and his "apostleship." But it is well for us that their failure called forth this earliest, most authentic and authoritative, as well as sublimest, definition of what the message of Christianity really is. It is not a new ethics, it is a new power. It is not a philosophy, it is a fact of history to be interpreted in the light of other facts and conditions. It is not even the life or work of a man. Paul himself, had he known a Christ after the flesh, now would know such a Christ no more. The word of the cross is a fact of human history, significant or not according as it is viewed. One may view it as Pilate did and report accordingly in a scanty footnote how among other disturbances of the Passover season it had become necessary to execute the so-called Prophet of Galilee for attempted insurrection in the temple. Or one may look at it from the point of view of the eternal, asking, What did God mean by it? This is Paul's method. To him the crucifixion was in its deepest meaning the act of God. It was the supreme act in the history of divine redemption.

One must have some idea such as Paul had, such as Jesus had before Paul, of what "redemption" means, and one must realize, as these did, that it is something for humanity, not for Israel alone. Then, if you ask, What was the significance of this culminating fact? What did God mean by it when he sought "through the agency of Christ to reconcile the world unto himself, not reckoning

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE

unto men their trespasses"? you will be looking at the matter as the first great interpreter of our religion interprets it. You will be looking at history 'under the aspect of the eternal.' You will be looking at it from the theologian's point of view, interested in it for its religious values, as a manifestation of 'God in history.' But it will be a supremely historical type of religion which will come from this mode of viewing things. Christianity will mean to you 'the history of redemption,' and you will not tolerate anything less than this as the basis of your faith. You will be unable to fall back upon the mere letter of any Scripture. Even Paul and Apollos and Cephas will be mere "ministers through whom you believed."

The anchorage which Paul had given to the new faith was soon put to the test. Paul had insisted that no other foundation could be laid than this of the fact of Calvary. But the world to which Paul had preached was impatient of so humble a foundation. Students of comparative religion describe to us the welter of oriental religions that were flooding the Empire, religions of personal redemption promising immortality by union with some mythical demi-god who had issued triumphant from the underworld. They assure us that the heralds of the cross carried the day with the religiously famished masses largely because they preached not a myth, but contemporary fact. Jesus was a really risen Redeemer, whom these witnesses had actually known.

To what extent this factor of present-day historicity contributed to the victory of Christianity over its 'fore-runners and rivals' for the adhesion of the Graeco-Roman world is not easy to determine. It was far from being the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

only advantage the new faith possessed over the mystery religions. This however is certain: its triumph was not won without a struggle. And in this struggle a perilously large proportion of the Greek-speaking Church favored a policy of assimilation. In the second century it has been estimated on high authority that fully one-half the nominally Christian body went over to various forms of Gnosticism, of which the common characteristic was their disdain for the historical aspects of the faith, a speculative interest in a Christ who came by water, not by blood, that is, was manifested in the temporary indwelling of a divine 'emanation' in the Galilean Prophet. This Christ-emanation descended upon Jesus at his baptism, endowing him with power to work miracles and to proclaim the unknown Father, withdrawing, however, before the suffering of the cross.

In various forms, some ascetic, some antinomian or even libertine, these various Hellenizing, theosophizing perversions of the historic faith sought to detach it from its roots in the soil of Palestine and the history of Israel, and to etherealize it into the form of a cosmopolitan religion of personal redemption like the other 'mysteries.' Some Gnostics dismissed the historical Jesus altogether, whether as a mere temporary "receptacle" of the "aeon" Christ, or as an illusion, a "phantasm." Some made him a real person, but entirely unhuman. The heavenly Father he proclaimed was an entirely different Being from the limited, austere Jehovah, the tribal god of the Jews. The unknown Father was the Eternal Goodness of the Platonists.

The conflict with Gnosticism was the great crisis of the

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE

period after Paul, as the conflict with Jewish-Christian legalism had been in Paul's day. Instinctively the Church clung to its historic tradition as the "faith once for all delivered to the saints." This was the period of the written Gospels, above all of the Fourth Gospel, combining the theology of Paul with the outward record of Synoptic tradition. Christianity would have been lost in a sea of theosophic speculation but for this falling back upon the simple story of Jesus' life, recovered from the anecdotes of missionary preaching. For its very salvation the faith became again historical.

One monument remains outside the New Testament and the scant records of the Apostolic Fathers, to tell in brief the story of this great conflict. It is the Roman baptismal symbol which we have learned to call The Apostles' Creed. It begins and ends with some general propositions of wider acceptance, but its Christian nucleus is the clear statement of the record of Jesus' life under the conditions of his time. Central to all is the story of Jesus' death and resurrection. This is the answer to all attempts to vaporize away "the word of the cross": "He suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried, the third day he rose again from the dead, he ascended into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty."

Thus Christianity sums up its message as the history of redemption. The God to whom it points is he who manifests himself supremely in the story of human redemption. He is the God of Israel, but above all the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Jesus' faith in him, vindicated in that supreme tragedy of human devotion, is the victory it offers, the victory that hath overcome the world. Look-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

ing up to God as the agent of world-redemption this religion takes for its special field the meaning of human history, the evolution of the kingdom of God. Philosophy and ethics have their splendid part, but for Christianity the supreme revelation must come through the story of human experience questioned and tested for its meaning 'under the aspect of the eternal.' For the solution of this great problem it has but one key, the cross.

All the light of sacred story
Gathers round its head sublime.

If such be the distinctive character of our religion it must be reflected in the type of training given to those who aspire to leadership in it. Not every Christian can be a historical critic. But every man who becomes a leader should have obtained some conception of what it means to be the interpreter of a faith whose motto is 'God in history.'

The claim may appear a paradox, though in fact well founded, that Christianity owes to its distinctively historical character both its freedom and its true conservatism. With Judaism and Islam it shares the common heritage of a sacred canon linking it indissolubly to the past. It shares with them also the common danger of bibliolatry. There are forms and phases of Christianity which reduce it to the same level as these 'religions of the book,' bringing the Church again under the same yoke of bondage to the letter which Paul warned against, and setting up a new tyranny of the scribes to take the place of that which Jesus overthrew. It is possible (we ourselves are witnesses

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE

of the attempt) for would-be interpreters of this characteristic religion of the spirit to represent it as another religion of the letter, in spite of the great revolt of freedom that gave it birth. But its principle of liberty remains. Its God is something more than the God of Moses or Mohammed, who writes his commandment on tablets of stone or bone. He is the living, present, actively redeeming God of Jesus Christ, who reveals himself by what he does, both outwardly and in the hearts of men. As long as those who teach this faith hold fast to the distinction between facts (which are God's own self-expression) and records (which are but human attempts to interpret and transmit the revelation), there can be no permanent entanglement in this yoke of bondage. God speaks a language of deeds, and he who would declare the message of God must be able not only to read with deeper insight than the scribe's the record of the past, but to read also the signs of the times. Words are the mere symbols of reality. To use the Scriptures as if in them we had eternal life, while refusing to penetrate through them to the eternal Spirit of revelation and redemption that is life's source in former generations as in ours, is to imitate the wilful blindness of the student of nature who never learns to "look through nature up to nature's God." God is behind the letter. This is the very essence of our Christian doctrine of sacred Scripture as summed up by our fourth evangelist (Jn. 5: 33-47). By it Christianity is forever raised above the level of mere 'religions of the book.'

To the follower of Jesus and of Paul the written page is but the means of access to the living, eternal God. Its value is in proportion to its capacity to render this service.

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Artistic beauty it often has; but it is not for this we esteem it. The level of its historical and scientific attainment may be higher than that of other writings of the time, or lower; the question is scarcely relevant. The Church has canonized this literature because it found there the handiwork of God. The Christian asks only, Does it in fact bring men into contact with him? If in its record of fact, or of the reaction of men's minds in former ages to the problems of the spiritual life, it does bring hearts and minds eager to know and love the truth nearer the object of their quest, then it is rightly canonized. It is a 'word of God' if it have this effect. As to methods of study, that is most Christian which is most effective to this end.

Thus the freedom of the Christian scholar is a freedom of faith. Whatever the origin or nature of these writings, their effect upon successive generations has proved them a paramount factor in the moral and religious progress of the world. Their history is a part (and no small part) of the working of God in his spiritual creation. How is it conceivable that the student should be justly debarred from any enquiry by any effective method into these records of the working of God's Spirit on the mind of man? The historian cannot conceive an objection to criticism, because (as has been well said) there is no history save critical history. The Christian scholar seeks God in history. Therefore he asks no man's leave to apply the methods of critical research. Faith makes him absolutely fearless of the result; but even without this faith he would still be forced to use the tests, the keenest which science can apply.

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE

The Church is conservative, as befits the vital nature of its interests, and has been slow to admit new methods. Yet the development of criticism has been quite as truly under divine direction as the fixation of the canon. Criticism, whether textual or higher, began with the sacred writings, and was resorted to as matter of dire necessity. Without it, as experience amply showed, the sacred record would have been made the tool of boundless subjectivity. In the absence of fixed principles, determining both text and meaning, the Scriptures, instead of proclaiming their own message, were made to proclaim that of every religious charlatan who aimed to secure the adoption of his views under a false claim of authority. Writings cannot be clothed with the more than human authority of canonization without provoking attempts (usually well-meant) to make use of this authority in the interest of what is called in the latest of New Testament writings "private interpretation" (II Pet. 1:20). The "wresting" of Scripture, from the time of the second century Gnostics to that of Smith and Jones, to make it teach not its own message, but what Smith and Jones conceive to be the message, is notorious as a fact. As respects cause it is an unavoidable consequence of clothing them with superhuman authority. With the Alexandrian fathers it was a principle that those portions of Scripture whose apparent sense gave no religious lesson, such as the genealogies, must be *given* a meaning, because it was unworthy of God to utter trivialities. Other portions were manipulated accordingly. The allegorical interpretations of the Alexandrian fathers, beginning with Pseudo-Barnabas, are an object lesson as to where one arrives once the road is taken of determining the message

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

by what (in the interpreter's judgment) it would have been *fitting* for God to say.

Chaos without end or limit is the sure result where canonicity is not guarded by the companion principle of objectivity. If we regard the Bible as God's word we cannot at the same time make it our own. We must take it as it is, and not as it would be convenient for our purposes to have it. This implies open-minded, historical interpretation. The revelation was given of old time to the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners. If anything is self-evident in Scripture it is this difference of the messages, not merely as between different ages, but as between various reporters in practically the same age. We have two accounts of the origin of man, and three versions of the Mosaic Decalogue, no two alike. All are put together in a final Pentateuch by post-exilic editors who sought to minimize discrepancies. We have four Gospels, not drawn up at intervals of centuries, like the various versions of the Decalogue, but within a few decades of one another; and we cannot so much as reconcile two divergent genealogies of Jesus. So wide apart are the divine and the human conceptions of what is best as a standard of faith and practice. The canon-makers are bent on securing a uniform rule. Is not a fourfold standard a very contradiction in terms? The Giver of the revelation seems almost to take pleasure in bringing in extremes of difference. We can get neither uniformity of text amid the hopeless variations of manuscripts and versions, nor can we dream of an accepted harmonization of one author with another, still less of any undisputed interpretation of any individual writer, were it possible to solve the problem of an undis-

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE

puted text. To judge by Scripture itself its divine Author differed from the ecclesiastics in his conception of what a sufficient rule of faith and practice should be.

An impartial judgment must admit the process of canonization resorted to by the Church of the second century to have been a practical necessity if the historic faith were not to be submerged in a sea of theosophic speculation. The apostolic tradition thus enshrined became an impregnable fortress against the vast sweep of Gnosticism. It was a salutary development. Whoever sees God in history at all must surely acknowledge his providence here. But canonization involves by its very nature a converse danger. To avoid the pain and toil of constructive thought (and there is no domain in which constructive thought is so toilsome and so painful as in that of religion) the easiest way is to fall back upon an immutable written rule. This is the peril of bibliolatry, to which religions of the book such as medieval Judaism and Islam are specially exposed. It is not strange that Christianity too, in spite of the protests of its origin against a worship of the letter, should have swung far back in the days of its struggle to preserve the historic faith once for all delivered to the saints, toward the ideal of a fixed, inerrant standard, tending to become itself also a religion of the book.

It was saved from this fate of stagnation and ultimate death not so much by any wisdom of its own as by the very nature of the records on which it was thrown back. For the framer of a fixed standard, uniformity is indispensable. Disagreements of equally authoritative records are intolerable. Harmony must be obtained; reasonable harmony if possible, but harmony at all costs. Prodigies of

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

violence to the canons of ordinary judgment have been done by the New Testament harmonizers of modern times, but they are small as compared with the feats of harmonization performed by second century Fathers. There was the notorious discrepancy between the genealogies of Matthew and Luke with which Porphyry twitted his Christian opponents. The transcribers of the text from which our famous Codex Bezae is drawn made short work of this by simply substituting in Lk. 3:23 ff. the genealogy of Mt. 1:7-16 in reversed order. Irenaeus answered those who pointed to the disagreements in chronology between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel by maintaining that the public ministry of Jesus covered a period of twenty years. He could thus be about "fifty years old" (Jn. 8:57; *cf.* 2:19-21), in its closing year.

Extravagances of this sort are soon withdrawn. Like the allegorizing interpretations of the Alexandrian fathers they are quickly found to defeat their own object and give way to less vulnerable arguments. Still the harmonizer does not give up his effort. To do so would be to his mind surrender of the very citadel of the faith. For biblicism refuses to distinguish between the records and the divine revelation they attest; and fails to see that revelation may be better attested by diversity among witnesses. The worshipper of the letter searches the Scriptures like the scribes before him thinking that in them he has eternal life. With such a conception, if they are shown not to have those qualities of inerrancy and identity which meet the scribe's conception of a perfect rule of faith and practice they lose their authority. Christianity conceives them as witnesses of value according to their power to bring men

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE

into effective contact with God and Christ. Christianity is a religion based on the movement of God in history. Its revelation is uttered in terms of deeds, not words. Let the Christian then learn to treat the Scriptures as Christ treated them, as witness-bearers to the eternal redemptive Word.

If there is something providential in the canonization of the apostolic records in the second century, to make of the Bible in its entirety a book of God rather than of man, there is something no less providential in the character of the writings thus preserved, and the fact that in their mutual relations they stand almost at the opposite extreme from what the framer of perfect and immutable rules would choose. To some extent the Old Testament, but in vastly greater degree the New Testament in the only forms in which it has ever been current in the Church, is a book which *enforces* criticism. That is to say, it makes careful, systematic comparison and relative valuation of diverse representations absolutely indispensable. Only with extreme reluctance has the Church been driven to abandon the easy path of a fixed, inerrant rule, and compelled by a wiser Providence to take the historian's view that documents are witnesses. Human reason and conscience, under direction of the eternal Spirit of truth, have been roused from debilitating inactivity and forced to exercise judgment upon "revelation itself." It was the work not of man but of God that the Christian canon should in its very nature be such as to drive the Church away from the letter, back to the Spirit, away from the bondage of bibliolatry, back to the freedom of Jesus and Paul.

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

The first difficulty of the harmonizer in his search for an inerrant standard is with textual variants. If ever God gave an inerrant form of the text he permitted it to disappear at a time so remote that our earliest records cannot reach back to it. The medieval Synagogue rigidly organized as a system of book-religion, centered on the belief in an infallible Torah miraculously perfect in every syllable, could meet this crucial test. By the rule requiring extirpation of every manuscript showing three variations, no matter how minute, from the Masoretic standard, the scribes have actually succeeded in suppressing every material variant. There is no textual criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament, because since the tenth century of our era all Hebrew manuscripts are practically identical. The broad differences of text which once existed survive only in the Greek translations made in the centuries just before and just after the Christian era and preserved by their transmission through Christian hands from the destruction visited upon their Hebrew originals. The Synagogue succeeded in destroying these wherever they were found to vary from the standard text.

Contrast with this artificial uniformity the diversity which has followed from free transcription of the New Testament writings, both in the original Greek, and in the multifarious versions of ancient times. The science of textual criticism had its origin here in these thousands of manuscripts of the New Testament with their hundreds of thousands of minute variations, not because the Church would not gladly have followed in the wake of the Synagogue in the suppression of variants, but because a wiser Providence forbade. How ardently uniformity was sought

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE

is amply attested by the scores of harmonistic readings which vainly attempt to bring the four Gospels into artificial agreement. Instead Christian scholars were compelled, much against their will, to become the teachers of the world in the science of textual criticism which every historian now feels obliged to apply to his sources, but only according to the principles laid down by students of the New Testament. Surely if ever the Church has been "taught of God" it was in this laborious discipline. In the study of textual variants it learned not to treat its records after the manner of the bibliolater, but of the student of history.

The second difficulty of the harmonizer lies inside the limits of the text. An infallible written standard cannot possibly be at variance with itself. Hence from the very outset of the attempt to present such a standard in the form of Gospels we find the most desperate efforts to remove discrepancies between the various claimants of the title. It was fortunately impossible for the more recent Gospels of 'Luke' and 'Matthew' altogether to displace the primitive Roman "Reminiscences of the Preaching of Peter," whose compilation was ascribed from earliest times to Mark, the companion at Rome of Paul. "Mark," as we call the work, was almost superseded by the later and larger Gospels. Especially did the unwarranted claim of apostolic authorship for 'Matthew' give this Jewish-Christian Gospel an immense preponderance in use and authority among the Fathers of the first half of the second century. 'Luke' too had obvious advantages which gave it predominant standing especially in the region of Antioch. Nor could even the Fourth Gospel be denied, though its

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

late appearance and wide divergence from its three accepted predecessors raised greater objection to it than to any other of the four. None of the four could be denied. To avoid the fatal defect of self-contradiction in the standard advocates of the "infallible rule" had but one alternative. It was harmonize or perish. We have seen some of the expedients resorted to.

And the expedients broke down. A wiser Providence decreed that they should, in order that Christianity might be something more than a new religion of the book. Textual criticism was the outcome of the vain attempt to secure uniformity among the manuscripts and versions. Its issue, far from producing uncertainty, was to give immeasurably greater security for the readings of the New Testament than for any other work of classical antiquity. There is nothing in the whole world of palaeography which even distantly approaches the perfection achieved by textual criticism in reproducing the authentic, original work of the New Testament writers. Something similar will in due time be found true with respect to the higher criticism, whose task is to trace the inward development by comparing divergent elements of the record with one another.

Instead of forced and violent harmonization, compelled by the fear of admitting characteristics incompatible with the human idea of what a divine revelation should be, the higher criticism makes no dogmatic assumption, because it seeks God's idea, and regards itself as simply the handmaid of history. It does not seek to join together what God hath put asunder. The author of Acts is not forced to take the same view as Paul of events which led up to the admis-

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE

sion of the Gentiles to equal standing in the Church, because Paul's view on the one side and the view of 'Luke' on the other are each a part of the evidence. This, and not the verdict, is what God lays before us. And the revelation of what God meant by these narratives and these events is all the clearer and better the farther apart (within the limits of the admitted sincerity of both witnesses) the separate points of view.

Christianity, as we have seen, is a religion based on the history of the redemptive working of God in humanity. As such it compels us to seek as the essence of the message what God meant by these events. God spoke in what happened, though we do not exclude from the happening the composition of the record. But the voice of God is not the record itself. The record merely attests it. For ages students of Scripture have sought to make of it a uniform, unchangeable, inerrant standard. Once and again they have been ready to do violence to honesty and truth itself in order to conform the testimony to what they were convinced it ought to be. Sorely against their will they have been forced to learn the lesson of the impartial, critical historian. For it is true in the field of the higher as well as the lower criticism, that it was biblical scholarship which led the way. Pentateuchal critics were the first teachers of the art of documentary analysis which now is applied in every field of historico-critical investigation.

Once more the distinction between Church and Synagogue is of deep significance. Professor G. F. Moore of Harvard long ago called attention to the extraordinary parallel which exists between the fate which according to critics of the Pentateuch overtook the separate four docu-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

ments out of which it was compiled in the post-exilic age, and that which in the Syriac-speaking church overtook our own four Gospels in the period from the second to the fourth century. In the post-exilic period, when Synagogue and scribe remade the religion of Israel on the basis of the written law, the prophetic narratives of southern and northern Israel with their embodied codes, documents known to critics as J and E respectively, together with their Deuteronomic recast and supplement (D), were all four combined into one on the basis of the Priestly Law-book (P). For the purposes of a legal standard nothing else was possible. Four conflicting versions of "the Law of Moses" would have been intolerable. Hence the prompt disappearance of the earlier sources. Canonization of the composite work implied refusal to the originals of the right to linger too long superfluous on the stage. History repeated itself in the case of the Syriac Gospels. Had not the Greek originals fortunately survived in another language exactly the same fate would have befallen our own four Gospels in the same regions a half-millennium later. For use among his own countrymen Tatian the Syrian, disciple of Justin at Rome, prepared a composite Gospel, a harmony of the four or *Diatessaron*, a work recently recovered to modern scholarship. In Tatian's *Diatessaron* Matthew, Mark, Luke and John were pieced together (omitting the troublesome genealogies) much after the fashion of J, E, D and P in the Pentateuch, the whole being translated into the Syriac. Tatian's was not the only attempt of the kind; Theophilus of Antioch felt the same impulse to harmonization as the needful method for securing the desired uniformity of standard, and also prepared

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE

a harmony on a similar plan. But Tatian's work was so pre-eminently successful as to displace the originals themselves. Two hundred years later Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa, found the *Diatessaron* alone in use. What had then come to be known in Syriac and are still known as the "separate" Gospels had disappeared. Rabbula was compelled to restore them by episcopal authority.

Churchmen will go far when convinced that the divine standard of faith and practice *ought* to be what they themselves would have made it. Fortunately for the Church its canon-makers of the second century lacked the power of the leaders of the Synagogue for the suppression of variants. God had sown the seed of the gospel in too wide a field. Ecclesiastics found the attempt to assimilate variant forms of the text impracticable, though the great revisions of Alexandria in the time of Hesychius, and of Antioch and Constantinople in the time of Chrysostom, went far to secure it. Forced harmonization of one Gospel with another, or the exclusion of an unpopular Jewish-Christian type of eschatology in favor of another, more acceptable to the Hellenistic world, were found impracticable for the same reason. Attempts were made in plenty. In the case of the apocalypses, known to the early Church under the name of "prophecy," reaction against the millenarian extravagances of Montanus secured the exclusion from the canon of the writings of Hermas and Pseudo-Peter, and were only prevented from robbing us of the great Apocalypse of John by the insistence of leading churchmen of the school of Papias, Justin, Melito of Sardis and Irenaeus, that the witness borne to itself in Rev. 1:9-11 was "worthy of belief."

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Rome spoke the final word in matters pertaining to the canon, and Rome's watch-word was 'catholicity.' It was a rule based on the experience of practical statesmen, but it reflected a type of wisdom which after all is only a prudent yielding to the inevitable. Again we say, as Loescher said of the origin of the canon, "It was not formed as they tell us at a stroke by the act of men, but little by little through the agency of God, the ruler of minds and of ages." Catholicity in the larger, truer sense was indeed the agency which preserved to the New Testament through an overruling Providence a historical character which the eagerness of ecclesiastics for a smooth-working, unified standard of faith and practice would have thrown away. The result is a historian's book, and not a lawyer's or ecclesiastic's; a book of testimony, not of official decisions; a book which bears eternal witness to the movement of God in history, not a book of oracular utterances from the distant heavens.

Christianity escapes the dangers of the mere religions of the book by the fact that it is fundamentally an interpretation of the drama of redemption. It is concerned with what God has done and is still doing in human history. Its ministry is an embassy of peace to a world estranged from its Creator, proclaiming a gospel of the Reconciliation, how that through the agency of Christ God was reconciling this estranged world unto himself, not imputing unto men their trespasses. Paul was able to interpret to the Graeco-Roman world of his time the meaning of this message, in spite of alien tongues and the institutions and conventions of a civilization to which the very title "Messiah," "Christ" was uncouth. The true historian is he

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE

who can likewise interpret to his own times in terms intelligible to his fellow-countrymen the ideals, hopes, aspirations of a past which in other respects may be dead, but in its faith in the eternal God of Righteousness and Truth, though dead yet speaketh. To this extent at least, and in this sense, the Christian leader must be a historian. He must know the past of which he speaks, and he must interpret it to his own time in terms intelligible to those to whom he is sent.

The methods everywhere followed by the Church in the training of its leaders are not arbitrarily chosen. They are prescribed no less by the nature of the task than by the experience of the ages. Historians are not supposed to be well qualified who cannot so much as read the language of their principal sources. Interpreters of the past in terms of the present must be supposed to have some knowledge of the historical background against which that drama of redemption was enacted which is the substance of their message. Men who speak in the name of the God and Father of Jesus Christ, and use these records of the past as witnesses to a gospel not of human but divine authority, cannot be satisfied to accept either the dogmas of churchmen or the sneers of skeptics regarding the sense in which the Scriptures are to be received as "the word of God." Their effect is the witness. Christian leaders must know for themselves, by personal study of their nature, origin and history just what these writings are, and how they have brought, and still do bring, those who search them aright into vital contact with the eternal Word, that Life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us.

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

At Yale, where Edwards studied and taught, the chair of New Testament teaching is entitled New Testament Criticism and Interpretation. What is meant by Criticism is the kind of historical study to which the Church has been driven, as the foregoing pages have shown, not of its own will, but by a wiser overruling Providence. Such study is indispensable for the adequate appreciation of God's self-revelation through prophets and apostles, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. What is meant by Interpretation is that so-called "grammatico-historical" interpretation to which the Church was forced many centuries ago, as the only bulwark against a rampant and unbridled distortion of the records to serve the ends of "private interpretation." The message of the Christian minister is the gospel of the Reconciliation. He must make plain to a world estranged from its Creator what God has done in Christ to restore it to right relations with himself. What can be more essential to the training of such a messenger on behalf of God than open-minded enquiry into the History of Redemption? What sources should he go to for such a purpose if not the documents of the New Testament, and those which furnish the background of the story in the Jewish canon? What methods should he apply, if not the approved methods of the most scientific historical enquiry?

Studies of this type are means, not ends. They are tools for men to wield. They do not take the place of men. But it is a conviction found wherever the Puritan tradition of an educated ministry obtains, and certainly not forgotten where the Pilgrims founded institutions of learning as the chief bulwark of liberty in Church and civil state, that the

NEW TESTAMENT SCIENCE

man who is made a leader in Christian service should be trained with all the equipment that science can give, and if trained in other fields, then surely first of all in the methods of the modern historian for the appreciation and interpretation of our historic faith.

THE LITERARY QUALITIES OF THE
ENGLISH BIBLE

CHARLES ALLEN DINSMORE

THE LITERARY QUALITIES OF THE
ENGLISH BIBLE

CHARLES ALLEN DINSMORE

THAT the study of the English Bible should have an important place in the training of a minister will hardly be disputed. If it is important for a lawyer to be familiar with the statutes of the state in which he practices, it is equally important for a minister to know the nature, the truth and the power of the Bible. To be perfectly equipped he should be acquainted with the languages in which the Scriptures were originally written, yet even this knowledge will not render less necessary a complete mastery of the English version which he must use in his daily ministrations.

The book has greatly suffered from false theories of inspiration. Its writers have been regarded as mere stenographers, taking dictation from the Most High. No adequate consideration was given by our fathers to the fallible human element, or to the methods by which the mind of man grows into a knowledge of truth. False theories of inspiration led inevitably to false methods of interpretation. The matter-of-fact Occidental mind explained the gorgeous imagery of Daniel, the lyrical outbursts of the Psalms, the epigrams of the Wisdom books in the spirit and by the methods of a judge expounding the most technical statute of the law. The books of the Bible

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

vary greatly in the value of their spiritual insight; they also represent different types of literature. Evidently truths expressed in the language of the imagination, or of exalted emotion, must not be interpreted by the same canons we use in the exposition of truth stated in precise prose. Each type of literature must be interpreted after its own kind. It is permissible to call the Bible an inspired book, yet it is an ampler and more correct statement to say that it is the record of an inspired race. It is a collection of documents of various kinds and value bearing witness to a divine movement in human history.

THE BIBLE IS THE LITERATURE OF A DIVINE MOVEMENT

Every race which has played a noticeable part in the history of the world has produced a literature. It has told in its own language and according to its own insights the story of its struggles with nature, with other peoples, with the Invisible. The Greeks, the Romans, the Babylonians, the Chinese have related their experiences in legend and history, they have interpreted the meaning of life in myth and allegory and philosophy, they have uttered their emotions in songs of love and of war. Through every faculty of mind and heart the genius of a gifted people will declare itself. The ancient Hebrews were no exception. A deep-natured and imaginative race they responded vividly and thoughtfully to the experiences of a long and eventful career. One of the permanent impressions coming to a student of the Scriptures is their incomparable superiority to the writings of Babylonia, Egypt or Persia in range, in beauty and in emotional power. Doubtless oblivion has taken large toll of the intellectual toil of the

LITERARY QUALITIES OF THE BIBLE

Hebrews. Probably only a portion of their songs and stories have come down to us. But why have these books survived? What vitality has made them live through the centuries? What unity of thought or passion has organized them into one volume? Why are they sacred?

The answer is familiar and quite evident. Every dominant people has its peculiar genius. The Greeks had a rare appreciation of beauty and a grasp of its laws; the Romans were endowed with large executive capacity; the Hebrews had a unique ethical insight and passion which organized the intellectual and spiritual life of the people, determined their national heroes and became their contribution to the common good of the world. "This people," wrote Matthew Arnold, "have a secret . . . they have discovered the way the world was going, and therefore they have prevailed." The Secret is Righteousness; the movement of the world is toward Righteousness. The Old Testament is the literature which recounts the inception of this idea, its unfolding through many centuries and many experiences, and its permanent establishment in the thought of mankind.

A comparison may make plain the process which brought these books together. The genius of the Anglo-Saxons is their ability to value and establish individual liberty under law. The struggle for liberty is the keynote of English and American history. If, centuries hence, some one should gather together the literature best expressive of this age-long battle—the Magna Charta, the speeches of Cromwell, the compact of the Mayflower, the legends of New England, the Declaration of Independence, the American Constitution, the poems of Whittier, Uncle

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Tom's Cabin, the speeches of Lincoln—and bind them in one volume, the result would be a book not unlike the Old Testament. In writing the story of liberty, however, one may fix his attention on man, but in telling of the birth and development of righteousness one centers his thoughts on God, for to be right is to be in harmony with the Nature of Things. The supreme concern of a people who are preoccupied with the secret of righteousness will be the nature and the will of God. Therefore we have in the Old Testament more than a collection of literature organized around the central idea of righteousness, we have the story of the way in which a righteous God has dealt with men and a nation. The Old Testament closes with threats and promises, the New completes the divine story with the good news of the strange way God has taken to help men attain right relations with him, and then it lifts the veil to show the end when redemption is achieved in a new heaven and a new earth.

Taking the Old and the New Testaments together, we have a drama of salvation, the different factors being unified in a plot as well developed as that of Hamlet. This organization of many books around an ever increasing purpose running through centuries distinguishes the Bible from the sacred books of all other peoples. The Koran is the product of the brain of one man, Mohammed, who wrote his visions on chance sheets which were afterwards assembled into a volume. We have, therefore, the truth as seen by one man, of a peculiar temperament, at one definite period of time. The Bible on the contrary is the crystallized experience of many men, in many centuries, of diverse temperaments, and with many points of view.

LITERARY QUALITIES OF THE BIBLE

Its folk-lore goes back to the mists which hung over the primitive world, its psalms are the lyrical aspirations of a multitude of singers of many generations, its reliable history covers a period of over a thousand years, it views truth from practically every angle and appeals to the heart of man through many faculties. The sacred books of India have marvelous insights into the unity, the sovereignty, the providence of the Eternal, but they unfold no drama of salvation, they do not reveal God as working through the ages by means of individuals and nations to establish righteousness and judgment on the earth. Other nations have a literature which is properly called divine because in it are heard the "accents of the Holy Ghost," but the Bible is the only sacred literature which is comprised of such documents as reveal God working through many centuries for the moral redemption of mankind. Unlike other histories its emphasis is not on man and his experiences, but on God and his purposes.

We asked a moment ago the question: Why were the books of the Bible preserved while so many contemporaneous writings were lost? These books have survived because they are vitally related to man's discovery of the way the world is going. We put the further question: Why are they sacred? They are sacred because the secret shows man involved in perpetual relations with God.

THE LITERARY CHARACTER OF THE VARIOUS BOOKS

Composed of sixty-six volumes, the Bible is one book because it is organized around one theme. Considered as a whole it has dramatic unity. It is a "Divine Comedy"

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

inspired by the Holy Ghost. We find here a multitude of players taking their various parts, with God always on the stage as the chief actor. There is an unfolding plot culminating in the tragedy of Calvary, then the final scene where men with faces aglow with faith and hope gaze into the heavens and through the coming years, beholding the glory of God filling a redeemed earth. "All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players" is true in a sense profounder than Shakespeare had in mind when he penned the famous lines. Cast as a whole into the dramatic form, the several parts have also the character and attraction of almost every variety of composition, and only by taking account of their peculiar nature can they be understood. It is simply stupid to interpret the different books of the Bible—this imaginative, impassioned literature of the East—by the same canons one uses to find the meaning of a statute law. The prosaic Western mind is sure to go far astray if it seeks to extract the significance of gorgeous Oriental imagery by the dry processes of logic. Our fathers had some excuse for their legalistic methods of exegesis, for when the King James version was printed it was not known that the Psalms were Hebrew poetry. Bishop Lowth made the discovery nearly a hundred years later. But there are more than the two grand divisions of prose and poetry in the Scriptures. Almost every type of literature here finds a place. God fulfils himself in many ways. He has truth for the imagination and the heart as well as for the practical understanding. It would be contrary to the known methods of the divine workings did we not find in the literature of the Hebrews what we find in the writings of all people—myth, legend,

LITERARY QUALITIES OF THE BIBLE

law, song, fable, history. We can know the value of the various books only as we interpret them after their kind. We wrest the Scriptures to our destruction, if we give myth the meaning of history, and see biography in an allegory.

To us the word "myth" has a sinister sound, suggestive of the untrue. Yet a myth is the sincere attempt of ancient peoples to state abstract truth in a concrete form. "A myth," declares the Century Dictionary, "is a tale handed down from primitive times, and in form historical, but in reality involving elements of early religious views, as reflecting an origin of things." Myths are the theologies of the childhood of the world. To-day we answer the great questions regarding the beginning of man, the meaning of life, the nature of the universe in terms of philosophy and science; the primitive man put his solutions in the form of a story. Knowing this universal fact, we have the key to the early chapters of Genesis. When we call the account of the Garden of Eden a myth, we do not discredit it, we classify and understand it. We know it is not history, but an explanation of life thrown into the only form which would be comprehensible to the dawning intelligence of mankind. It is true as King Lear is true—true to life. These Hebrew myths, however, differ from those of other peoples in that there is in them a sense of a future destiny; they are prophetic of days to come.

It is supposed that the two oldest documents which form the framework of Genesis were compiled about 825 and 750 B. C. This would make their authors practically the contemporaries of Homer. A reader can hardly fail to be impressed with the similarity in style between the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Iliad and the Genesis narratives. There is the same rapidity of movement, simplicity of expression, vitality of human interest and high seriousness. But the Hebrew stories omit all picturesque adjectives and possess a solemnity and an ethical value superior to those which came from Greece. Both are the folk-tales of a marvelous people, and as such they have a charm which is often lacking in stories written by a single author. As an ancient story teller must hold the attention of his audience he will naturally seize the salient facts and the spectacular features of a narrative, amplify dramatic situations, eliminate what is uninteresting and make his tale true to the imagination and views of life held by his hearers. As a folk-tale passes down from generation to generation it will ultimately become instinct with the emotions and expressive of the life of a people. This is one reason why the stories of the Old Testament are so extraordinarily interesting. Produced by the many, they lay hold on the many.

“The world,” says Emil Sauvestre, “is full of peoples without agriculture, without commerce or manufactures, but you will never find one without its singers and its poets.” To this rule so imaginative and keenly emotional a people as the Hebrews were no exception. When the first historian of Israel sat down to write the annals of his nation he found a rich and varied body of poetry at his hand. There was Lamech’s “Song of Vengeance,” the triumphant war ballad of Deborah, the “Book of Jasher,” a collection of songs probably recounting the deeds of heroes; there was also the book of the “Wars of Jehovah,”

LITERARY QUALITIES OF THE BIBLE

containing songs celebrating the victory of the Lord's host over his enemies.

But the finest expression of the Hebrew poetic genius is found in the Psalms. It is worth remembering that this gifted people lacked that quality of imagination by which one puts himself in the place of another. They were destitute of dramatic ability, hence they produced no plays like those of Aeschylus or Shakespeare; the book of Job, an epic in the form of a dialogue, being the nearest approach. Perhaps the mental deficiency which deprived their literature of drama also deprived their hearts of sympathy and made them intolerant. Yet of the splendor and power of their lyrical genius there can be no question. It is fortunate on the whole that the poetic energy of Israel took the form of the lyric rather than the drama, for in the latter there must be make-believe and the expression of false positions, while the former is a simpler and more genuine utterance of individual experience, and the appeal of the poetry of the Old Testament lies in its utter sincerity and simplicity.

The reason the Psalms were so long unrecognized as poetry lies in the fact that their form was strange to the Western mind. Poetry considered in its technique is "patterned language." Greek and Latin lines were based on the number of syllables and the time required to utter them. English verse is formed by accented syllables and is usually marked by rhyme or recurrent sounds. But the translators of the authorized version found none of these familiar signs in the Hebrew text. A century passed before it was noted that the underlying principle of Hebrew poetry was not the recurrence of sound, but the recurrence

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

of thought. The rhythm was primarily in the idea rather than in the form. This principle is called parallelism; the second line repeats the thought of the first in a modified form, or it affirms the antithesis, or makes a slight advance. Once having found the clue, it was later discovered that Hebrew poetry also has a measured beat, the throb of that rhythm of nature which lies deeper than the rhythm of art, and is manifested in all elevated emotion.

The affection of all spiritually-minded people for the Psalms is not strange. These lyrics are not the utterance of one sweet singer of Israel, they represent the aspirations and the experiences of many men and many centuries. Approximately eight hundred years of worship sifted the hymns of the temple till only those remained which were true to the feelings of men and the grace of God. Sung by many generations in the sincere hours of prayer and praise they speak to us with the authority of attested experience. The thoughts of men may have been widened by the process of the suns since those days, but their emotions remain the same.

Now poetry must be interpreted by its own laws. How often have leaders in the church carried us into absurdities by accepting the emotional affirmations of poetry as prosaic statements of fact! It was a war song which declared that the sun and moon stood still over the field of Ajalon. We are no more warranted in believing that the clock of the world was stopped on that day than that "the mountains skipped like rams, and the little hills like young sheep" when Israel went out of Egypt.

Allegory is another form of literature which the Spirit uses to express truth. The classic example is "Pilgrim's

LITERARY QUALITIES OF THE BIBLE

Progress." Here the way of life as conceived by the Puritans is set forth with a simplicity and power which are not found in any sermon or theological treatise. In the Bible this subtle teaching of truth through imaginative experience finds its best illustration in the book of Jonah. To consider the story as a statement of historic fact—the fish swallowing a man who writes a psalm in the horrid prison house while the seaweed is wrapped around his head, the capital of the world converted by a single discourse of a stranger speaking in an unknown tongue—is to be led into all manner of difficulties. But read as an allegory satirizing the timidity and inhumanity of the Jews, as contrasted with the tolerance of the heathen and the wideness of the Divine mercy, it is the epitome of Hebrew history, the breath and finer spirit of the noblest prophets. As a piece of literary art it challenges unstinted admiration. The English novelist, Charles Reade, affirms that "Jonah is the most beautiful story ever written in so small a compass." There are forty-eight verses composed of 1328 English words, yet in that narrow space "there is growth of character, a distinct plot, capable of great expansion, worked out without haste or crudity. Only a great artist hit on the perfect proportion between dialogue and narrative." What modern novelist could compress so much in 1328 words!

Another stinging rebuke to Jewish intolerance is found in the book of Ruth—"the daintiest of love idyls" in Goethe's judgment. At a time when the reformer's zeal was casting out all foreign wives from Judah, some Hebrew, filled with the spirit of the Good Samaritan, aimed to teach his people that there are natural human ties deeper

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

than race or creed; he would chasten the national pride by showing their greatest king to be a descendant of a Moabitess. Was ever toleration taught in a kindlier, more effective manner? And then its delicate artistry—common events glorified in a golden atmosphere, the cadence of the sentences, the deft handling of the midnight scene, the unwonted theme of the love of a woman for a woman, of a daughter-in-law for her mother-in-law, all touched with finest feeling. Like Jonah and every great work of art, truth is woven into the very texture of the story, not attached as a moral.

Both time and space forbid the elaborate description of the many other types of literature contained in this unique book. There are proverbs, fables, legends, wonder-stories, orations, parables, riddles, aphorisms; God, indeed, spake to the fathers in divers manners.

One other style of writing I must mention because it is so alien to our modern habits of thought that its purpose and meaning have led to the perversion of the truth. There are fashions in literature as in dress, and old styles are not always appreciated. Most of the books of the Scriptures were written for comfort and instruction, now we come to the literature of martyrdom. From the time of the revolt of the Maccabees through the persecutions of the early church by the Caesars—a period of approximately three hundred years—there developed a peculiar kind of imaginative writing. It had been used to some extent and with effect by the later prophets, and Dante, over a thousand years later, employed it in his Purgatory, but its vogue was from about 168 B. C. to 100 A. D. During this period there were many writings of this order,

LITERARY QUALITIES OF THE BIBLE

the two put in the canon of the Scriptures, Daniel and Revelation, being the best. In them history is written in the form of prophecy under the shadow of a great name. The purpose is to sustain the martyr during his fiery trial by revealing the supernal powers behind the veil enlisted in his behalf, and to predict the sudden intervention of God to establish righteousness. That this predictive element does not pretend to detailed accuracy is seen in the vague numbers used, 7, and 12, and 12 times 12, and in the further fact that all who attempt to fix the times and seasons by it fail lamentably. Prosaic, literal minds are fascinated and woefully entangled in the blazing imagery. They interpret vision by arithmetic, whereas an apocalypse is but a prolonged and glorious metaphor. To understand it we must seize the central value, being careful not to confuse the decorations of the casket with the jewel it contains.

This is the truth I wish to enforce by the foregoing discussion. The Bible is the literature of a uniquely inspired and a divinely led people. It must be interpreted as literature, each book after its kind. Otherwise we do violence both to God's way and to his message.

THE LITERARY GENIUS OF THE HEBREWS

As a literature of such spiritual insight and beauty of form could have come only from a race of exceptional genius, it will repay us to consider some of the qualities of mind which are characteristic of this people.

In the first place the Hebrew mind was intuitive and deeply emotional. It seems to have been destitute of

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

philosophical ability. It lacked the power of elaborate argument and of high speculation. It saw facts and interpreted their significance. What it saw, it saw vividly and described picturesquely. To this intuitive habit of mind, which kept close to experience and shunned abstraction, we owe much of the simplicity, rapidity and clarity of the Old Testament. Such a mind sees straight, its thoughts are not subtle, nor are its utterances involved. Even the casual reader of the Scriptures cannot fail to note the absence of subordinate clauses in its sentences. One simple statement follows another, linked in our translation by the awkward and ever recurring word "and."

Our modern Occidental minds are less intuitive and more philosophical. We are interested in the delicate relationship of ideas. We reason by dialectical processes. Truth to us is not a vision, it is a conclusion. This philosophical habit of mind has affected our language by introducing a multitude of abstract words, and has made our sentences elaborate and ponderous with qualifying clauses. The seeing mind will naturally write more simply, vividly and rapidly than the argumentative mind. It will keep close to facts and use concrete expressions. If it reasons, it will reason by analogy, and will delight in fable, parable and startling metaphor.

Not being inclined toward general ideas, the ancient Hebrew found truth in the experiences of men and women. A large part of the perennial interest in the Bible is due to the fact that it is concerned not with philosophical systems but with human life. Its truth is embodied in personality. It deals with men in all manner of situations

LITERARY QUALITIES OF THE BIBLE

and it deals with them in utmost sincerity, hiding nothing of their faults.

Preoccupied with man, the Hebrew naturally interpreted God through human nature. There are two ways, and two ways only, by which Deity can reveal himself—through the material order and its processes and through man and his experiences. Many nations read the character of the gods through the forces of the world; they deified the energies of nature and the passions of men. This tended to brutalize religion. The elect minds among the Jews interpreted God through man, and finally the best in man, his moral nature. Finding God in their own consciences they thought of him as just and righteous; feeling him in their own hearts, they trusted him as love.

The Hebrews, intuitive, vivid, keeping close to the facts of life, were possessed of an historic conscience quite different from our own. Being inclined to interpret God through human nature, they found the evidences for the existence and character of the Most High in the events of history. They knew Jehovah was the living God because of his dealings with the nation. They knew him to be just because he had smitten Pharaoh the oppressor. He must be full of compassion and of tender mercies, for he had heard their cry when they were in bondage and had chosen them to be his people. He was a king among the gods, for even in Egypt the forces of nature had obeyed his will. We Americans of the twentieth century quiet our doubts regarding the existence and character of God by philosophical argument. Like the Greeks we seek after wisdom, but the sons of Jacob have always sought for a sign.

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

An intuitive mind is inevitably emotional. Because it sees clearly it feels deeply. When one is speaking from his intellect merely the sentences may be lucid, but they are unrhythmical. As soon, however, as the feelings are stirred the periods throb with the beat of life itself. "See deep enough," says Carlyle, "and you will see musically, the heart of nature being everywhere music, if you can only reach it." In the Bible the intuitive Hebrew mind is dealing with man in his relationship with God. Confronting life's most insistent and tremendous questions, it felt the surge of profound and lofty emotions. The deep without stirred the deep within. It is this preoccupation of the Biblical writers with momentous issues which gives the rhythm of poetry to their speech and that "high seriousness" which Arnold says is the indispensable quality of all great literature.

Mr. Gardiner in his most excellent volume entitled *The Bible as English Literature*, to which I am much indebted, calls attention to another source of power in the writers of the Scriptures. In describing an emotion they do not use abstract terms, but visualize it by enumerating the sensations accompanying or causing it. When the psalmist is in despair he mentions the sensations going with the feeling—the dry throat, the failing eyes; we see him sinking into the mire, while the deep waters overflow him. (Ps. 69: 1-3.) Are we called to praise God? The writer enforces his summons by bringing before our minds the various mercies of the Lord which demand our rejoicing. (Ps. 65: 6-13.) The writing is powerful for the mind sees a picture.

LITERARY QUALITIES OF THE BIBLE

THE LITERARY QUALITIES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

It is very interesting to note how completely the Hebrew literary genius found expression in Jesus. He not only fulfilled the prophetic and priestly spirit of his people, he was the consummation of their unique characteristics of thought and speech. The national mind was intuitive, not philosophical; it was practical, not given to speculation; it saw facts and their meaning, and reasoned by analogy, not from premise to conclusion; it was prone to ignore secondary causes and refer activity immediately to God. Not being philosophical it expressed itself concretely; not being analytical its sentences were statements of facts and truths added one to another without the modification of subordinate clauses.

These peculiar literary qualities of the race are clearly seen in the so-called Wisdom literature—Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Job. Here the sentences are compact, they deal with the near end of truth, they proceed by analogical reasoning.

The discourses of Jesus as reported in the synoptics are examples of the Hebrew mentality carried to its highest point. Our Lord did not arrive at truth by logical processes, he knew and affirmed; the common facts of nature and the events of daily experience presented to him analogies of spiritual truth. As a result he taught in parables—"the kingdom of heaven is like . . ." And what artistic power is revealed in these parables! What short story writer ever packed so much truth and beauty in so small compass! Not a superfluous word, not a false sentiment. Apparently they were created without premeditation. Jesus fulfilled the manner of the sages as well as the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

spirit of the prophets. He was the Son of Man, yet he thought as a Hebrew and not as a Greek. We have only to contrast him with Socrates to perceive how conspicuously he was the flower of the literary genius of his people. The only element we miss in him is the patterned speech of poetry, and this lack is more apparent than real. His feeling toward nature and human experiences was eminently poetical, and many of his sayings have the beat, the rhythm of great poetry. The passage beginning, "Consider the lilies of the field" is a poem in every quality but verse form.

When we come to the fourth gospel, however, we find Jewish thought moulded by Greek influence. The book opens with a philosophical conception. Jesus is represented as continuously matching himself in debate with the Pharisees, he conducts an argument through many paragraphs. Evidently he is being interpreted by a mind trained in Greek habits of thought.

So too in the epistles of Paul we have a logical argumentation entirely unlike anything which ever came out of the tribe of Benjamin. The epistle to the Hebrews, with its elaborate discussion of the relationship of ideas, reveals the workings of a mind quite different from that of the priests of the old dispensation. In this epistle, in Paul's abstruse arguments, in the reasonings and debates of the fourth gospel the shadow of the West falls upon the pages of this Oriental book. The facts which the Hebrew mind saw so clearly, felt so deeply and stated so simply are now set into schemes of thought. His truths develop relationships whose statement requires abstract words and many qualifying clauses.

LITERARY QUALITIES OF THE BIBLE

THE KING JAMES VERSION

The King James Bible is the supreme literary monument of our English tongue. It retains much of the rhythm of the original Hebrew plus the idiomatic vigor of the Anglo-Saxon. Fortunately it was translated at the precise moment when our English speech was most virile and colorful. In the days of Chaucer and Spenser the language was still unformed. Later centuries have greatly enriched it in scientific and philosophical words, but the additions have been largely technical and abstract, the vocabulary of the study. The King James version was translated in the days of Shakespeare and Milton. It was a time of tremendous events. Men lived close to revolutionary movements in thought and deed. Life was real, speech was vigorous, words were picturesque and sentences were metaphors.

The translators availed themselves liberally of the previous work of William Tyndale, whose avowed purpose was to make his translation so plain that a plowboy could understand it. Therefore he used the simple Anglo-Saxon speech of the common people for whom he wrote. Knowing that he was introducing into his country a power that would revolutionize both church and state, he toiled under a sense of immense responsibility. He had a gift for the expressive word and the shadow of impending martyrdom gave to him utter sincerity.

The makers of the revised version were doubtless more learned than the early translators, and their readings are nearer the original text, because they had more manuscripts at their command. But they were not so familiar with the idiom of the people, neither did they have the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

apostolic zeal of the men who braved death for their work. In academic leisure they performed their tasks in the spirit of scholars, not of missionaries. In consequence the language of the revision is more accurate, more abstract, less terse and vital than that used by men who stood at a crisis of history, realizing that the rendering of a text might light the fires of revolution.

THEOLOGY IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE
DOUGLAS CLYDE MACINTOSH

THEOLOGY IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE

DOUGLAS CLYDE MACINTOSH

HE who would be a minister of religion in these or any future days should not forget that he is to do his work in an increasingly scientific age. It has become a commonplace of speech to refer to the period in which we live as an age of science. The characterization is doubtless true, so long as we are comparing the present with the past; what a future and still more scientific age may think of us and our achievements is another question. Our own generation has not only witnessed the discovery of more new truths through scientific investigation than any individual can master; we are also in the daily enjoyment of countless benefits due to the practical application of scientific knowledge. Moreover, the modern mind is thoroughly accustomed to the appeal to experience for the testing of opinion and the proof of truth, and theoretically at least it is committed to the method of induction on the basis of observation and experiment. Indeed by insensible degrees there has grown up an almost religious faith in science as the all-sufficient means of human self-realization, if not also the worthiest end of human devotion.

Perhaps our age is not really as scientific as it thinks it is, however. The scientist is necessarily a specialist, and his right to speak authoritatively in the name of

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

science is confined to his own limited field of investigation. Outside of his own narrow domain his judgment is quite likely to be unscientific opinion, and even within his own field his beliefs are commonly made up in large part of unverified speculations and guesses, including philosophical interpretations which are in the nature of the case incapable of verification within the limited field of his particular science. A very large proportion of what is popularly appealed to as the teaching of science is nothing but the unscientific opinions and dogmatic utterances of individuals who are in a small part of their thinking really scientific. It would be truer to say that ours is not so much a scientific as a pro-scientific age.

And just as truly as it is pro-scientific is it anti-theological. It is an age which is accustomed to think and speak scornfully of theology and all theologians. The reaction is not simply against the older theological method; it is to a great extent against the fundamental aim and the essential content of theology. The very attempt to have a self-consistent system of religious beliefs is resented. Not all who join in the hue and cry against theology would be ready to disavow all religious interest. Indeed there are those who would make their protest against theology in the name of religion; it is in the interest of freedom for their own religious life that they desire to be rid of all systems of doctrine, those chains and fetters upon the life of the spirit. And yet, while this passionate desire for emancipation commands our sympathy, a little attention to the organic relation between theology and religion reveals the fact that any final and uncom-

THEOLOGY IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE

promising revolt against theology must come to be a rejection of religion itself.

I do not mean to imply that religion is the result of indoctrination with a theological system. It would be much truer to say that religion creates theology than to say that theology creates religion. But theology is not created by religion without a purpose; it is not a mere useless by-product. The function of theology in religion is threefold, like that of ideas in life generally. It serves to express and communicate feeling, to represent reality and to guide action. Theological forms of thought and speech may be used in the expression of religious feeling, but this does not mean that they are mere metaphorical symbols of subjective states of consciousness. Theological belief serves to guide and control certain attitudes of will, thus coming to be ultimately a factor in human conduct and the development of society; but this does not mean that theological ideas are mere temporary, practical devices, enabling the individual or the social group to adjust itself to its changing environment, that this is their whole significance. Theological judgments claim to be representations of the nature of a reality upon which man is conscious of being ultimately dependent, and if these representations are to function acceptably as expressions of religious feeling and as guides in practical life, it is essential that they be believed to be correct representations, as far as they go, even if they are necessarily incomplete. Man cannot disbelieve in the existence of a Being such as theological ideas claim to represent and at the same time use these ideas in such a way as to conserve for him the benefits of religious experience. We deceive ourselves

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

if we imagine that we can keep religion permanently and let theology go. As well might we expect to keep the use of electricity unimpaired and to develop it further, while giving up all thought about electricity and all knowledge of its laws.

As a matter of fact already in our own day in many instances the giving up of theology has led to a very noticeable departure from religion. I am speaking of religion here in the common understanding of the term, as involving a conscious relation to a superhuman Reality. The loss of religion, in this common historical sense of the term, is often camouflaged by the simple device of retaining the name "religion" but applying it either to the appreciation of social values in general or to elements of the spiritual life other than the distinctively religious, such as morality, or devotion to science or art. There need be no quarrel about the ultimate importance of social well-being or as to the absolute value of truth, beauty and moral goodness as human ideals; nor need we object to an extension of the meaning of the historic term "religion" such as would make it include self-devotion to such absolute values or divine ideals. Indeed in the present situation there may be some very good reasons for such a widening of the significance of the term and for recognizing that in religion there is nothing more fundamental or essential than spiritual aspiration, especially when made instrumental to social as well as individual development. But the point which needs emphasis in these days of so much lax and easy-going liberalism is just this, that adjustment to a superhuman Reality or Power upon which we are dependent and with which we have to do

THEOLOGY IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE

is also an essential and the most characteristic element of religion. And it is for religion in this sense, if it is not to be a mere blind, instinctive groping, that a systematically thought-out theology is essential as an instrument.

But along with this fundamental claim that a theology of some sort is religiously essential, it is important to add that this theology must be, like science, adequately methodical and progressive. It must be ready to revise the formulas of the past in the light of further experience and reflection. There is always a danger in departing from the standards of the past, for the new experience is sometimes not so deep as the old, and the thinking of the modern man is not necessarily more logical than that of those who have gone before him. All this is as true in science as in theology. But what must be insisted on is the possibility of progress in theology as well as in science, the equal right of the theologian to investigate religious experience for himself and to formulate the results of his investigations according to the most approved logical methods. We have not yet reached a time when all this may be taken for granted. We live in a day of panicky reaction to the dogmatism of the past and of an almost incredibly wilful refusal to admit the possibility of the discovery of new truth in the religious realm.

It may be well in this connection to be more explicit. Commemorating as we are this year the hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Yale Divinity School, we remember that not more than a decade ago there appeared a volume marking the centennial of another well-known eastern theological institution, containing a sermon by

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

the president of the seminary in which occurred these remarkable words:

I do not for a moment deny that there may be a place in the world for an institution the professors of which work in the unhampered exercise of their judgment in the search for theological truth; but in the nature of the case the seminary which is ecclesiastical in its origin and relationships and which does its work under the rubric of confessional standards cannot have that sort of freedom. P—— Theological Seminary, as you all know, is the creature of the Presbyterian General Assembly, and is committed by the terms of its constitution to the propagation and defence of the Reformed Theology. . . . P——'s boast, if she have reason to boast at all, is her unswerving fidelity to the theology of the Reformation. *Semper eadem* is a motto that would well befit her. The theological position of P—— Seminary is exactly the same to-day as it was a hundred years ago.

Well might the speaker admit, half-apologetically, that this might seem like "a strange statement to make about a living institution in this very progressive age."

It is indeed a strange statement; it is amazing. Just how irrational the attitude is which these quotations reveal may be realized when we reflect that it was exactly the same attitude which the medieval scholastics took toward the authority of Aristotle in physical science, and that it was necessary to break away from this attitude of servility toward external authority before there could take place those marvelous advances in the physical sciences which have been made since that time. *The laws of logic do not become different when we pass from the physical to the religious.* All knowledge of reality is dependent upon experience and inductive and deductive

THEOLOGY IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE

thinking. This is not to deny revelation; rather is it to affirm it. In normal physical experience there is revelation of physical reality, the world, and in normal religious experience there is revelation, we would maintain, of religious reality, God. And as the task of physical science is to generalize on the basis of experience of the physical, to formulate laws of nature and ultimately a reasonable theory as to the character of the natural world, so it is the task of a scientific theology to generalize on the basis of experience of the revealed divine Reality, to formulate laws of the divine activity and ultimately a reasonable theory as to the nature of the divine Reality.

This, it should be stated, is not quite the way in which the task of theology has been commonly understood, even among progressive theologians. Most of those who have departed from dogmatic traditionalism in theology may be classified as either rationalists or subjectivists. For the rationalist—the term is used here in the strict sense—theology is just speculative philosophy. No special dependence is placed upon either religious tradition on the one hand or religious experience on the other. By purely rational argument on the basis of universally evident first principles, it is claimed, the clear and consistent thinker, be he religious or be he irreligious, can demonstrate with absolute precision and certainty all that man either can know or needs to know concerning God, freedom and immortality. Theology of this rationalistic or speculative brand sets itself up as self-dependent, requiring nothing at the hands of experiential religion. On the contrary it poses as the patron and even the savior of religion. In the speculative idealism of Hegel and his followers we have a

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

very good illustration of this rationalistic theological method.

The votaries of this method claim too much. If the essential doctrines of religion can be demonstrated in mathematical fashion, is it not strange that the proofs have failed to gain anything like the universal assent which the deductive demonstrations of mathematics command? Indeed, when the so-called "speculative proofs" of philosophical and theological doctrine are examined with due impartiality and critical care, they are seen to be shot through and through with logical fallacy; there is either a more or less disguised begging of the question, or else one or more fallacies in inference before the desired theological conclusion is arrived at. The present plight of speculative philosophy and theology forms a good commentary, and one easy to read, on the statements just made. Before long these speculative disciplines will have found their place, no doubt, along with astrology and phrenology and other pseudo-sciences and futilities of thought. It is only what was to have been expected if a purely speculative theology ends in failure. The discovery or proof of the truth about reality is not to be looked for apart from experience. There is a place in science for deductive reasoning, for speculation; but its place is simply in the consistent development of a theory, the explication of what is involved in a hypothesis, the discovery of logical *possibilities*. For the discovery of *reality* the hypothesis thus understood must be acted upon in adjustment to reality; it must be used as a *working* hypothesis and there must be *verification*. It is the great defect of the purely speculative or rationalistic method, whether in

THEOLOGY IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE

science or philosophy or theology, that it seeks to discover the nature of the reality in question without seeking experience of that reality. It finds its model in pure mathematics, where absolute certainty is reached without having to encounter the embarrassing opposition of empirical fact. Verily, they who choose this "royal road" to learning, who evolve their "arm-chair philosophies," have their reward; they do get absolute certainty, but what is such certainty worth? It is not certainty as to what the reality *is*; it is only a hypothetical certainty, a certainty as to what a reality *might be*, or *would be*, if certain assumptions could be taken as true. Speculative philosophy or theology is a mere playing with ideas, instead of getting to work by grappling with facts. It accomplishes about as much as the workman does by feeling his muscles. So far as knowledge of man or the world or God is concerned, it is bound to fail, no matter how consistent its deductions, just because it stops short of verification.

The other method employed among progressive theologians does not fail to appeal to experience, and to religious experience at that. It would have theology be primarily and essentially the expression of the religious experience of the subject, whether that subject be thought of as the single religious individual or the psychologically unified religious community. But there are more ways than one, conceivably, whereby propositions may be the expression of subjective states. The psychological connection between the experience and the proposition may be there, either with or without logical justification. And we may group together as unduly subjective all those types of modern theology which, while consciously shaped to

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

be the expression of present religious experience, fail to fulfil the ideal of verifying the theological propositions.

Of such unduly subjective theology there are three main types. First, there is mystical theology. This is a more or less systematic presentation of doctrines suggested with a high degree of subjective assurance by a very special type of religious experience, a mystical state of rapt contemplation and ecstasy in which—in the most characteristic form of mysticism, at least—God seems to be not only real but the only reality. The tendency is toward pantheism rather than theism of the Christian type. Moreover, the certitude is simply psychological rather than logical. It is produced by a special psychical state akin to self-hypnosis; its doctrine is not proved in any logical or scientific sense. It appeals to experience, but it fails to show that the experience it appeals to is not to a great extent illusory. There is great practical value in the mystic's certitude in so far as it is subjective assurance of what is indeed true; but the trouble with the mystic is that he is so absolutely sure of so much that simply is not so! Nor is it enough to have the characteristic doctrines of the mystic arranged in a self-consistent philosophical system. The mystical doctrines may not contradict each other, but they may be contradicted by the experiences of everyday practical life, including those involved in moral action and moral practical religion. Thus the doctrines that there is only one Being, *viz.*, God, that God is perfectly good and that there is no evil, are mutually consistent propositions, but they are in part contradicted by the practical experiences of human self-activity and religious dependence, by the empirical facts

THEOLOGY IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE

of sin and salvation. The mystical doctrine, in spite of its dependence upon religious experience, is partly erroneous, refuted by the facts of life, and the characteristic certitude of the more extreme mysticism is, notwithstanding its subjective intensity, to a considerable extent illusory and mistaken. This is not to deny that there is great potential value for theology, both for its content and for its certainty, in the mystical phase of experimental religion. It simply means that a critical and discriminating attitude must be taken toward the assertions and assurances of the mystic. Let the subjectively assured convictions of the mystic be tested by being used as working hypotheses in practical everyday living, particularly in the practical religion of dependence upon God for deliverance from sin and enhanced achievement in the moral life, and let those mystical doctrines be regarded as refuted which do not stand this test, and those as being progressively verified which do. The great virtue of "the mystic way" in theology is its recourse to religious experience, but the great defect of the merely mystical method is its undue subjectivity, its failure to provide for an adequate objective verification. It does not recognize sufficiently the great importance, even in the religious realm, of scientific procedure.

A second type of subjective theology is that associated with the names of Schleiermacher and Ritschl. This is the so-called "theology of the Christian consciousness," the systematic formulation of the judgments which express the Christian type of the feeling of absolute dependence, *i.e.*, the religious consciousness first achieved in its fullness by the historic Jesus and preserved in the vitally re-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

ligious Christian fellowship, the church within the church; or, to use the Ritschlian terminology, it is the theology made up of, or derived from, religious value-judgments, particularly those which embody and agree with the Christian religious evaluation of the historic Jesus.

Now I have no desire to underestimate the great value of this type of theology or the importance of its positive contribution to modern religious thought and life. In selecting an essentially "Christocentric" theology as true, I believe these thinkers have chosen wisely and rightly; but have they *shown*, on sufficiently critical grounds, that this is so? They have retained the good and vital essence of the Christian tradition, while freeing themselves from the spirit and method of traditionalism. They are clear as to the distinction between "Biblical theology" and a systematic or constructive Christian theology. They see that the former, for the modern mind, can never be more than *history*, a very important part of the history of religion; it is not *theology* in the constructive sense at all, even if the teacher of Biblical theology may also be, incidentally, a constructive theologian.

But the procedure of the followers of Schleiermacher and Ritschl in constructive theology itself is not wholly satisfactory. They commonly favor the threefold division of systematic theology into Christian apologetics, Christian dogmatics and Christian ethics. Christian apologetics they treat under two main heads, the essence of the Christian religion and the truth of the Christian religion. In their attempt to set forth the permanently vital essence of the Christian religion they may be said to have achieved conspicuous success and to have made important contri-

THEOLOGY IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE

butions to the Christianity of to-day, in spite of the incompleteness of individual statements, like that of Harnack. But they have not been so clear as to just why these elements are to be regarded as belonging to the essence of Christianity, nor can their defense of the truth of the Christian religion be accepted as at all adequate. The fact that these selected doctrinal elements do not contradict modern science and so may be believed as theoretically permissible, is not sufficient to establish them as either essential or true, nor is it enough to point out that they accord with the Christian feeling and appreciation of value. It is just this Christian feeling and appreciation which we want to see defended and objectively justified. To say that the theological judgments are safe from scientific attack because they are knowledge in some other, non-scientific sense of the word, is to play fast and loose with logic; and to refuse, as the Ritschlians do, to bring together the doctrines of theology and the results of the sciences in a comprehensive and systematic philosophy of Reality, is to leave unattempted one of the most obvious tasks of apologetics and to give the impression that such a theology is too fragile to stand the rough handling which the undertaking would involve. The Christian who already feels subjectively convinced that a certain religious content is the essence of Christianity, and that this essence is true, may find it fairly satisfactory to be assured that the enemy cannot show that his faith is mistaken; his satisfaction is similar to that of the Kantian theist who reflects that while he cannot prove that there is a God, neither can the atheist prove that there is not. But the Ritschlian apologetic is found weak and wanting

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

when there is thought of commending the Christian faith on objective rational grounds to those who do not already share the conviction that it is true.

It is much the same criticism which we have to make when we consider the "Christian dogmatics" of this school of thought. The main objection to be made here is precisely this, that the theology is just *dogmatics*; from the logical point of view it is too subjective and dogmatic. The theological statements are brought under the norm of the collective Christian consciousness, it is true, but, so far as appears from the method, the Hindu or Mohammedan theologian has an equal right to measure his dogmatics by the consciousness of his own religious fellowship and to proclaim it as true. It is what is subjectively impressed, dogmatically expressed. Nor is the subjectivity or dogmatism wholly relieved when appeal is made to history as a norm. When the character and spirit of the historic Jesus is taken as normative for the Christian view of God, the consequences may be far-reaching and important, but what the critically-minded will want to know is on exactly what logical grounds this procedure itself is to be justified. Even when, as with Troeltsch, appeal is made not to Christian history alone but universally to the history of religion, and then, on the basis of a critical philosophy of history, the Christian religion is selected as the one which happens to be best suited to our modern Western culture, there remains the question whether, granting its *relative* justification, an essentially Christian theology is absolutely or *really* true.

What is lacking in this whole procedure is a logical verification of the fundamental hypotheses of Christian

THEOLOGY IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE

faith, parallel with the verification of working hypotheses in the recognized sciences. And in most cases there is lacking also the reassurance which would result from finally vindicating this scientifically stated theological theory by showing that it fits in with the results of other sciences in a comprehensive and reasonable theory of Reality. In spite then of its twofold merit—its making religious experience normative and its happy choice of what is (in our opinion) essentially the right form of religious experience to make normative—this theological method fails to make explicit provision for the logical verification of its propositions. It does not go beyond the self-consistent formulation of hypotheses *suggested* by a certain selected variety of religious feeling. These hypotheses are not presented as verified in the world of real events. That is why we must reluctantly condemn this type of theology as undesirably subjective and dogmatic.

In recent times a third method, making fundamental reference to experience, has appeared, *viz.*, the method of religious pragmatism. Here appeal is made to the practical results of religion and its theology in life as a basis for regarding the theology as true. By taking as its norm practical value—something universally appreciated—it is thought to overcome the narrow dogmatism of arbitrarily assuming at the outset that one's theology must necessarily express the *Christian* religious consciousness, or be essentially Christocentric. A pragmatic theology may turn out to be essentially Christian, but it is felt to be unscientific to assume at the beginning that it *must* be so. We must wait and see.

As a matter of fact, however, there have been three

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

main types of religious pragmatism, and if we are to do justice to the pragmatic method it will be necessary to distinguish them. In the first place, there is an extremely conservative pragmatism, which would find in such practical value and particularly in such moral value as a religion with its traditional system of doctrine may have had, a sufficient reason for accepting the system as a whole as being true. Pragmatism in this sense of the word has been made an apologetic for widely divergent doctrinal systems, such as Roman Catholicism on the one hand and Protestant orthodoxy on the other. But the fallacious nature of this procedure is readily detected. On the basis of the somewhat ambiguous major premise, "Truth has practical value," and the undisputed minor premise, "This system has been shown to have practical value," the conclusion is drawn, "This system is true"—an obvious instance of the fallacy of an "undistributed middle term." Or, if it be insisted that the major premise is, "Whatever has practical value is true," it may be pointed out that this statement is derived from the proposition, "Truth has practical value," by fallacious conversion, or else is a more than doubtful doctrine arbitrarily presupposed.

At the opposite extreme from these reactionary pragmatists are the radicals, who interpret pragmatism as meaning that truth *is* nothing more nor less than the practical value of ideas, so that, given the practical value of a theological idea in a particular situation, we can say that it is true in that situation, while in a different situation it may very well be untrue. From this point of view it is claimed that there is no need to raise such questions as whether the theology is permanently true, or whether it

THEOLOGY IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE

is universally true, whether it is true in the sense of correctly representing any reality, or whether indeed there is any really existent God for the theology to represent. Of course this type of pragmatism gives up the whole problem of theology, not only in the sense in which we are concerned with it here, but also in the sense in which it has always engaged attention in sincere and earnest experimental religion. A theology true only in the sense in which an atheist might admit it to be true, *viz.*, as a system of temporarily useful symbols, but not necessarily as having any permanent validity, is neither true nor theology to the believer in a really existent God.

Both of these extreme forms of religious pragmatism have the merit not only of appealing to experience as a test of truth, but of directing attention to the moral religious experience, an experience of the value of religion for morality, as the experience in which the truth of theology should be tested. In this, as well as in avoiding—or at least the attempt to avoid—the fundamental dogmatism of the other subjective methods, they may be said to show progress. But in most other respects they are immeasurably inferior to those other methods. Religiously and logically they are extremely superficial. If religious pragmatism is to make good its claim to be more satisfactory than older methods, it must become more self-critical and find a position somewhere between the two extremes to which we have referred.

Theoretically, there might be a critically and really religious pragmatism undertaking to construct a theology on the principle that we have a right to believe that theology true which best serves the religion which best

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

serves the morality which best serves human well-being. Of course, logically considered, this involves a tremendously optimistic assumption; but still it *might* be true, so far as we know, and if we can be sufficiently optimistic we can believe that it is true. It becomes at once evident, however, that this most defensible of the three forms of religious pragmatism is far from achieving logical verification for its doctrines. Even if its task were successfully completed and known to be completed, its doctrines would be verified only hypothetically, *i.e.*, on the supposition that a certain highly optimistic doctrine is true. A merely pragmatic method in theology must therefore in any case be included among those which are too subjective to be completely satisfactory. But another criticism remains to be made. Even assuming the underlying optimistic principle of critical religious pragmatism to be true, a little reflection will show how extremely difficult it would be to apply it with any high degree of assurance. Theoretically we should have to consider the function of ideas in religious experience, the function of religious experience in moral conduct and the relation of moral conduct to the general welfare of individuals and of societies, in each case both universally and permanently. Strictly speaking, the ideal is one that cannot be fully realized, and even its approximate fulfilment would involve researches of appalling magnitude. For which reason a practical method for theology can hardly be said to have been discovered in even this most critical and defensible form of religious pragmatism.

Thus not only have all three methods of religious pragmatism proved disappointing; the same may be said of

THEOLOGY IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE

all three of the more general forms of the method of appealing to religious experience, *viz.*, the mystical and the Christocentric, as well as the pragmatic. They are all unduly subjective, failing to appeal to experience in such a way as to secure logical verification. Moreover, we have now examined the three principal types of theological method, the traditionalistic, the rationalistic and the subjective. The traditionalistic method would make sure of retaining the values of the past, but to do this it would enslave the thought of the present. The rationalistic and subjective methods would permit individuals and the religious community to experience and think for themselves, but while the rationalist emphasizes independent thinking he does not take the knowledge-value of religious experience seriously enough, and the subjectivist, while impressed with the importance of religious experience, does not think through to the end in a logical, scientific manner.

The results of our critical survey of the various recognized types of theological method may seem very negative and discouraging. But the final outcome of criticism is often more constructive than its earlier promise. We are well on our way toward knowing how to do what we have to do, when we have learned what to avoid when we make the attempt. We have criticized the religio-empirical or subjective methods, but this was for their subjectivity, not because they started from religious experience. Let us begin on the basis of religious experience and see if it may not be possible to avoid undue subjectivity. Again, we criticized religious pragmatism, not as being, in its most critical form, probably untrue, but because it was difficult to apply practically; and inadequate theoretically,

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

since it failed to distinguish working-unto-verification from the desirable practical working of ideas in general. Let us take, then, the empirical sciences as our model, since they have succeeded in making this distinction, and let us undertake to make our theology the one which humanity needs by making it the theology which can be shown to be true. If we were to achieve this, we could retain on a critical scientific basis the religious certitude of the mystic, in so far as the suggestions of the mystical experience are capable of verification in the practical religious life. Moreover, we could also vindicate, we may well believe, the universal validity of the Christocentric theology, which remains merely subjective and dogmatic in the systems of Schleiermacher and Ritschl.

The proposal to make theology fundamentally scientific should not be dismissed as chimerical. There is nothing esoteric about scientific method; it is simply logical thinking under the guidance of experience. It is modelled upon common sense, and differs from ordinary, haphazard thinking in being more careful and orderly and expert, and consequently more successful. The scientist is simply one who is an expert observer and thinker in some special field or fields of investigation. Scientific technique is a perfectly transparent device or set of devices for economizing thought and utilizing experience. Reduced to its lowest terms science may be said to be made up of theories and presuppositions. Presuppositions may be general or special. The general presuppositions include such axioms and laws of thought and previously established scientific results as may bear upon the particular investigation. The special presuppositions, or data, include the particu-

THEOLOGY IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE

lar facts under investigation, either presented in their bare immediacy or as represented by memory or the testimony of others, or as included with similar facts in generalized descriptions, or laws. Viewed just as propositions, whether true or not, all theories, generalizations and assertions of supposed fact are hypotheses. Hypotheses which "logically follow," or may be deductively inferred from other hypotheses, we may call minor hypotheses, those from which they may be inferred being, relatively speaking, major hypotheses. Now while deduction involves proceeding from major hypotheses to minor hypotheses, induction involves proceeding from minor hypotheses to major hypotheses, first by suggestion and constructive imagination, and then, to test the new major hypothesis, by reversing the process, inferring other minor hypotheses and comparing them with admitted "presuppositions," *i.e.*, either with already established descriptions or with newly observed facts. If the minor hypothesis contradicts the presuppositions (data included), it is refuted and its major hypothesis is at the same time discredited. If on the other hand the minor hypothesis agrees with the data and other presuppositions in such a way as to be verified, its major hypothesis must not be held to be fully verified unless it is the only admissible major hypothesis from which the minor hypothesis could have been inferred. It may be said to be partially verified, however, in the sense that it is accredited further as a legitimate working hypothesis.

Since then science is in its essence simply the only logical way of learning the truth about reality by means of experience, if religious experience has value for knowledge of God, a scientific theology must be possible. Given

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

logical thinking, the one further essential is a dependable religious experience. If there is any valid and dependable experimental religion, or in other words if there is a God who can be depended upon for any result in human life on condition of man's right religious adjustment, then a scientific theology is possible. The responsibility rests ultimately just where it ought to rest, on the ultimate nature of Reality, upon the ultimate Object of religious dependence and upon religion as a universally practicable attitude toward that Object. It does not depend upon some chance contact with some particular dogma of tradition, nor upon the ingenuity of the speculative reason, nor upon some individual peculiarity of constitution or temperament. If, for instance, there is a universally available experience of moral and spiritual salvation on condition of a certain religious adjustment, then there is an adequate basis for a scientific generalization as to the operation of a certain dependable religious Factor, which Factor, whether we can learn anything further about it or not, is on the one hand the real God of experimental religion and on the other hand an object of scientific knowledge. The theological method we are suggesting was, when first advocated in print in the author's *Theology as an Empirical Science*, condemned by one critic as "ill-advised," apparently on the ground that it is bound to fail and "the attempt but not the deed confounds us." But this will be the necessary result only if religious experience be necessarily illusory; only if the object of religious dependence be unable to stand the test of a practical experimental attitude on man's part. But even if this were the case, would it not be well to know it? Even on this supposition the

THEOLOGY IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE

procedure by which the truth was made scientifically known could scarcely be regarded as ill-advised. On the contrary supposition, which religious experience seems well able to justify, much of the content of theological theory may still continue to be of the nature of working hypothesis, *i.e.*, of practical working faith, but a part of it will be empirically verified, and thus theology will have become a science. There will be a nucleus of verified knowledge, of science, at the heart of reasonable faith.

This placing of theology on a scientific basis will solve at the same time the main problem of apologetics. Medieval theology was on reasonably good terms with medieval science, but in modern times theology has been fighting science. This is because so much of theology has remained medieval while science has been making rapid progress. For theology this has meant a series of ignominious defeats in a still more ignominious warfare. From first to last it has been for the older dogmatic theology and its apologetics mainly a losing struggle. If any one has doubts on this matter, let him read Andrew D. White's *History of the Warfare between Science and Theology*. And yet the defeats of the old dogmatic are clearing the way for the triumphs of a true and more scientific theology. The religious man has been learning to let science have its way in the whole realm of experience and possible knowledge. This does not mean that the individual scientist should always be permitted to have his way. Scientists are often mistaken even in their own field, and the dogmatism and blunders of men of science, when they step outside of their own narrow province into fields belonging to other sciences or into the broad realm of metaphysics,

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

are notorious. Many natural scientists, for instance, have been materialists, but their materialism has never been science; on the contrary it is always a metaphysical dogma. But genuine science should always be given free course. In astronomy, in geology, in biology, in anthropology, in psychology, including the psychology of religion, in sociology, in historical criticism even when applied to the sacred books of religion, let there be the most rigid application of approved scientific methods. In all these realms it is coming to be seen that an earnest seeking of the truth, not a stubborn defense of preconceptions, is not only the more scientific but also the more religious course. But the final triumph of the scientific spirit among the friends of religion will come when religious thinking itself—*i.e.*, thinking about God and not simply about religion—becomes fundamentally scientific. This will mean the solution of the two main problems of apologetics, the problem of the essence of the Christian religion and the problem of its truth. On the one hand the vital essence of the Christian religion will tend to be identified with that in historic and traditional Christianity which is able to stand, in a positive way, the test of scientific method, while on the other hand, in its becoming scientific the truth of this essence will have been amply vindicated. Of course there will be some negative results as well as those that are positive; what is superstitious and thus clearly non-essential will have to go, if that which is essential is to be revealed as true and impregnable. But in its negations as truly as in its affirmations, true science will always be the friend of true religion.

As a matter of fact the older method in apologetics has

THEOLOGY IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE

been discredited for some time, and that to a great extent inside the church as well as outside. Instead of apologetics we now speak of the philosophy of religion. This important and relatively new branch of philosophy, like philosophy in general, may be viewed as consisting of two main divisions or types, the one critical and the other metaphysical. Critical philosophy of religion is concerned with an estimate of the value of religion not only for life in general but for knowledge in particular. This problem of religious knowledge is perhaps the most crucial problem of the philosophy of religion; it involves both a consideration of the concept of revelation, or, in other words, of the discovery of a divine Reality in and through the experiences of religion at its best, and on the other hand a discussion of the whole question of theological method. The metaphysical part of the philosophy of religion is concerned with the philosophical formulation of a religious theory of reality. If in the critical philosophy of religion the knowledge-value of religious experience and of a logically constructed theology has been vindicated, the metaphysical part of the philosophy of religion will have as its task the synthesis of the laws and theory of this empirical theology with the laws and theories of other sciences in a comprehensive and self-consistent theory of reality. This will mean a mutual service between theology and metaphysics. Each will suggest hypotheses to be tried out for verification in the other. Thus metaphysics may expect to gain both in the spiritual richness of its content and in the empirical verification of its religious speculations, while theology may look for a better understanding of the relation of God to the world and to man, as well

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

as for the reassurance involved in successfully meeting the final metaphysical examination. This is what the Ritschlians sacrifice when they reject a metaphysical development of theology.

But while it is true that the philosophy of religion has largely displaced the theological discipline of apologetics, this does not mean that a defense of religion is now confined to technical philosophy. There is ample room for popular arguments for religion in general and for Christian faith in particular. Such common-sense considerations as William James and others have adduced in vindication of "the right to believe" have value for the initial determination of an attitude, to say the least. A good argument for some of the most essential features of Christianity may also be found by drawing out what is logically involved in a healthy moral optimism, *i.e.*, in such an attitude as would recognize the existence of evil but would maintain the faith that no absolute or final disaster can befall the person whose will is steadfastly devoted to the ideal of the good and the right—that "no evil can befall the good man, in life or in death." A popular apologetic of this sort may be a practical substitute for a more technical philosophy of religion, and may even make its contribution to such a philosophy.

In bringing this discussion to an end it may be well to mention a criticism that will probably be made against our position. It will be objected, perhaps, that the attempt to formulate theology as an empirical science would lead to an overintellectualizing of religion, whereas normal religion is not primarily a matter of intellect but of inner feeling and practical life. This is a criticism which is only

THEOLOGY IN A SCIENTIFIC AGE

superficially plausible. Our procedure is not the "high and dry *a priori* road" of rationalistic speculation. That supposedly royal road to religious knowledge bears for us the sign, "No thoroughfare." Our appeal is to religious experience, and without vital inner religion manifesting itself in practical effects the whole undertaking we have advocated must collapse. Besides, while religion is not primarily a matter of intellect, it is no more anti-intellectual or non-intellectual than human life in general. It has its intellectual phase. Moreover, it should not be forgotten—least of all should he who would be a minister of religion in our day forget—not only that the present age is in a very real sense an age of science, but that many of the problems which religion must face are occasioned by this fact. It is not too much to say that the present religious crisis is fundamentally a crisis in religious thinking; its problems are intellectual problems. Among a vast number of the educated and the half-educated, religion languishes because of intellectual doubts and skepticism. Religious doubt to-day is radically different from what it was in the older Protestantism. There the truth of the Christian religion was unquestioned, the only uncertainty being as to whether the individual could have a justifiable expectation of gaining the benefits of that religion. Present-day doubt is more fundamental; it questions the truth of the Christian religion and of all religion. But a new day will dawn, not for faith alone, but for religious assurance and knowledge, when once the truth is grasped that in Christian religious experience at its best there are available the most important data for a fundamentally scientific theol-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

ogy, *i.e.*, for a true and verified knowledge of God. Once theology has thus fully adapted itself to this modern age of science, religion will be in a position, more than ever before, to come into its own.

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

HENRY HALLAM TWEEDY

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

HENRY HALLAM TWEEDY

THERE is a widespread impression abroad that worship is on the decline. The spiritual health of the ordinary church service is viewed as weak and anaemic. At times its pulse seems to be so low that the only fitting sacrament is that of extreme unction, and the wail of the mourners, too many of whom are strangers and hirelings, is heard in the land. In the press, religious and secular, the jeremiads of ecclesiastical pessimists appear side by side with the prescriptions of spiritual physicians. Charges of coldness, deadness, formalism, superstition and stupidity are flung at both ministers and congregations, while here and there the enemy lifts his head in triumph, and exults because at last religion—for when worship goes, religion will go also—is about to vanish from the land.

Nor is the experience with the ordinary congregation assuring. There are reasons for suspecting that the minister faces more auditors than worshippers. Many of them are being sung to rather than singing, prayed for rather than praying, and pleased or bored by a sermon, not always an aid to worship, which they have no intention of following. Even when they take part in the ritual, it is an open question as to how many actually mean what they say.

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Day is dying in the west,
Heaven is touching earth with rest,

has been sung at a morning service with no sense of impropriety. Too many choirs are made up of hired performers who make no pretense of being true ministers in music. They do not use melody as the preacher uses words, to save men. The purpose of their "performance" is to impart pleasure for pay. Even those composed of professing Christians err occasionally. One such body of singers startled a visiting clergyman by chanting melodiously that bitter, vengeful cry:

O daughter of Babylon, that art to be destroyed;
Happy shall he be that rewardeth thee
As thou hast served us.
Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones
Against the rocks.

Nor are all leaders of worship blameless. Dr. Lyman Abbott tells us of an ordination service at which the moderator, after a long sermon and an equally long charge to the people, arose and said, "In order to relieve the tedium of these exercises, we will sing the fifty-fifth hymn"—"and also," he added after a pause, "to the praise and glory of Almighty God." That was a very fortunate addition. Singing "Nearer, my God, to Thee" merely as a means of relieving physical weariness and intellectual boredom does not strike one as a worshipful exercise. The only effect upon the congregation would be to increase their devotional indifference and to train them in hypocrisy. The charge may be false, but the impression is certainly made by certain ministers that the one pearl of great price

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

in the entire service is the sermon; that when this has been prepared, their supreme task is practically over; and that the other parts are negligible preliminaries to be extemporized on the spur of the moment. Meanwhile, some saintly souls are puzzled and a bit discouraged as they dream rosy dreams of an imaginary past in which worship flourished, and lament the passing of what they regard religiously as the golden age.

This brings up at once the question as to whether the past reveals any golden age of worship. If there is a decline in true devotion, from just what heights has it fallen, and according to what standards shall we measure the decline? A glance at history proves at once that any such Utopia of worship is merely a roseate fiction. Whatever lamentations regarding the present may be poured out upon us, there never has been a generation which was inwardly or outwardly more religious, never a period when there were not wails in abundance in regard to the spiritual condition of the Church.

Just when was this era in which deep and sincere devotion flourished and the mumblings of formalism were drowned by the chorus of praise? Not in the times of the prophets; for they inveighed against the religious worthlessness and even immorality of Israel's new moons and appointed feasts. Not in the days of Chrysostom and Augustine; for the great preacher himself tells us that the noisy throngs who filled his church would not be quiet during the worship, but chatted about the games and their business, made bargains and indulged in boisterous laughter, until the deacons had to take their stand by the pulpit and cry "Silence!" when the sermon was about to begin.

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Not during the Reformation, when John Calvin exclaimed: "The future appals me. I dare not think of it. Unless the Lord descends from heaven, barbarism will engulf us." A century later Samuel Pepys records in his *Diary* hearing a sermon on the bad state of the Church, and promises to buy a book entitled *The Causes of the Decay of Piety*. Not in the days of Baxter and Bunyan, when the preachers in the royal chapels were too often sycophants and place-hunters, while the preachers in the country were servile dependents upon the local squires. The vicar who preceded Baxter at Kidderminster was quite as ignorant and scandalous in character as the people of that famous parish. In the neighboring churches one curate was a faggot-cutter and another a rope-maker, "their abilities," as Baxter tells us, "being answerable to their studies and employment." Not in the Georgian period, of which Thackeray could write: "As I peep into George II's St. James, I see . . . that godless old king yawning under his canopy in the chapel royal as the chaplain before him is discoursing. Whilst the chaplain is preaching, the king is chattering in German almost as loud as the preacher; so loud that the clergyman actually burst out crying in the pulpit, because the defender of the faith and the dispenser of bishoprics would not listen to him. No wonder that the clergy were corrupt and indifferent amidst this indifference and corruption." Whenever one is tempted to be pessimistic about the present, truth and sanity may be recovered by studying the past. Professor Gilbert Murray, of Oxford, tells us that one of the oldest clay tablets found in the excavations of Babylon begins, "Alas! alas! times are not what they were!" Whatever

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

the shortcomings of our age, it is not a day in which men carouse around the communion table, or fly falcons during service, or bless daggers which are to be used in a massacre; or when ministers "exclaim merrily," as the Bishop of Dunkeld did at the trial of one of the Protestant martyrs in the sixteenth century, "I thank God that I never knew what the Old or the New Testament was!"

The truth in this rumor of a decline in worship is to be found less in a falling away from the spiritual heights of the past than in a confession of a lack of that religious ardor which ought to characterize the present. It is an unhappy contrast not between ages, but between the ordinary churchman of to-day and the extraordinary churchman of yesterday, between the practices of the "tired business man" and the ideals of the saint. There has never been a time when the majority of Christian homes were like the one described in Burns's "Cotter's Saturday Night," even in Scotland. We devoutly wish that there were more of these, and there ought to be; but a student of human nature and of history has no reason to be discouraged or even surprised.

Nevertheless; the condition of worship in our times is capable of great improvement, and the criticisms of our most caustic reformers are not without their modicum of truth. It is probably fair to say that the majority of church members and not a few ministers are prone, consciously or unconsciously, to view the service of worship as "opening exercises." Too many church edifices are constructed almost exclusively for the purpose of instruction with little or no regard for their fitness as aids to the devotional spirit. Our ministers have been trained chiefly

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

to preach. Many have had no courses in the art of public worship, and some who have enjoyed excellent opportunities bear gnarled and tasteless fruit. As for the frank pagans, their attitude was expressed by a newspaper reporter who, in describing a musical vespers, wrote, "Between the various musical numbers the rector read the service."

The causes to which our present condition has been attributed are many and various, though in some instances these are as innocent as Maggie Tulliver's doll, which that forlorn little personage used to beat in the garret whenever anything went wrong with her world. It is easy to charge our age with being materialistic, money-mad, searching for new thrills in all forms of hectic amusements. Some prophets cry aloud because it is so engrossed in its struggle for bread and pleasure and power that the sense of God is drowned in a sea of selfishness and his voice shouted down in the clamorous marts of the world. But here again the accurate historian and sympathetic observer demurs. If it is materialistic, it is also deeply spiritual. If a part of the race is mad for money, there is an ever-increasing number of enthusiastic idealists, who are ready to sacrifice all for the visions which even their old men are seeing, and daring poverty and death if only the youths may realize their dreams. If it is hectic in its amusements, it is also passionately hungry for life, not merely the so-called "high life" but "the life that is life indeed." If it is an age of doubt, it is also an age of faith, as the warmth with which numerous modern cults and religious fads are embraced abundantly testifies. These are less differentiating characteristics of our age than

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

concomitants of modern conditions which may be affirmed to a greater or less degree of all ages. Carlyle's scathing comment on the eighteenth century—"soul extinct; stomach well alive"—was not true then, and is far less true to-day. One must search deeper than this if the causes of the present unsatisfactory condition of worship are to be diagnosed and cured.

At least three sources of the trouble are at once apparent. First of all, we are living in a strangely new and bewildering world. Habitations of the mind which we were accustomed to view as "eternal cities" have crumbled like Rome into imposing ruins. The scientific, philosophical and theological systems of our forefathers remind us at times of the shattered temples of the Acropolis and Forum—architectural monuments of rich human interest and with bits of surpassing loveliness, but no longer habitable for the modern university-trained man. Our little world has lost its unique glory as the center of the universe, the one stage upon which the supreme tragedy and comedy must be played out to a dramatic close. It is merely a tiny atom in a single solar system among a million other solar systems which are being whirled through unimaginable vasts of space. Man is no more viewed as the child of yesterday, created suddenly out of the dust by a divine fiat in the year 4004 B. C. He is the last, loveliest and most divine child of a life emerging out of creation's unthinkable beginning, and journeying hopefully along the highways of illimitable time.

His social world is in a state of flux as well as his scientific world. Some industrial systems—those built upon slavery and feudalism, for example—have "had their day

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

and ceased to be," while the reign of unbridled competition under which he is living is changing rapidly into what he hopes will be a new and better era. Some of his fellows hail this; some bewail it. As for the vast majority, they either endure the hardships of their lot stoically or rebel ineffectively, being profoundly impressed by a vague sense that something is wrong.

Morally, also, some revered conceptions of the past are being challenged. Ethical theories which were once discussed with bated breath in secret are now shouted brazenly from the housetops. The principles of the Sermon on the Mount Nietzsche attacked as the most colossal wickedness and stupendous folly. "Christianity," he wrote, "is the one great curse, the one great spiritual corruption." The young flaunt their freedom in the eyes of the old in ways that are denounced as scandalous. What is right, and what is wrong? And if there is anything more than an ever-varying series of human *mores*, is God back of it all, and does He care?

This brings us to another element in man's new world which is still more disturbing. For what kind of God is it who reigns over this welter of worlds, this Universe of universes? The Jehovah of Sinai, hurling his thunderbolts against Israel's enemies, and the great Father in heaven, who marked pityingly the sparrow's fall, were to the men of old very definite beings in whom they found it easy to believe. But what manner of Deity is this who may have a million earths like our own, starry children who in turn come in and then go out of existence? Can our prayers reach Him? Does He hear us singing,

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

O God, our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come?

Is there any reason for hoping that He will help us at all?

It is only the thoughtful who ask these fundamental questions; but they ask them with a passionate insistence that will brook no evasion. Their fellows, who constitute the vast majority, rarely consider the meaning and value of worship. They pray blindly and instinctively. All men worship something, whether it be their own petty selves or a divine savior, a quality or a person, a god or an idol. The testimony of the race is that it has found worship helpful and inevitable. Doubts and questionings, however, are in the air, especially in view of the murky problems and horrible experiences of the Great War; and these, together with the breaking down of the old conceptions and standards, have indubitably influenced the attitude toward worship assumed by the modern world.

Difficulties of thought, however, are by no means the only reasons for the present unsatisfactory condition of worship, neither are they the most important. Much more powerful are certain very practical matters. Chief among these is the fact that the religious natures of multitudes have been persistently starved and neglected. The instinct to worship has been allowed to degenerate and atrophy, like the unused legs still tucked away under the skin of whales. This is true not only of the frank pagan but of all too many church members and their families, whom Fosdick likens to flying fish, making occasional brief excursions into the sunlight and free air of religion, only to fall back into the sea of practical godlessness which is the at-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

mosphere of their ordinary lives. Christian nurture, as Horace Bushnell viewed it, has not yet dawned upon a host of Christian parents. As a science religious education is still in its infancy, and its fundamental principles, even among those who know them, are practiced by a very select few. The average mother sees to it that the children "say their prayers" at night, though with the lack of all instruction, the failure to prepare the mind and the mood of worship, the absence of the devotional atmosphere from the usual process of getting into bed, "Now I lay me down to sleep" comes to be classed with the washing of faces and the brushing of teeth. The children look upon it as an imposed exercise, a mere form of words corresponding to nothing in their experience. Such a habit is as little like true prayer as a bunch of paper flowers on the desert of Sahara is like a garden on the Riviera. Repeating the multiplication table would have almost as much effect, so far as the development of the child's religious nature is concerned. The prayer—not the best, by the way—is literally "said," not prayed.

Learning the catechism, becoming familiar with Bible stories and memorizing verses may be excellent practices, if they are wisely adapted and used for the main purpose. This is not mere knowledge, but the awakening and nurture of the child's whole being. He must thrill with the religious experience lying back of the formulas of the catechism, and become himself a new "living epistle," glowing with the Book's divine life. Merely because a boy knows the facts about Abraham and David, and can recite glibly various responses and verses, there is little

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

assurance that he is thereby made a better worshipper, "nurtured in the fear and admonition of the Lord."

Going to church is another custom fraught with rich and varied possibilities. But here the method employed all too often hampers or entirely prevents the aim in view. Little or no preparation is made for participation in the service. Parents hurry from the experiences of the breakfast table and Sunday newspaper to the Doxology and invocation without the slightest attempt to make any spiritual transition. No help is given the children to render the service interesting and effective. They go to church with far less appreciation and preparation than they go to school, and accordingly wonder and wriggle more than they worship. The entire responsibility is placed upon the shoulders of the leader of worship. If a body of tired, devotionless people are not inspired to worship, given the tools and paraphernalia of worship, and absolutely compelled willy-nilly to worship, it is usually regarded as wholly the minister's fault. The fact that a majority of the members of the congregation have not given a thought to their own reasons for giving thanks, their failures and deliberate wrongdoings which cry to heaven for repentance, their need of strength and peace and joy, which must always come less from the mediation of the minister than from their own communion with God, is entirely lost sight of. Apparently it is quite enough to sing,

Come, thou fount of every blessing,
Tune our hearts to sing thy praise,

whether they have taken pains to do any tuning or not. Add to this utter lack of preparation an indifferent and

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

faint-hearted participation, and it is easy to see one of the causes for the present unsatisfactory condition of worship, a condition which can readily be changed whenever and wherever the people please. The complaint of some men and women that they find little joy and meaning and helpfulness in worship is no more to be wondered at than that they fail to find them in the paintings of the Louvre and the poetry of Dante and the music of *Parsifal*. They have done nothing whatever to taste the delights and experience the power of these glorious creations; and their failure to share the raptures of painter and poet and musician and worshipper is a judgment not upon the arts and religion, but upon themselves. The outcome of all these pious practices, then, may bring forth only a group of people admirably characterized in George Eliot's description of Hetty in *Adam Bede*. "Hetty," she writes, "was one of those numerous people who have had god-fathers and god-mothers, learned their catechism, been confirmed, and gone to church every Sunday, and yet for any practical result of strength in life, or trust in death, have never appropriated a single Christian idea or Christian feeling." Their devotional habits are merely ecclesiastical fashions, not expressions of an abounding life.

This lamentable condition in our congregations is unfortunately matched by the lack of knowledge and skill in the art of worship on the part of all too many ministers. For this they are not altogether responsible. A glance at the older catalogues of many of our seminaries reveals a sorry situation. One investigator found that out of twenty-nine theological school bulletins, dating from twenty to forty years ago, only twelve offered any courses in worship, the

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

total number of courses being eighteen; while in the more recent catalogues from sixty-nine similar institutions he found only thirty-nine offering such courses, the total number of courses being forty-three. In other words, 42 per cent of the older catalogues and 51 per cent of the more recent ones listed worship as worthy of study, while every one of them stressed the minister's homiletical training and strove to develop his ability to preach. It is encouraging to note the advance made along this line by the best of our schools; but in many instances any adequate recognition of the importance of the art of worship has still to be made.

This fact, however, by no means relieves the ministers of their share of the responsibility. If some men who are fairly successful as preachers are flat failures as leaders of worship, the fault is not only that of the seminaries but of themselves. For it is difficult to conceive how any specialist in religion can face a congregation Sunday after Sunday and not train himself in the fine art of expressing and impressing the sense of communion with God. The plain fact is that when this vanishes, religion will disappear. Few are the mothers who are practicing the presence of God in their nurseries, and fewer still the fathers who are doing this in their workshops and counting-rooms. If they fail, then, to find this consciousness of God expressed in the worship of the churches, we may have some righteous Stoics and virtuous Epicureans; but the peace of the psalmists, the passion of the prophets, the power of the apostles, will become merely sacred memories, doomed to disappear like unsubstantial visions in a roseate mist. For ministers to devote no hard and patient

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

study to the art of worship, neglect all rigid discipline and persistent cultivation of the power and beauty of its expression, and slight as unimportant preliminaries the very heart and soul of the entire service, is a ministerial crime. Nor can the blame be shifted upon other shoulders. The expenditure of time and effort demanded may be great, but the task is worthy of it. "For twenty-four years," said Admiral Peary, "sleeping or awake, to place the Stars and Stripes on the Pole has been my dream." It would be well if something of the zeal of the explorer might be shared by more leaders of worship. Careless orders of service, impromptu invocations, stupid, stumbling and utterly inadequate prayers, inappropriate hymns, a neglected notice of a cake-sale interjected while the people's heads are bowed for the benediction—an actual occurrence—all these are major misdemeanors, open confessions that the minister has not 'studied to show himself approved unto God,' and that he is very far from being 'a workman that needeth not to be ashamed.'

For worship, which is merely the abbreviated form of spelling "worthship," is one name for the heart of religion. It is the outward expression of that sense of oneness with God and with man, that intense and vital appreciation of the highest spiritual values, which leads to godlikeness, the noblest conception of worthfulness. "This feeling of unity with all that seems to be worthy," writes Professor Soares, "with the supreme worthiness, with all possible human worthiness, with all the worth of nature, this is religion. To engender this feeling is the purpose of worship." Once this condition of mind and of heart is created, the worshipper finds himself glowing with light and thrill-

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

ing with power. As he visions the supreme worth, he praises it, gives thanks for it, aspires toward it, repents that he has not attained it, communes with it, and purposes resolutely to order his life according to it. As a transformer of character, an illuminator of the moral sense, a minister of peace and of strength and of joy, a path to God, worship has no peer. Professor William Adams Brown adds a similar testimony. "To worship," he writes, "is the most important thing a Christian can do, and the most difficult. . . . In its simplest and most fundamental meaning it is the practice of the presence of God. . . . It means by deliberate and intelligent effort to make explicit to consciousness the supreme fact of religion, namely, the reality and nearness of God, to the end that God may be able to do for us, in us and through us, and so for the world at large, what He desires."

Here a new element is added. To express worship fully it is not enough to feel; one must also act. All the emotions which flood the soul of the devout Romanist, whose senses are awakened by every conceivable stimulus at the dramatic spectacle of the Mass, must be worked out in the ethical activity of the practical Protestant, intent upon transforming this present world, with its mercilessly materialistic industry, its pagan, pettifogging politics and its Machiavellian diplomacy, into the Kingdom of God. "Worship," said Charles Kingsley, "is a life, not a ceremony." Practically it is both; but the ceremony without the life—a life which includes the hands and feet as well as the head and heart—is dead. There is good reason why the regular appointed meeting of a worshipping congregation should be called a "divine service." It both serves

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

and inspires to service. When a little fellow climbs up into his father's lap for an hour of close fellowship, pouring out his aims and ideals, telling the story of his successes and failures, striving to learn the purposes of his father until his will and the will of his father are one, a great service is rendered to the father and another equally great to the boy. But that is not all. If the fellowship has been real and the oneness of will vital, the boy is going to do something about it. He will be something better and do something better, putting into deeds the emotions and ideals of that filial hour.

If, then, we worship on Sunday, we shall strive for worthship in ourselves and in our fellows on Monday. The benediction and postlude are less the close of the service than a new beginning. We must, as Spurgeon phrased it, "pray to God, but keep the hammer going." The awe and humility which led us to exclaim,

Whither shall I go from thy spirit?
Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?

will help us to make God the unseen guest at our tables and the silent partner in our businesses. The cry of penitence, "Have mercy upon me, O God, have mercy upon me!" will breed a hatred of sin strong enough to exterminate it from our lives and from the lives of our fellows. The sense of peace which is breathed upon the mind that has learned to "rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him," will bring healing and balm to spirits feverish with hurry and worry. The glad shout of confidence, "The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear?" will conquer timidity and pessimism. The song of joy,

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

O sing unto the Lord a new song,
Sing unto the Lord, all the earth,

will lift us to jubilant heights as we strive to banish all that makes for pain and sorrow. The glad hopes and holy aspirations which broke from us in the prayer,

O send out thy light and thy truth; let them lead me:
Let them bring me unto thy holy hill,

will abide with us until we have climbed the hilltops of our dreams and realized the most Christlike of our ambitions. In brief, the will to work should be the consummation of the wonder of worship. In it and through it love must transform life.

In the light of such a conception, to ask whether worship is of any practical value is futile. The blows of a trip-hammer are not more effective. Worship is a builder and an interpreter of man's entire world. There is nothing upon which it has not laid its hand. Think of its effect upon architecture, of the development of the first rude heap of stones into the Parthenon! It has filled the galleries with altar-pieces like the Sistine Madonna and hosts of treasures that cannot be appreciated without reference to the spirit of worship which created them and which they were intended to serve. It has been the well-spring of some of the world's greatest poetry, not only in the Psalms but in the Rigveda, in Homer and Aeschylus as well as in Dante and Milton. In music it burst into song. Indeed, worship has been one of the chief developers of the musical art, rising from the chant of the savage, dancing naked in the moonlight, to the Hallelujah Chorus,

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

from the processions of the Grecian festivals to Haydn, beginning his manuscripts with "In nomine Domini" or "Soli Deo gloria," and reciting the rosary whenever he chanced to pause.

It has flooded man's view of nature with "transcendent awe," as Carlyle defined worship, ever increasing in its beauty and reasonableness. The savage's sense of wondrous powers lurking in sky and in sea was the crude beginning of Goethe's interpretation of nature as the living garment of Deity; while the thrill of the worshippers who bowed before the deities dwelling upon the summits of Sinai and Olympus flowered in the experience of Wordsworth:

I have felt
A presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
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.

More than this; for worship has kept man's view of man and of all human relations from being degraded and made common. He who does not reverence God will not be inclined to reverence his fellows. They may be tools, chattels, intelligent beasts of burden; but they will not be children of God and brothers of his own soul. It is the men and women who are turning devotionless faces to godless skies who are undermining our homes, climbing

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

over the bruised and bleeding bodies of their fellows as so many stepping-stones to a so-called success in business, debauching our politics, filling our jails and penitentiaries and asylums, and lying down at last in unmourned graves. Where there is no worship, there you may look for slumberous consciences, lower planes of thought and of morality, hardened natures, and a blunting of the finer sense of duty. Whether we cultivate the devotional spirit will determine whether we have men like the sweat-shop owner, who declined to put shingles upon his leaking roof, because, as he explained, men were cheaper than shingles, or David Livingstones, giving their lives for the chain-gangs of blacks in Africa; whether we grow individuals like Caesar Borgia or Phillips Brooks.

These are only a few examples of the power of worship. Without it no soul can ever attain to its highest self. Until we worship perfectly, we shall live imperfectly in an imperfect world. The psychological fact back of it is that

The thing we long for, that we are,
For one transcendent moment,

as Lowell puts it; while the object of our worship is the ideal toward which we are growing, the kind of being which, unless it exceed all our powers and faculties, we are destined, or rather are destining ourselves, to become. That poor bit of soiled womanhood, kneeling on the streets of the Bowery as she clasped Mrs. Whittemore's knees and cried, "I wish I were like you! Oh, I wish I were like you!" was like her in that burst of aspiration, and will grow into the same gracious character if the mood and the will can be made permanent. The sensuous Greeks, who

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

joined the revellers in the orgiastic festivals of Bacchus and of Venus, not only were like, but grew more like, the deities they worshipped. The Hindu thug worships the brutal goddess Kali, and the worship of Kali helps to make him a more brutal and bloodthirsty thug. To-day, if we can induce men to worship the Father revealed in Jesus, we shall succeed in making the world Christlike. Worship nothing, and you will come to nothing. The snail has crawled to the tip of the cabbage leaf and fancies that it has reached the pinnacle of earth. Worship low ideals and mean gods, and your pathway slopes downward, and easy is the descent to Avernus! Worship the highest and best, all that Jesus experienced in his communion with God, and in the very act you grow godlike. Better adore at the shrine of an idol, or bow before a pantheon of deities, or pay divine homage to a human being, as Comte did to Clothilde de Vaux, than, having learned to laugh at, or, better yet, to interpret these practices, to find no God. Worship is a builder of the world and a maker of man. Without it the individual is in danger of starting back toward the brute, becoming in the end not a son of God, but "three pails of water and a package of salts."

Granting these facts, how may we better the condition of worship in some of our churches? Three ways are at once apparent. First of all, a more adequate training must be given to our ministers. These trained leaders, in their turn, must train the people. Finally, both leaders and people must use more richly and effectively all the means which have been placed at their disposal for impressing and expressing the sense of God. If these three objects can be attained with any degree of success, we shall be

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

journeying along a highway that is constantly rising and from which some of the main obstacles have been cleared.

First of all, then, a word in regard to the training of the minister. That he is a sincere worshipper, in public and in private, is taken for granted. If his laboratory is not also an oratory, all the technique in the world will result in nothing more vital than a pious mumbling of the "patois of Canaan." There are church services, conducted with dignity and decorum, which are mere mummies, dead forms in which live men once expressed true devotion, rituals and rubrics performed in as perfunctory and professional a manner as that of an undertaker. But even the most sincere and devoted leader may fail utterly unless he has been properly trained. This has been so well illustrated by Professor Soares that I venture once more to quote him. "Shall we say," he writes, "that any man led by the spirit of God can lead a congregation in worship? Let me suggest a parallel. I myself am greatly stirred by the song, 'If with all your hearts ye truly seek me.' Sometimes it is just the song which I need in my service. I feel its beauty. I appreciate its meaning. I think I have a right to say that the spirit of God inspires me with that song. Then why should I not sing the song for the congregation? Simply because I cannot sing. I have every qualification of a great singer except vocal ability. One must be a master in song to help a congregation in song; one must be a master of worship to lead a congregation in worship. . . . The art of public prayer, of the arrangement of a service, of the stimulus of song, of the creation of a mood, of the moulding of a congregation into a unity is a consummate art. If some men have possessed it with-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

out study, that is only another example of genius. There is no law for genius. But most of us have to work for our skill."

In some theological schools much admirable training is already being given; but there are none in whose courses of study there is not also much that is to be desired. This is due in part to the crowding of the curriculum, which has led one institution to lengthen its course to four years. But even in a three years' course much more ought to be and could be accomplished. A brief survey of the history of worship, dealing with the great liturgies of the Church, would give the necessary background. In connection with this the student should read selected portions of the literature of devotion, saturating himself with its spirit and practicing the art of its expression. This should be followed by a study of the elements entering into an order of worship, together with the psychological laws governing their use and arrangement. How may they be made intelligible and comprehensive, beautiful and effective? How may unity and harmony, proportion and progress be gained? One has only to recall memories of barren, complicated, inharmonious services to realize the importance of this. Without correct proportions and right methods one may use the best of materials and still spoil the result.

In the service nothing is more important, nothing more beautiful, nothing more difficult than the prayers. It is not a simple matter to voice the petitions of an entire people. To rouse slumberous natures, revealing their deepest needs and desires, to lift all sorts and conditions of men with their various aims and ideals, their joys and their

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

sorrows, their self-sufficiency and their sins, into the presence of God is far from easy. The old petition of the disciples of Jesus, "Lord, teach us to pray," may well be often on the minister's lips. For his prayers must be lessons in worship and inspirations to prayer. His people need to catch the spirit of devotion by a kind of divine contagion. It was to hear Beecher pray as well as preach that men came in throngs to Plymouth pulpit. There are few greater services which a minister can render than to lead a congregation truly in prayer.

To do this successfully will demand hard intellectual work. Piety without brains is a mere mush of emotions. To be dull, sentimental, incoherent in prayer is an insult to man and an irreverence toward God. Not that mind is the one thing needful. Emotional content, rich, deep, varied, is also essential. Other things being equal, however, the more mind employed, the more spiritual motion will be generated. If confronted by the choice, ordinary folk would doubtless prefer Moody's prayers to Emerson's; but there is no reason why a Maclaren or a Maltbie Babcock should not combine something of the virtues of both. Variety, richness of content, beauty and power of expression, elevation of mood, the appropriate use of a trained voice, will all contribute to the leader's usefulness. As for carelessness, tediousness, hectic emotionalism, slovenly language, sentimentalism, the tendency to pray as if one were instructing God, pleading with Him to be good and wrestling with Him to obtain some favor which can be gained only by patient teasing—these are demons to be cast out by toil and training. Reading, writing, medi-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

tation and practice are all needed by the minister who would lead a people in prayer.

Next in importance to prayer is the music of the service. This is treated in an utterly flippant fashion by many ministers; and yet there is perhaps no more potent means of obtaining worship's goal. Too often music is viewed as a mere frill, a means of attracting people to church; and there is much truth in Pope's ironic lines:

Some to church repair
Not for the doctrine but the music there.

But music has ever been the handmaid of religion, the chief of all art pathways to God. "The truth that music is for religion," writes T. T. Munger, "is evident in the fact that nothing calls for it like religion. Eloquence and logic will not take its place. Worship being a moral act or expression, it depends upon rhythm and harmony of art for its materials. And so the Church in all ages has flowered into song. We may get to God in many ways—by the silent communion of spirit with Spirit, by aspiration, by fidelity of service: but there is no path of expression so open and direct as that of music." It was Sankey as well as Moody who made possible those great evangelistic campaigns which so stirred Henry Drummond, while history abounds with illustrations of the power of sacred song.

Courses in the meaning and use of music, then, are indispensable in the minister's training. He need not be technically a musician. Moody once mistook "Yankee Doodle," harmonized in majestic chords and played with great dignity, for "Old Hundred," while Dean Stanley

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

would never have recognized his national anthem if the people had not risen at the first bar. But the leader of worship must know something of the ministry of music and learn how to make melody a means of saving men. So strongly did Luther feel this that he once wrote, "We should not ordain young men as preachers unless they have been well exercised in music." Every musical number is important. The prelude sets the tone of the service, helping to weld the congregation together into a psychological unit, and preparing for all that is to follow. The postlude should bring the service to its spiritual culmination as well as to a musical close. Some preludes and postludes are devotionally as harmful as a march by Sousa would be if used as a prelude to *Parsifal*, or a modern dance record if substituted for the final movement of Beethoven's "Eroica Symphony." The careful selection of hymns and anthems, the choice of the best settings, avoiding the cheap and inappropriate for the lovely melodies which will best express the words, is a task worthy of the greatest care. Some leaders seem to feel that if the words are suitable, the music is unimportant. One needs only to try to sing "O God, our help in ages past" to the tune of "Yankee Doodle" to be shocked by the irreverence and folly. The minister unacquainted with the history of music, inappreciative of the power and meaning of melody, unskilled in its use, will be a sorry bungler whose people will suffer. So to apply music as to transform characters into Christlikeness is a department of the minister's opportunity which calls for assiduous training and the utmost skill.

What is true of music and of prayer is true of every

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE.

other part of the service. There is not one of them unworthy of study, not one whose effective use does not demand knowledge and power. The selection of responsive readings, the mastery of the Bible and its presentation to men, the lifting of the offertory out of another begging nuisance into a holy consecration, the administration of the sacraments—all these suggest lines of study which must be followed in our seminaries if the present unsatisfactory condition of public worship is to be changed.

But when we have educated efficient leaders of worship, a second task confronts us—that of educating the people. Something of the work done for him in the theological school must be imparted by the minister to his congregation. The men and women in the pews ought to know his conception of worship, the reasons for his choice of materials, the explanation of his methods, though they will respond to these, whether they understand them or not. Much of this will be accomplished unconsciously by the example and contagion of the minister; but in addition there must also be direct teaching on his part, and whole-hearted preparation and co-operation on theirs.

In some way family worship will need to be stimulated. For this was the beginning of social religion. Historically the father was the first priest, the hearth the first altar, the mother and children the first worshipping congregation, and the structure which sheltered them the first church. The home is the world's Holy of Holies, the place where the religion of the individual should rise into the custom of the group. This habit of daily fellowship in worship is sorely needed. One hour on Sunday will no

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

more suffice for the entire week than one dinner on Sunday. Furthermore, without this service in the home the church service will seem somewhat strange and unnatural, especially to the children. Of what use is it? If on ordinary days religion apparently exerts no influence on their work and play, the all-important things to their minds, they can hardly be blamed for viewing it on Sunday as an unintelligible mystery, not to say meaningless fad, something which is not helpful and joyous but tedious and queer.

Even when family worship is practiced, some preparation for going to church ought to be made by the people as well as by the minister. Unfortunately, there is little hope of expecting this even from the most intelligent worshippers, so that the leader must plan for some measure of success with the minimum of co-operation. What should have been done by his people before church must be wrought by him after they are in church. The thoughts and emotions which they bring to him, far from being a help, are often a hindrance, which by dint of other thoughts and emotions he must cast out before the aim of the hour can be achieved. In the meantime, however, he must do all in his power to change these untoward circumstances, to show his people what ought to be done and how to do it, until they come ready to be tuned for the service in the prelude, sing sincere praises in the Doxology, voice their aspirations and penitence in the psalms, wing their souls heavenward in the hymns and anthems, pray with the leader in his prayer, consecrate themselves—all they are and all they have—in the offertory, look for guidance in the sermon, and depart to express their wor-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

ship in the language of deeds. Nothing but years of untiring effort, like those which Oberlin gave to his desolate and degraded parish at Steinthal, can work this miracle in certain churches. But wherever even a moderate success can be gained, there is no minister so modestly endowed, no service so simple, no meeting house so lowly, that the glory of the Lord will not fill the place, until the people exclaim with Jacob, "Surely, this is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven!"

But when our ministers have been more adequately trained, and when something of their aims and ideals have been imparted to the people, a third task still confronts us—that of developing the technique of worship until both the services and the structures in which they are held utilize more richly and effectively all wise aids.

Here tastes and opinions differ widely. Some are crude and perverted; some are due to personal whims and temperamental peculiarities; some are based on sound psychology, artistic appreciation and liturgical skill. Most of them, however, are worthy of study, and each has its rights. Only a bigot would attempt to force Cardinal Newman to conform his practices to those of George Fox, or to arrange a service which would be equally helpful to Doctor Orchard and Billy Sunday. The Cardinal and the Quaker, the dignified ritualist and the athletic evangelist may well strive to understand one another, to gain a clearer vision of their own faults, and to acquire new virtues. But no one form will ever be sufficient for all sorts and conditions of men.

In general, however, certain principles hold true. For most persons a richer and more carefully planned service,

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

better adapted to foster worship, is a crying need. One student of the subject writes, "The great lack of Protestantism is not intellectual nor moral but artistic, not ethical but cultural" (Vogt). Such general negatives are dangerous, but the positive statement is indubitably true. The forms of worship in many of our churches are barren and meager. We honor the crusade of our Puritan fathers against formalism and superstition, but we lament that we still suffer from the zeal which drove beauty from their doors. For the good, the true and the beautiful are constantly associated in human experience. Each creates, supports and interprets the others, and worship for its perfect work needs all. In the past the Church has called to her aid all the arts, not only architecture, music, poetry, painting and sculpture, but the drama and the dance. Of the drama an increasing use is being made for distinctly religious purposes, as in the miracle plays and morality plays of the Middle Ages, while here and there, as at Toledo in Spain, sporadic uses of the symbolic dance appear. The latter, out of harmony with modern ideas and customs, is properly viewed as freakish if not evil by most worshippers, in spite of the examples of Miriam and of David. As for the drama, that must ever be the unusual means of creating religious impressions, though the power of the dramatic element in worship is evident in the Mass.

Of the other arts, however, it is fair to ask whether the Church has not lost in power by the neglect and ignorance with which she has treated them. Possibly a deeper appreciation and wiser use of the holiness of beauty would create more of that beauty of holiness which she so eagerly desires. For beauty is essential to the highest ideals

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

and experiences, and the church which would foster the religious experience may well ask whether God's gift of beauty has been utilized to the full. Art and religion have always been closely associated. Religion has produced much of the finest art, and art has helped to inspire some of the truest religion. So striking is the testimony to this fact that the claim has been made that "all the art of the human race is religious art; from the Chaldean to the Egyptian, from the Mycenaean to the Greek, from the Assyrian to the pre-Buddhistic Chinese, from the Mexican to the Peruvian, there is no exception." The moral beauty involved in the very conception of God and in the doctrine of salvation has been one of the chief creators of artistic loveliness. "Beauty," writes Professor Hocking, "is reality offering a glimpse of the solution of its own problems of evil." It is not strange, then, that it should be recognized as the twin sister of religion, which is attempting to solve the problem of moral evil and to build a better and more beautiful world.

Whatever the sins of the Roman Catholic Church, failure to utilize beauty is not one of them. Of her practices a Protestant critic has said: "The stateliest architecture, the sweetest and most solemn music, the chastest language, the goodliest vestments, the most solemn postures and the most suggestive ceremonies are all brought into requisition to assist the sluggish soul in its flight toward God. Surely, if a man's spirit could take wing above the earth, it would be under these conditions." It must be confessed that religion has thrived in the midst of ugliness. The monk and the missionary have risen above bleak and sordid surroundings, developing natures of surpassing

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

beauty. But this triumph over obstacles is the reward of the heroic. Where religious geniuses succeed, the ordinary man would fail. It is beyond all doubt that many natures have been starved for lack of beauty, and that its absence from the sanctuary has robbed services of their power. Tawdriness and drabness have driven some people out of the Church and kept others from it. When Christianity has wrestled with its intellectual task of squaring its thought with modern science and philosophy, and with its moral task of applying its principles to the practices of the world, it will still need to give to men their birth-right to beauty, a beauty which shall call forth that inner glory involved in the salvation of a soul and the vision of God. Here is another realm in which our ministers should be trained. Their artistic sense must be cultivated and their imagination developed. Only so shall they be fitted to answer the prayer of the Psalmist, "Let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us," or to inspire the people "to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in his sanctuary."

In the order of service this beauty will appear not so much in elaboration and ceremonial as in the unity, harmony and satisfying loveliness of a true work of art. Some orders will need to be entirely reconstructed. They are tedious and unimpressive, badly arranged and far from beautiful. They do not conform to the experience of worship, with its vision of God, its sense of sin, its in-breathing of power, its purification and illumination of the mind, and its re-consecration to the work of bringing in the Kingdom of God. They flagrantly disregard psychological laws, often spoiling perfectly good materials,

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

as a tyro may use the paraphernalia in the studio of a Raphael and bring forth only a daub. Others have failed to use important elements—introits, responses, creeds and common prayer. To certain worshippers these may be distasteful, and in churches possessed of meager resources some of them will be impossible. Their use, however, would bring help to thousands, relieving the barrenness and monotony of too many services to-day.

Creeds as differentiating statements of theology may clarify thought and build sectarian walls; but they are abhorrent to the spirit of devotion revealed in the prayer of the Christ. As poetic symbols of faith, a means of common worship, they have their rightful place in a service; though here some of the wisest Christians prefer a simple expression of the heart of their religious experience, often composed of verses from the Bible, to all the ancient formularies, even to the Apostles' Creed. Of the historic statements of faith this is by far the best, binding together, as it does, Greek, Roman and Protestant Christianity. But it omits much. All such statements do, and must. As Coventry Patmore phrases it,

In Divinity and Love
What's best worth saying can't be said.

Each of its clauses was originally aimed at a heresy. As for its conception of the world, with its flat earth separating the heavens above from the hell beneath, that is as different from our own as the maps of Ptolemy are from those of the National Geographic Society. Some common expression of faith, a united declaration of the truth of Christian experience, is unquestionably helpful.

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

But most of us infinitely prefer no creed to one whose repetition smacks of superstition and insincerity, and whose statements need endlessly to be explained.

Other orders ought to be carefully revised and purged of the outworn. This is true of all the ancient liturgies, even of that great masterpiece, the Book of Common Prayer. Fortunately it is the book's staunchest friends rather than its enemies who are busy with plans of revision. It is its lovers who have rejected some of its theological statements, outgrown its aristocratic and monarchical ideas, and hungered for greater range and liberty in its prayers. "We never guessed of old," wrote one chaplain during the war, "how removed it was from our common wants, nor how unintelligible are its prayers and forms of devotion. Its climate to the simple, ardent Christian is often ice." "If John Smith and Thomas Jones," writes another, "are to learn to pray with reality, they must be allowed to ask for things they really need, and to ask for them in the language of their own day, not in that of the Elizabethans, no matter how perfect the latter might have been."

The ideal service doubtless lies between the bald simplicity of the Puritans and the elaborate liturgies which enshrine outgrown sacerdotal and hierarchical ideas. Certain worshippers will always prefer one of these. A George Herbert will sing of his beloved British Church,

I joy, deare Mother, when I view
Thy perfect lineaments, and hue
Both bright and sweet.

Meanwhile a Browning will

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

receive with meekness
That mode of worship as most to his mind,
Where earthly aids being cast behind,
His all in all appears serene
With the thinnest human veil between.

No one form, as has already been confessed, will please all, and any attempt to force even the most wisely and skillfully planned order will defeat itself. "If a man dislikes to use a liturgy," writes John Watson, "and you crop his ears and slit his nose to encourage him, human nature is so constituted that he is apt to grow more obstinate and to conceive a quite unreasonable prejudice against the book."

The unmistakable tendency of the present, however, is toward an order of service combining the excellencies of both Puritan and Anglican. In England and America non-conformists are growing more liturgical, while the Established Church is searching for more of spontaneity and freedom. Episcopalians find themselves strangely at home in certain Congregational and Presbyterian churches. On the other hand, Phillips Brooks was "indignant and also amused," his biographer tells us, "that, when the city of Chicago was in flames, the General Convention, then in session, showed its sympathy and asked for divine aid by reciting the Litany, while the name of the city and the awful occasion were passed over in silence." Men of all creeds and denominations are recognizing the fact that the treasuries of the past belong to every church; that the Litany, the Te Deum, and such prayers as that of St. Chrysostom are no more the exclusive property of Episcopalians than the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer.

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

It is to Calvin that we owe the General Confession. He and Zwingli and Knox all composed simple liturgies. Indeed, John Knox used the Prayer Book of Edward VI, and at one time the Book of Common Prayer came very near to being adopted by the Presbyterian Church in England and America. Modern books of worship with varied orders of service are being issued in encouraging numbers, and many helpful and interesting experiments in the art of worship are being tried. It is a high task, delicate and difficult, and the minister who is awake to the needs of his people will make himself a master in this field.

After the problem of the order of service has been solved, there remains the task of rearing structures better adapted to incarnate and foster the mood of worship. The importance of architecture as an aid to devotion is too little appreciated. The ordinary church-building committee is apparently under the impression that any architect capable of planning a house and garage may safely be entrusted with their contract. He may be utterly ignorant of the history of church architecture and inappreciative of religion and its needs. Nevertheless, out of his "experience" he plans a "practical" structure, trimmed down to suit the financial estimate of the committee. The result is that we have churches of all known styles, and not a few whose styles never ought to have been known. Some are barnlike and some bizarre. Oftentimes the first impression on entering is that of the theater or town-hall. Secularity, triviality, and all too often vulgarity are the most prominent features. Instead of being created and nurtured, worship is everywhere affronted and hindered. The plan, the materials, the colorings, the decorative and architec-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

tural sins of omission and of commission all combine to defeat the very purpose for which the building was constructed. Dr. W. E. Orchard recently described a certain new structure in England as a "blanc-mange cathedral." Of the building of a tabernacle in London he paraphrases an account given by a friend as follows: "First it started out to be a jam factory; then a happy idea occurred to the builder that he should turn it into a waterworks; then the foreman suggested that it would make an ideal swimming-bath; but finally the architect came on the scene and said, 'Here, half a minute! There's an alteration wanting here. We're going to make it into a church!'" Even the best trained leader of worship will be able to achieve only a lukewarm success in such surroundings. The structural mood, the artistic aids which should have been given are denied him; and he is as much handicapped as Edwin Booth would have been if, dressed in evening clothes, he had been called upon to play "Hamlet" in a kitchen.

To feel the power of architecture in worship one has only to contrast the impression made upon entering Chârtres Cathedral or S. Paolo fuori le Mura with Browning's description of the ugly little chapel, with its lath and plaster entry, into which he stumbled one Christmas Eve. In the first instances, every suggestion leads toward aspiration, prayer, purification; in the second we have merely a white-washed hall in a squalid knot of English alleys, a dingy refuge from a December storm.

Now not every slum chapel can be a Chârtres Cathedral, nor shall we ever look for glorious basilicas in New England towns. But the difference in these extremes is not merely that of expense. The same contrast may be felt

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

on comparing the worshipful mood created by one of our fine old colonial churches with the utterly secular impression made upon entering some costly monstrosities which may well be left undescribed. One congregation may spend lavishly, and, so far as worship is concerned, erect only a colossal failure. Another with the most modest expenditure may so use brick and plaster, stone and timber, as to fashion a true temple, marked by the warmth and repose, the dignity and austere beauty which shall incarnate and call forth the spirit of devotion. In such structures the crassest pagan is awed, while the simple peasant instinctively bows the head and bends the knee. They are true homes of the soul, holy places which make whole, sanctuaries in which all men may find symbols of the presence and power of God.

If such church buildings are to be reared, our leaders of worship must have some knowledge of church architecture. They need not be specialists. Architecture is not their profession. To have some share in building a church is a rare privilege. But their artistic consciences must be exercised to discern good and evil, if they are to prevent more stupid bumbles from being perpetrated upon the world. If too few architects know enough of the purpose and spirit of the Church, more churchmen must make themselves at home in the realm of art and of architecture. They should at least read the history of church architecture until they understand the various styles—Greek, Roman, Byzantine, Gothic, and their successors. They should appreciate the significance of such details as columns, vaulting, window designs and sculpture, and consider the proper position of pulpit and lectern and com-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

munion table. No detail is unimportant, and the leader of worship should be sufficiently skillful to appreciate and advise.

The use of symbols, distasteful to some, will be a gracious aid to many. The aesthetic mystic will be lifted Godward by the crucifix, the altar, the robes of the ministrant, the candles, incense and similar appeals to the senses, by which some of the strongest impressions are indubitably made. A rigid Scotch Presbyterian finds a wealth of suggestion in the symbolism of the sacraments. Between these extremes the great majority will welcome a wise use of objects and rites which speak to their souls. Such symbols must be in accord with the religious ideas of the worshippers and have the prestige of religious tradition. To create symbols by an ecclesiastical fiat is impossible. As a recent writer points out, no decree of council could make an effective symbol of an aëroplane, admirable as are at least some of the ideas associated with it; and yet an angel, "an impossible human hexapod," is one of the dearest of all the symbols of the Church. The average man finds the ritual of the Masons impressive and helpful. Stained glass windows, statues and mosaics are aids to be considered. Sir Henry Irving, the actor, always kept a picture of Christ in his bedroom, where he could see it the moment he awoke. It is possible that pictures of the Master, unsatisfactory as most of them are, would bring him more vividly before the mind of the ordinary worshipper. The cathedrals of the Middle Ages, from their crypts and tombs to their gargoyles and spires, were the architectural expression of the worship of the people. Some one has called the church "the art school of the common man."

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

But it should be more than this. In some way, it should stand, like the temples of old, as the architectural incarnation of his religion and an inspirer of worship, the kind of place which it is difficult to enter without being lifted into the presence of God.

Such is the task of the modern leader of worship—to train himself, to nurture his people, and to provide adequate means in appropriate structures. It is an open question whether there is any department of a minister's work more vital either for developing Christian character or for inspiring Christian service. Furthermore, it is interesting to note how deeply the values of worship have been appreciated by men who did all in their power to make it impossible. The ideas of God, the soul and immortality were all banished by Comte from his philosophy; and yet he taught his followers to spend two hours every day in prayer, simply because he recognized it as meeting an elemental human need. Forty years ago Christian thinkers regarded Tyndall, the scientist, as the most formidable opponent of prayer; and yet he once wrote: "It is not my habit of mind to think otherwise than solemnly of the feelings which prompt to prayer. Often unreasonable, even contemptible, in its purer forms prayer hints at disciplines which few of us can neglect without moral loss." So Bertrand Russell, who has no belief in God, eagerly desires to perpetuate the values of that belief. "There are in Christianity," he writes, "three elements which it is desirable to preserve, if possible; worship, acquiescence and love. Worship is given by Christians to God; acquiescence is given to the inevitable because it is the will of God; love is enjoined toward my neighbours, my enemies, and, in

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

fact, toward all men." How he is to maintain these he attempts to explain in terms of his philosophy; but it is safe to say that when the world accepts his godless universe, worship will cease to function in the lives of men.

Fortunately in every human heart there is a shrine, if the leader of worship can but win his way to it. The fire may be burning low upon the altar, but both the altar and the fire are there. "Know," writes Carlyle, "that there is in man a quite indestructible reverence for whatever holds of heaven, or even plausibly counterfeits such holding. Show the dullest clodpole, show the haughtiest feather-head that a soul higher than himself is actually here, were his knees stiffened into brass, he must down and worship." Not only that; for after the terrible years through which the world has been passing, men are becoming increasingly conscious of a need which only worship can satisfy. In his characterization of Miss Maude Royden, the *Gentleman With a Duster* writes: "What men and women want to know in these days . . . is whether Christianity works, whether it does things. The majority of people, she feels sure, are looking about for 'something that helps'—something that will strengthen men and women to fight down their lower natures, that will convince them that their higher nature is a reality, and that will give them a living sense of companionship in their difficult lives—lives often as drab and depressing as they are morally difficult."

This is what worship always has done and always will do. The test is experience. As in the case of all great truths, the proof is less a syllogism than a day in life's laboratory. History, too, bears its unmistakable witness.

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

Religions and creeds rise and fall with successive sunrises and sunsets; but the spirit of worship, which created them and gave them value, like the sun, still abides. It built the magnificent temples of Luxor and of Karnak, with their mammoth halls and pylons and long avenue of sphinxes. It reared the glorious Temple of the Sun at Baalbek, fashioned the matchless perfection of the Parthenon, carved itself in the lace-work of Milan, and embodied itself in the exquisite spires of Châtres.

To-day, at the head of Wall Street, stemming its restless tide, stands old Trinity. Around it surges a hectic, hurrying and often money-mad multitude. As one watches the throng, the words which Longinus wrote of his own age come to mind: "Vast and unchecked wealth marches with lust of pleasure for comrade, and when one opens the gate of house or city, the other at once enters and abides. And in time these two build nests in the hearts of men, and quickly rear a progeny only too legitimate; and the ruin within the man is quickly consummated as the sublimities of his soul wither and fade, and in ecstatic contemplation we omit to exalt, and come to neglect in nonchalance, that within which is immortal." Such men and such cities need our churches, whose spires, like warning fingers, point heavenward, admonishing the thoughtless lest they lose the glory of life and the goal of all civilization by forgetting God. "O come, let us worship and bow down," is the voiceless sermon of these temples of worship; and only as we heed their call shall we receive the full heritage of the sons and daughters of God.

The choice is clear. No cloister in our homes, no beauty of Fra Angelico. No hearts kindled with a fire from God's

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

altar, no passion of Amos and no power of Knox. No quiet hilltop with the Master, no peace which the world cannot give and cannot take away. One of the great tasks of our theological schools in the next century is to train leaders who shall convince men and women that their success in life, the uprightness of their dealings with men, the peace, the power, and the beauty of their souls is in jeopardy if they do not worship; and to teach our marvelous age of ever increasing knowledge to pray with Tennyson:

Let knowledge grow from more to more,
But more of reverence in us dwell,
That mind and soul, according well,
May make one music as before,
But vaster.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE AESTHETIC
CONSCIOUSNESS AND ITS BEARING
ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

E. HERSHEY SNEATH

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE AESTHETIC
CONSCIOUSNESS AND ITS BEARING
ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

E. HERSHEY SNEATH

EDUCATORS are more and more realizing the fact that, in the final analysis, education is the development of a true sense of values. The aesthetic values have not received the recognition in our formal educational schemes that they deserve by virtue of their importance. The reasons for this are not difficult to determine. In the first place, man is a bodily organism. By the very organization of his being the bodily needs come first. Much of his time and labor must be given to the satisfaction of his physical wants. It is really pathetic in a sense to note, in view of his higher endowment, how much of the time and effort of the average man must be devoted to making provision for the bodily necessities of himself and of those dependent upon him. Because of this the aesthetic interests often suffer. Again, man is endowed with capacities that fit him for existence in society and society organized under government. His social and political relations make large demands upon him. These demands seem to be more vital and pressing than those of the aesthetic nature. Then, too, there are the intellectual, moral and religious interests that often seem to claim precedence over the aesthetic. Still, making allowance for all

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

this, the slowness with which we have progressed along aesthetic lines in our schemes of education is due, in a large measure, to a failure to appreciate adequately its importance in human nature and human unfolding. For, after all, in education as in every other form of human activity, it is the important thing as we conceive it that secures our attention and effort; and until the great significance of the aesthetic values for human culture is more thoroughly appreciated this part of our education must inevitably suffer. A study of its influence on our complex life may help us to a better appreciation of this form of human consciousness and the recognition that should be given it in our educational schemes, both "secular" and religious.

Let us note, first, how it affects the bodily life. The accounts of bodily decorations in the form of painting, scarification, tattooing and clothing to be found in works on anthropology are interesting as showing that the aesthetic impulse manifests itself early in relation to man's physical being. Although there are several motives for such decorations the aesthetic motive is supreme. Even in the case of clothing this is found to be true. Authorities in this field of research tell us that clothes had their origin not so much in a desire to protect man from the elements as in aesthetic and social impulses. They were the outgrowth of a desire to look well and to secure the admiration of others. But, although the aesthetic motive was responsible primarily for the origin of clothes, they make greatly for the welfare of the bodily organism in the protection that they afford. Again, aesthetic as well as hygienic motives are responsible for bodily cleanliness. It is

THE AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS

often a disgust for bodily filth rather than a desire to avoid disease that induces us to keep clean and thus again the aesthetic makes for bodily welfare. Once more, influenced by aesthetic and social motives men and women desire to attain unto beauty and grace of form and movement. Therefore, they often indulge in systematic exercise to realize these ends. As a result, not only are these ends attained, but good health also. We can hardly understand the unusual physical development of the Greeks save as we look at it in the light of the fact that the Greek mind was largely dominated by the idea of the Beautiful. In aiming at beauty and grace of physical manhood they, at the same time, attained bodily health and vigor. There are those, also, who are profoundly impressed by the unity of our being, and, prompted by a desire to preserve this unity and harmony of our bodily and mental life, they treat the body with great respect, so that it may properly symbolize the spiritual life. Is this not the import of Socrates' remarkable prayer, recorded at the close of the *Phaedrus*: "O beloved Pan, and all ye other gods who haunt this place, give me beauty in the inward soul and may the outward and inward man be at one." It is evident, then, that the aesthetic consciousness greatly influences the bodily life.

But we are cognitive beings also,—endowed with desires and capacities to know. Our appreciation of the value of the aesthetic grows as we note how it figures in cognition. Perceptive consciousness is greatly influenced by beauty. The beauty of an object often arrests and holds our attention and secures for it such consideration as results in a more intimate and adequate knowledge than

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

might be the case were we lacking in this endowment. This is undoubtedly true in much of the child's acquisition of knowledge of natural objects, and teachers of "nature study," consciously or unconsciously, are profiting in their work by this fact. What is true of the child is true in a larger measure of the adult. The beauty of an object often increases our desire to know more about it. A striking illustration of the indebtedness of our cognitive life to aesthetic consciousness is manifest in the perceptive life of the poet. He is a careful observer of Nature. He loves her for her beauty. Because of this he views her with an intenser gaze than does the average man. Her charm brings him into closer relations with her which results in greater knowledge. What he beholds he communicates to others. His descriptions of her are minute and accurate and they become the permanent possession of the race. We see her in turn through the poet's eyes and much of truth that might have escaped us becomes our own. Principal Shairp's remarks on the poet as an observer are undoubtedly true. He says: "In the presence of Nature the poet and the man of science are alike observers. But in respect of time the poet had the precedence. Long before the botanist had applied his microscope to the flower, or the geologist his hammer to the rock, the poet's eye had rested upon these objects, and noted the beauty of their lineaments. The poets were the first observers and the earliest and greatest poets were the most exact and faithful in their observations. In the Psalms of Israel and in the poems of Homer how many of the most beautiful and affecting images of Nature have been seized and embalmed in language which for exactness cannot be surpassed, and

THE AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS

for beauty can never grow obsolete! Indeed, fidelity to the truth of Nature, even in its minutest details, may be almost taken as a special note of the higher order of poets. It is not Homer but Dryden who to express the silence of night makes the drowsy mountains nod. It is a vulgar error which supposes that it is the privilege of imagination to absolve the poet from the duty of exact truth, and to set him free to make of Nature what he pleases. True imagination shows itself by nothing more than by that exquisite sensibility to beauty which makes it love and reverence Nature as it is. It feels instinctively that 'He hath made everything beautiful in his time'; therefore it would not displace a blade of grass nor neglect the veining of a single leaf. Of course, from the touch of a great poet the commonest objects acquire something more than exactness and truth of detail; they become forms of beauty, vehicles of human sentiment and emotion. But before they can be so used, fidelity to fact must first be secured. They cannot be made symbols of higher truth unless justice has first been done to the truth of fact concerning them. Hence it is that the works of the great poets of all ages are very repositories in which the features and ever-changing aspects of the outward world are rendered with the most loving fidelity and vivid exactness. This is one very delicate service which genuine poets have done to their fellow-men. They have by an instinct of their own noted the appearance of earth and sky, and kept alive the sense of their beauty during long ages when the world was little heedful of these things. How many are there who would own that there are features in the landscape, wild flowers by the wayside, tender lights in the sky, which

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

they would have passed forever unheeded, had not the remembered words of some poet awakened their eye to look on these things and to discern their beauty."

But not only is the aesthetic nature influential in our cognitive life so far as perceptive consciousness is concerned, it is present also in our more highly organized cognition. We aim not only to observe and describe things, we want to *explain* them. Science springs from this deeper interest in things. Here, too, the aesthetic nature is active. There are aesthetic momenta in what we call scientific knowledge. Much of our accepted science is not demonstrated knowledge. It has its roots in the emotional nature of man—and especially in the aesthetic emotions. Professor Ladd calls attention to this as manifest in the sciences of astronomy and biology. He says: "By far the greater majority of the stellar universe so far as this science has any information from observed facts, are behaving in the most disorderly, unharmonious, and meaningless fashion. Millions of masses of matter, void of any life that could follow a pattern known to us, are rushing through space in all directions and with an indefinite number of velocities, paying no attention to each other, and seeking no end,—doing nothing in fact that has conceivable significance or use. Yet the steadfast faith of the astronomer proclaims the order and harmony of the stars; and his soul kindles with a feeling of the sublimity and beauty of the celestial scenery as he applies his trained eye to telescope or heliometer. Is the proclamation based merely on inference from the facts? Do the feelings arise at the call simply of a cogent logic? We do not believe that either of these questions can be answered affirmatively.

THE AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS

Or again: There is current just now a highly elaborate and largely metaphysical doctrine of evolution as applied to the known facts of biology. This doctrine is exceedingly optimistic in its view of the significance, the tendencies and the issue to be expected from the facts. That which is better is, on the whole, winning the day; the way is long and weary indeed, and it is well strewn with slime and blood. But the end is to justify the way. And the same Nature which appears relentless, cruel and hideous in certain aspects of the descriptive history of animal life, is, after all, believed to be striving toward a goal that has an ideal value sufficient to pay all the costs and more of the passage. Now, on what basis is this so optimistic theory of evolution actually placed? Is this basis simply what is known of observed facts, and what may be concluded by fair but strict logical inference from observed facts? Or is not every form of the evolution theory, so far as it is pronouncedly optimistic, largely derived from aesthetical demands which arise in the nature of biologists themselves? What kind of theoretic handling these same facts and laws admit of, if treated in their relations to our human conceptions of a good to be realized, becomes apparent when the decidedly pessimistic temperament takes them in hand. The optimist is ready to ascribe the pessimist's conclusions in such a case to the temperament of the investigator. Doubtless the charge is largely just. But the very point at issue is whether the prevailing optimistic conclusions are not themselves largely a matter of 'temperament,' or rather whether they do not need for their full explanation the admission that aesthetical influences enter into the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

cognitive judgments of the natural sciences in a very prevalent and persuasive way."

Undoubtedly they do. The scientific man in his cognitive life does not live by mere fact and logical inference alone. If he did science would make very slow progress, indeed. The large body of theoretical science would be greatly impoverished. If the scientist in interpreting nature were limited to mere fact and demonstration, much of nature would remain chaotic to the scientific mind. In approaching the deeper and more ultimate interpretation or explanation of phenomena the scientific man would find his task hopeless. But he is not merely perceptive and logical intellect, he is also emotion—he is a being of aesthetic sentiment. He will not listen to suggestions of a *lawless* universe. He will not believe in a "reign" of anarchy in nature—that there is neither order nor system in objective fact and that they do not really include all reality. This is his aesthetic faith and, consciously or unconsciously, it influences him in his investigations and interpretations of natural phenomena. In science man walks much of the way by aesthetic faith. Many of the fundamental assumptions underlying his science ultimately have merely the warrant of his aesthetic nature for their acceptance, and, strange as it may seem, he regards this warrant as sufficient. Did space permit, the presence of aesthetic momenta in philosophy in its ideal interpretation of Reality, and in poetry in its interpretation of Nature and Life could be easily shown. But we must hasten to the consideration of the aesthetic in other forms of man's complex life.

Let us note its influence in man's social unfolding. The

THE AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS

relation of the sexes lies at the foundation of human society. Out of it grows the community, and out of the community grows the state. Now, this relation is greatly influenced by aesthetic considerations. Beauty of face, beauty of figure, beauty of conduct, beauty of spirit, are, of course, powerful influences determining the mutual love of man and woman. Men and women even supplement nature's work by various devices to improve personal appearance and conduct in order to establish themselves more thoroughly in the affection of the objects of their love. Bodily decoration and ornament, grace of speech and manner,—all are brought to their aid in furthering love's interests. And so it is in man's relations to society. Social interactions embody themselves in conventionalities and customs often cast in aesthetic mould—expressing ideas of fitness or propriety which are aesthetic ideas. Our manners, our customs, must be becoming—they must possess a certain aesthetic value. This is true in all classes of society. The relation of children to parents, of servants to mistress and master, of subordinate to superior, of employee to employer, of student to teacher, of man to woman, all of these relations to a very large extent are affected by the aesthetic in human nature. They seek it as a means of expression. Practically all social life is “shot through” with it. And so powerful is it in its influence that he who consciously offends in this respect, either willfully or through ignorance, is bound to suffer. On the other hand, he who obeys its behests reaps a rich reward. Boorishness, which is a failure to give a proper aesthetic expression to our relations to others, inevitably brings punishment to the offender. On the other hand, a fitting expression to all

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

social interactions just as surely brings its recompense. In reading Locke's celebrated educational treatise, *Some Thoughts concerning Education*, one may at first be surprised at so sober a philosopher uttering exceedingly earnest words in the interests of good breeding and making it a most important feature of a young gentleman's education. But Locke was a utilitarian and recognized the great value of good breeding as a factor in a young man's success in life. Whatever qualities of mind and heart he might have, a young man would be greatly handicapped if he were unable in his relations with others to give a fitting or aesthetic expression to them. So true and admirable are the philosopher's words on this subject that they are worthy of careful consideration:

"Breeding," he says, "is that which sets a Gloss upon all his other good Qualities, and renders them useful to him, in procuring to him the esteem and Good-will of all that he comes near. Without good Breeding his other Accomplishments make him pass but for proud, conceited, vain, or foolish.

"Courage in an ill-bred man has the Air and escapes not the Opinion of Brutality; Learning becomes Pedantry; Wit, Buffoonery; Plainness, Rusticity; Good Nature, Fawning. And there cannot be a good Quality in him, which want of Breeding will not warp and disfigure to his disadvantage. Nay, Virtue and Parts, though they are allowed their due Commendation, yet are not enough to procure a man a good Reception, and make him welcome wherever he comes. Nobody contents himself with rough Diamonds, and wears them so, who would appear with Advantage. When they are polish'd and set, then they give

THE AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS

a Lustre. Good Qualities are the substantial Riches of the Mind, but 'tis good Breeding sets them off. And he that will be acceptable, must give Beauty, as well as Strength, to his Actions. Solidity, or even Usefulness, is not enough. A graceful Way and Fashion in everything, is that which gives the Ornament and Liking. And in most cases, the Manner of doing is of more Consequence than the Thing done: and upon that depends the Satisfaction or Disgust wherewith it is received. . . . A young Gentleman, who gets this one Qualification (good breeding) from his *Governor*, sets out with great Advantage, and will find that this one Accomplishment will more open his Way to him, get him more Friends, and carry him farther in the World, than all the hard Words or oral Knowledge he has got from the Liberal Arts, or his *Tutor's* learned Encyclopaedia: not that those should be neglected, but by no means preferred, or suffered to thrust out the other."

Now, Locke was not writing as a student unacquainted with the social and business world. He was not only a philosopher, but, as secretary and adviser to the elder Lord Shaftesbury, was a "man of the world." He knew life and he knew what were the qualifications necessary for men in their interactions with men. He was a sane observer and, as such, was capable of adequately measuring the worth of a proper aesthetic expression of our social relations. He saw the estimate placed upon it by others. And it needs only a little careful observation to-day to confirm Locke's opinion. Society will not tolerate the boor. All classes, as a rule, appreciate and value the true gentleman. An ability to give a fitting expression to our social life is a necessity. Hence, aesthetic rules, conventionalities

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

and customs grow up for governing the social interactions of man. Every prominent social relation is colored by the aesthetic. All of our social functions and institutions are powerfully influenced by it. This simply reveals the dependence of the social nature on the aesthetic for its realization.

But man's social life comprehends also his relations as an economic being,—the relations of his industrial and commercial life. The economic life is so fundamental to our well-being that we can hardly be blamed if even such a spiritual element as the aesthetic should be considered and more or less evaluated from this point of view. Here, again, we are in danger of underestimating rather than overestimating its value. The very ideals by which we unify our economic life are largely constructs of aesthetic consciousness. The order and system on which business success so largely depends are, to a considerable extent, the products of the aesthetic. The courtesies of trade, which are such important factors, for example, in a commercial house, from the humblest salesman to the proprietor, are the man's behavior cast largely in aesthetic mould. The colorings and patterns of silks and satins, of calicoes and woollens, of hardware, wooden- and earthen-ware, the artistic design of the store and the arrangement of its goods, the beauty of its show windows, and a dozen other things indicative of taste and aesthetic development of at least some degree—all this has a commercial value which, as a rule, we do not adequately appreciate. So careful and practical a writer as Carroll D. Wright, in an interesting and important chapter on "Art and Social Well-Being," in his book entitled *Outlines of Practical Sociology*, says: "If in-

THE AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS

dustry to-day had nothing more to do than the furnishing of the simple necessities of human life it would have little field for expansion, and would offer meager opportunities for employment. Life would be a burden, so dull and monotonous would it be. Trade, as we understand it, would cease, and commerce become a thing practically unknown. But industry flourishes because it is not limited to the production of things that are needed for food, raiment and shelter. It is because art has come in to increase the wants of the race that trade and commerce flourish. Art carries industry beyond our actual wants, and calls upon it to supply those things which make for social progress. The future expansion of industry and commerce, the future elevation in the character of the employment of all classes, the increase of their earning capacity, the opportunity of increasing the standard of their environment, all these depend upon the cultivation of the industrial arts." Thus writes this practical student of the social conditions and development of the race. And what he says of the industrial arts, is in a large measure true of the fine arts. They, too, have a commercial value if we must look at them from this somewhat crass point of view. The same practical writer says: "Fine art itself is a wealth producer. The payment of ten or fifty thousand dollars for a painting enriches the community in which the artist lives. There has been something added in the way of treasure to a country's assets by the productions of its artistic genius. The very presence of great pictures is a local benefit. Take the Sistine Madonna from Dresden, rob Paris of the Louvre, despoil London of its National Gallery, or Antwerp of its Rubens collection, take the Art Museum out of

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Boston, destroy the galleries which are growing up so richly in our western cities, and we have depreciated the commercial value of all these places far beyond the selling price of the pictures." This is undoubtedly true. Take the Meccas of art referred to and what a source of income art is to the cities! Travelers from practically all parts of the world visit them. They bring large sums of money to the cities possessing these treasures. All of the fine arts, music, poetry, painting, sculpture, architecture and the dance, are more or less prolific sources of wealth. So that in trying to determine the importance of the aesthetic in human unfolding we must reckon with its relation to the economic life of man.

But man, as Aristotle says in the *Politics*, is a political animal. He is a being endowed with capacities to exist and function in society organized under government. It is very interesting and suggestive to note the influence of the aesthetic in man's political evolution, for it is present here in a marked degree. It is present in the origin, development, manifold organization and maintenance of the state. Whether the state had its origin in a social contract, or whether it be a kind of organic development, we find aesthetic relations involved. Even Hobbes, the founder of the modern social contract theory, regards disgust for the "nasty" and "brutish" conditions of a state of nature which is a state of social chaos, and a desire for peace and commodious living—a kind of social or political cosmos,—as motives that lie at the basis of the genesis of the commonwealth. If, on the other hand, the state be not thus artificially contrived, but is rather a kind of "organism," the family being the ultimate "unit" of political society,

THE AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS

we find present one of the fundamental relations of beauty—unity in the manifold. In the development of the state such aesthetic relations manifest themselves as unity, order, harmony, proportion and symmetry. The same thing is true in its manifold organization—its division of labor—its various modes of functioning. And this is true of its maintenance. A love of social and political order and harmony lies at the basis of political preservation. Political anarchy is almost as impossible aesthetically as it is socially and politically. Social and political chaos is an offense to the aesthetic nature. The architectonic of the state is one of its main bulwarks. Furthermore, political authority and power often clothe themselves in impressive manifestations of beauty. Especially is this true of ancient and oriental nations. We see a decided tendency in this direction in modern times also in both European and American nations. Look, for example, at the military branch of government and note the use made of the aesthetic in dress and drill. Again, political relations among ourselves and between different countries, like social relations, cast themselves in aesthetic mould. There is a “court etiquette” which must be observed, and in international relations a certain propriety must not be violated.

Again, political sentiment seeks the aesthetic as a means of expression, hence we have our national music, poetry, painting, sculpture and architecture, and these in turn become powerful factors in the well-being of the state. Art is not only expressive, but also productive of common political feeling. It is a unifier—a universalizer—it makes the members of the body politic conscious of their political unity. How often this is manifest in the response to the

playing of a national air or the singing of a national hymn. A poem or painting commemorative of a great national event has a similar effect. It is because art is expressive of our common sentiments, faiths and ideals that it becomes such a strong political bond. A nation can well afford, therefore, to be generous in its support of art. It can utilize all of the fine arts to advantage. Properly used they all make for better citizenship, for what is more vital to the state than that which makes for, reveals, and helps to preserve political unity? It is worthy of note that, even in a materialistic and utilitarian age, when man is greatly occupied with the crasser interests, and despite the still inadequate recognition of the value of the aesthetic in education, we recognize to some extent its value in relation to our political life—in its tendency to make for better citizenship. This is manifest in the provision made for formal instruction in at least several of the fine arts in our public schools, in establishing public gardens and parks, in the construction of superb public buildings—municipal, state and national, in the erection of public art galleries and museums, in the contributions for aesthetic display in state and national celebrations and in wise legislation protecting the natural beauty of the country. The Greeks greatly emphasized the value to the state of aesthetic education. It was traditional with them, even in Plato's time, and Plato himself, in the *Republic*, is not less emphatic in his recognition of its importance. Whatever he meant by the statement, "A rule of music cannot be touched without disturbing the foundations of the state," he showed, at least, the high estimate he placed on the relation of the aesthetic to political well-being. Furthermore,

THE AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS

consciously or semi-consciously, an ideal of political worth governs every people; and the aesthetic is present in its formation. It is largely a construct of aesthetic imagination. So, when we note its activity in the genesis, development, organization, maintenance and ultimate end or ideal of the state, we appreciate still more what a conspicuous part the aesthetic plays in human life.

Further analysis of man reveals him to be a moral being. The aesthetic and moral natures are very intimately related—so intimately, indeed, that they are often identified. Plato thus regards them. In modern times Lord Shaftesbury and Schiller take essentially the same position. A little reflection will reveal what an influential factor the aesthetic is in the moral life. There is a beauty of virtue that appeals to the soul with remarkable force—often, indeed, more powerfully than the distinctively moral element itself—if such a separation can be conceived for the moment. A distinguished writer once said that “Many enter the kingdom of God (which is a kingdom of righteousness) through the Gate Beautiful.” It is the beauty of holiness that attracts them. On the other hand, it is the ugliness of sin, in all of its foul forms, more than strictly moral considerations, that deters them from indulgence. Moral evil is an offense to their aesthetic natures. Indeed, there are some, doubtless, who approach very near to Tennyson’s description, in “The Palace of Art,” of “a glorious Devil” who loved “good only for its beauty”:

I send you here a sort of allegory,
(For you will understand it,) of a soul,
A sinful soul possess’d of many gifts,
A spacious garden full of flowering weeds,

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

A glorious Devil, large in heart and brain,
That did love Beauty only (Beauty seen
In all varieties of mould and mind),
And Knowledge for its beauty; or if Good,
Good only for its beauty.

If we are honest with ourselves we will find our own attitude often to be similar to this in certain lines of conduct and character. The beauty of good conduct is the magnet that draws us. The ugliness of bad conduct is a powerful repellent. We speak of a beautiful character almost as frequently as we speak of a good character. Were virtue to clothe herself in homely garb, despite her intrinsic worth, her following would not be half so great—nor half so loyal. All must admit that beauty is a powerful inspiration to right being and right doing. There is something so elevating, so ennobling, so pure about beauty that it often gives us a tremendous moral uplift.

This moralizing power of beauty is emphasized by Compayré, a French writer on education, who says: "Evil, in fact, is an ugly thing; and the delicacy of a soul sensitive to beauty is offended at it and spurns it. And if we make a minute study of the different beauties which art and nature have contrived for charming and ennobling life, the moral influence of the beautiful appears still more striking. The spectacles of nature allay the passions and envelop us in their purity and innocence. The plastic arts at the very least reveal and communicate to us the grace and elegance of the bodily movements. Music, the most impressive of the arts, to which the ancients attributed a preponderant part in education, transmits to the soul a certain contagion of order and harmony. Finally, poetry

THE AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS

exalts and enchants us by its more formal inspirations; it moves us with admiration for all the beautiful deeds which it celebrates, and which it proposes as models to the enthusiasm that it excites within us."

It is interesting to note how the Greeks emphasized the aesthetic factor in education because of the moral influence it exerted upon the individual and upon the state through the individual. It would be well for us moderns to learn from them in this respect. There is little danger of our overestimating its power in moral life. The moral progress of the individual and of the race cannot be explained without regarding the aesthetic as an exceedingly potent factor of the cause.

The aesthetic and the religious consciousness are also closely related and mutually influence each other in their development. Religion has often inspired art. On the other hand art has been the veritable handmaid of religion. Music, painting, poetry, architecture, sculpture and the dance have been utilized by the religious consciousness as means of expression. Anthropologists tell us of the service rendered by music and the dance to the religious consciousness of primitive man. But it is in more highly organized religion that we best note the impressively effective ministry of the aesthetic. This is manifest in all of the great religions. An illustration as it relates to the Christian religion will suffice. Here all of the fine arts have served as aids to religious expression. Music and poetry have, of course, been especially helpful from the beginning. The account of the Last Supper represents Jesus and his disciples in that solemn communion hour as singing a hymn. Paul enjoins the singing of psalms, hymns

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

and spiritual songs. Music was used in the early church in the form of psalms and hymns. A little later priests chanted and choirs responded. Still later, according to Professor Pratt, six hundred melodies were associated with the mass and other rites, and three thousand with the breviary! Still later, especially in post-Reformation times, we have congregational singing, a larger number of hymns, also responses, choruses, chants, psalms, cantatas and oratorios. The genius of the greatest composers was engaged in thus expressing religious thought and sentiment. Bach wrote not less than two hundred and twenty-five cantatas, among which are such beautiful compositions as "My heart was full of heaviness," and "Festa Ascensionis Christi." He also wrote superb oratorios like "St. John Passion," "Magnificat in D," "St. Matthew Passion," "Mass in B Minor." The list of great composers and their works in this particular field of music is most impressive. Among the composers are Mozart, Beethoven, Weber, Handel, Haydn, Spohr, Meyerbeer, Wagner, Liszt, Brahms, Bruch, Gounod, Verdi, Massenet, Saint-Saens, Rossini, Rubenstein, Dvôrák and Sullivan. How the Christian consciousness has been enriched by such inspiring oratorios as Mendelssohn's "St. Paul" and "Elijah," Handel's "Messiah," Haydn's "Creation," Gounod's "Redemption" and Rossini's "Stabat Mater"! When we add to the contributions of the above list of masters, the thousands of hymns and songs by humbler writers that have interpreted and ministered to the Christian spirit throughout the centuries, we gain a fair conception of how the aesthetic consciousness in this form of its manifestation has been a valuable aid to religion.

THE AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS

Poetry, like music, has also been intimately associated with religion. In a number of the older religions, Zoroastrianism, Brahmanism, Buddhism and the Hebrew religion, a large use has been made of psalms and hymns which, in most cases, are poems set to music. But besides the hymn writers, poets like Dante, Milton, Wordsworth, Tennyson and Browning, and many of lesser note, have not only received inspiration in their art from the Christian religion, but have rendered a large service to it. There is much of truth in what the late Professor Bowne said in one of his works on Theism, that a poem like "In Memoriam" often does more for religious faith than whole acres of Natural Theology. Such poetry is frequently not only an antidote for skepticism but it helps to establish the individual in faith. The poet is often possessed of superior spiritual insight. He apprehends the objects of the transcendental world with which religion is concerned with an immediacy and vividness that makes him exceedingly helpful to others in their efforts to lay hold upon the great spiritual realities. Thus poetry often becomes the ally of religion, the aesthetic consciousness greatly assisting the religious consciousness in its efforts toward self-realization.

But painting also has been of great service to the Christian religion. Here, too, many of the world's greatest masters have helped to interpret and express the Christian consciousness. Among them are Michael Angelo, Titian, Leonardo da Vinci, Fra Angelico, Fra Bartolommeo, Lippi, Giotto, Reni, Correggio, Raphael, Murillo, Rubens and Van Dyck. What a list of geniuses, who have made immortal contributions to religious art! It would seem that, were all other records of the story of self-sacrificing

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

love as represented in the life of Christ destroyed, this portrayal of it by the great painters of the world would perpetuate it. Such art is both educational and inspirational. It visualizes much of the history of the Christian religion, and interprets often the fundamentals of Christian faith, and makes for the development of Christian character.

Architecture, also, has rendered valuable service to the Christian religion. The Christian consciousness has found expression in this noble art. Christianity rivals the Egyptian and Greek religions in this respect. This is manifest in the superb cathedrals and churches that are part of the glory of Christendom. Among many are St. Peter's in Rome, St. Mark's in Venice, and the cathedrals in Milan and Florence. In France, Châtres Cathedral, the cathedrals of Rheims, Amiens, Notre Dame of Paris and the Church of St. Ouen at Rouen are monuments of beauty. The Cologne cathedral in Germany and the remarkable group of magnificent churches in England, among which are such well-known structures as St. Paul's, Lincoln, Canterbury, Durham, Salisbury, Wells, York, Lichfield and Westminster Abbey, are all beautiful edifices expressive of religious thought, feeling and aspiration and reveal to us not only how religion inspires noble art, but also how dependent on art she is in her efforts at self-expression.

Sculpture, also, has afforded aid to the Christian religion. In the great religions its aim is to symbolize the character, attributes and functions of the deity or deities and to represent much of what is conceived to be the truth of reli-

THE AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS

gion. Christianity is no exception to the rule. Hence, we have sculpture utilized in many churches and cathedrals. It may not figure as conspicuously here as in the Greek religion, and possibly the religion of Egypt. But the sculpture of the Early Renaissance and Renaissance periods shows that the Christian consciousness realized the need of this form of expression. Baptisteries, bronzed doors and pulpits are evidence of this. Here, too, artistic genius like that of Ghiberti, Donatello, Verrocchio and Michael Angelo was at the service of religion.

Thus we see that music, poetry, painting, architecture and sculpture have rendered a most helpful service to the Christian religion. Even the dance has been utilized by it, having been at times associated with choir music and used on festal occasions, at which time the dance was led by the bishops. What is true of the Christian religion is, in a measure, true of all religions. They have made strong demands on art in seeking self-expression and in realizing their ends. It is not meant by this that religion owes a greater debt to art than art owes to religion. Indeed, it seems as though the greater obligation rests upon art. But, in studying the development of the religious consciousness throughout the ages, the student of the history of religions cannot fail to be profoundly impressed by the invaluable ministry of the aesthetic consciousness to man in his religious evolution.

Space will permit only a brief reference to the great contributions to human happiness through the immediate satisfactions of the aesthetic nature in the contemplation of nature and in the creation and contemplation of art.

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Suppose we were not endowed with the aesthetic and were thus deprived of the ministry of the beautiful and sublime in nature and art, how poverty-stricken human life would be! If we heard nothing but plain noise in the roaring thunder and the rolling billows; if we saw only darkness and fire in the starry heavens; if we observed naught but heaped up earth and stones in the Alpine heights; if we saw nothing but fertile earth and useful timber and water in the outstretched landscape; what an unattractive and forbidding thing this world would be! What a barren waste life itself would be! Rob man of his aesthetic investiture and you take from him one of the main sources of his happiness. But, on the other hand, how this endowment enriches his life. Instead of the bare and prosaic view of nature just described we have one much richer in content. We see in the darkness and fire of the heavens, order, symmetry, proportion, harmony, unity in variety, glory, grandeur, sublimity and in their marvelous on-goings we hear the sublime music of the spheres. Instead of mere might, expanse and volume of water, we see in the great ocean the grandeur of its restless billows, the sublimity of its tremendous force, the loveliness of its varied hues, the serenity of its peaceful calm, and we hear in the roar of its waters the voice of the eternities. Instead of the mountains being heaps of earth and stone, they are the everlasting hills, "clothed with beauty as with a garment"—beauty of outline and beauty of coloring. We see in the landscape not merely the utilities of fertile lands and growing timbers, but the silvery sheen of waving grain, the sparkling dash of running waters, the silent

THE AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS

flow of winding rivers and the rich foliage of luxuriant forests. Beauty rather than utility greets the eye and ear, and inspires the soul with the gladness and peace of life. But this is not all. The aesthetic nature is something more than mere capacity to receive passively the impressions of objective beauty. It is a creative energy, which, by its exercise and achievement, contributes wonderfully to the happiness and richness of life. The fine arts are the product of its activity. How much the exercise of this creative energy adds to the worth of living! Even the child finds great delight in its exercise, as all who are familiar with children will testify. To put forth energy along these higher lines constitutes one of the delights of mind unfolding from the meager efforts of the child to the consummate strokes of the genius. When we add to the happiness of this creative energy that which results from the contemplation of its products, who can fail to appreciate the importance of the aesthetic factor in soul culture? Eliminate poetry, music, architecture, sculpture, painting and the dance from man's life and do you not cancel one of the main sources of his enjoyment?

But what, also, of its power in alleviating human suffering? The beauty of nature and art performs a valuable ministry here. A golden sunset, a mountain view, a murmuring brook, a beautiful poem, an evening song, bring peace and silent joy to a troubled soul. They take it away from itself and its burden. Longfellow fully appreciated this with reference to poetry and music. In his poem entitled "The Day is Done," with which we are all so familiar, he refers to it.

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Come, read to me some poem,
Some simple and heartfelt lay,
That shall soothe this restless feeling,
And banish the thoughts of day.

* * * * *

Read from some humbler poet,
Whose songs gushed from his heart,
As showers from the clouds of summer,
Or tears from the eyelids start.

Who, through long days of labor,
And nights devoid of ease,
Still heard in his soul the music
Of wonderful melodies.

Such songs have power to quiet
The restless pulse of care,
And come like the benediction
That follows after prayer.

Then read from the treasured volume
The poem of thy choice,
And lend to the rhyme of the poet
The beauty of thy voice.

And the night shall be filled with music,
And the cares, that infest the day,
Shall fold their tents, like the Arabs,
And as silently steal away.

What is said here of the power of poetry and music, is true of all beauty in nature and art. Human nature would be almost wrecked by the storm and stress of human experience were it not for the saving power of the aesthetic.

If, then, the aesthetic consciousness be such a potent

THE AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS

factor in the complex life of man, greatly influencing the development of his bodily, intellectual, social, economic, political, moral and religious natures, and through its capacity to appreciate the beautiful in nature and art contributing greatly to human happiness, and alleviating human misery, should it not be accorded a more generous recognition in our educational schemes than it receives to-day? A crass materialism and utilitarianism which raises the cry of "fads and fancies," and clamors for a curriculum of "bread and butter studies," should not influence us to neglect such an important factor in human culture. Larger provision for the development of the aesthetic life than we have at present in "secular" education should be made. In view of the significance of the aesthetic in human unfolding as revealed in the above analysis, we may well ask, what shall it profit an individual, or community, or nation if it gain the whole world of material things and lose its aesthetic soul? The need of the hour in "secular" education is more idealism.

If a proper recognition of the aesthetic in human culture is to be desired in "secular" education, it is pre-eminently desirable in religious education. We have seen how intimately related are the Beautiful and the Good—how true it is that "many enter the kingdom of God through the Gate Beautiful." Despite this fact, Protestant Christianity, at least, has failed to appreciate adequately the value of the aesthetic in moral and religious development. Indeed, in the past, it has met with more or less opposition in Protestant circles. Goodyear says: "In the early days of the Protestants there was a general prejudice against church paintings and religious art decora-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

tions which we no longer share but which was long ascendant. . . . Painting practically disappeared from Germany as a consequence of this religious prejudice after the death of Holbein and Lucas Cranach. In England it had no flower till the eighteenth century." Any one familiar with the history of the Puritans will recall their hostile reaction to art as associated with religion. Even so late as 1884, a Congregational minister, in a lecture before the faculty and students of the Yale Divinity School, called attention to "a prejudice against the use of the beautiful in the service of religion" in the denomination with which he was affiliated. He said it manifested itself in "an altogether too powerful array of unarchitectural and unadorned church edifices," also, "in a strong dread of—not to say contempt for—everything decorative, or symbolic, in connection with religion and religious worship"; also in "a foursquare resistance of all hands to that most serviceable of the arts, Christian music, in its higher forms"; and, again, he adds, "we are shy of all liturgical advance among us, suspecting that if public worship starts out deliberately and consciously to be decorous and perhaps beautiful, some enervation will manage to creep into our piety, some luxuriousness, some aesthetic voluptuousness, at any rate some stiffness of formalism and resulting chill of death."

Although this religious denomination has since then developed a much more friendly attitude toward "the use of the Beautiful in the service of religion" there are a number of Christian communions in which a decided shyness of such use of the beautiful is still manifest. Among some even a very moderate use of the fine arts in the serv-

THE AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS

ice of the Christian religion is frowned upon. A kind of asceticism with reference to such use prevails in certain quarters. This means a decided spiritual loss, for, as a recent writer has said, the arts are needed by religion to render it impressive, to secure for it a hearing, to make it enjoyable, to assist reverence and humility, to represent or symbolize its truths, to conserve and vivify them, to prepare the way for new spiritual insight and to strengthen resolution. This is no exaggeration. Art does help religion in all of these ways and religion loses much when, either through hostility or inappreciation, it fails to avail itself of the service of the beautiful.

However, a better day will soon dawn. Religious education has been making great progress during the last few decades, and aesthetic values are receiving greater recognition. Child psychology has developed to such an extent as to be, in a sense, an independent discipline. With the scientific study of child-consciousness we have gained more intelligent views of its capacity to appreciate the beautiful in nature and art. Religious education is taking advantage of this and is utilizing this love of the beautiful in developing the religious consciousness of children. In many church schools music and poetry (in the form of song and hymn), drawing, color work, picture work, modeling and, in a number of instances, pageantry and dramatics, are used to develop the religious life of the child. Nature study is also utilized, for, through the beauty of nature, children may be taught effectively the fatherhood of God. Jesus realized the value of such teaching in the case of adults when he referred to the care of the Heavenly Father in those beautiful words: "Consider the lilies of

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin. But I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. And if the grass of the field which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, God doth so clothe; how much more will he clothe you, O ye of little faith." Through the child's love of the beautiful in nature a most effective means of developing in him the highest conception of God and of his relation to us is at our command. The child knows what earthly parenthood means, and through the beauty of nature he frames with comparative ease the conception of divine parenthood with its corresponding filial obligations. In this use of nature and the fine arts the child's love for the beautiful is intensified, and the beautiful as associated with religion makes an impressive appeal.

It is not too optimistic to look forward to the recognition in the near future on the part of religious educators of their duty as it relates to the beauty of religious environment. The church buildings in which the child worships and studies should be aesthetic expressions of the religious consciousness. Architecture, sculpture and painting should make religious truths concrete and vivid. We may look forward also with more or less confident hope to an improvement in worship. We ought not to allow our fear of formalism to rob the child of what, in the form of ritual, might prove exceedingly helpful to him. For, as Professor Coe says: "The church and its services offer material of instruction that the pupil can experience as present and concrete. . . . Small children are fond of action and of repetition. When to the sensuous impressiveness of a churchly interior, music, vestments, proces-

THE AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS

sional and responsive actions of priest, choir and congregation, we add opportunity to take an active part in the whole, important conditions of a child's interests are met." A sane ritualism should be an essential part of our religious educational scheme. Protestantism must learn this lesson better than it has and profit by it. Let the children have a part in worship and let art in relation to religion do her perfect work.

Another advance that religious education has made during the last few years relates to the training of the adolescent in religion. In this work we are greatly aided by the progress made of late years in the psychology of adolescence. Careful study shows that this period in the life of the individual is pre-eminently the period of religious unfolding. Such study also reveals it to be a period of marked aesthetic development—so marked, indeed, that Professor Tracy says it amounts almost to a "new birth." It manifests itself in a love of the beautiful in nature and art—especially the art of music and pictorial art. Other phenomena of adolescent consciousness, psychologists tell us, are the real birth of the sex life, the development of the "gang" or group spirit, a tendency to follow leadership, hero worship, intellectual ferment, a love of fiction, an usual birth of altruism and enthusiasm for noble causes, and religious doubt. Because of a close relationship between the Beautiful and the Good, and the valuable aid that the former renders in the service of religion, a rare opportunity during the adolescent period is presented to religious educators. They cannot wisely overlook the actualities and possibilities here. Because of this aesthetic "new birth" music and pictorial art

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

can render an important service in our efforts to develop the religious life of adolescents, and a large use should be made of them. Religious education should also set before itself the task of effectively dealing with youth's love of the beautiful in nature in connection with religious training. Professor Tracy, speaking of the adolescent, says: "There is in many cases a strong feeling of fellowship with the things of external nature; a feeling which seems closely akin to the religious sentiment and which we may agree with Lancaster in regarding as a very natural point of departure for the culture of the religious life." May it not be that this might prove to be one of the ways of successfully dealing with adolescent religious doubt, which is largely the outgrowth of the intellectual ferment peculiar to youth, especially when this intellectual activity has to do with the study of the physical sciences. We have seen that there are aesthetic momenta in cognition, and that the aesthetic is often an antidote for skepticism and a positive aid to belief. Nature does inspire us with religious awe, reverence, humility and adoration, and her beauty makes for religious belief. The Psalmist says, "When I consider the heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and stars which thou hast ordained, what is man that thou art mindful of him and the son of man that thou visitest him." Addison sings, as he views the starry firmament,

Forever singing, as they shine,
The hand that made us is divine.

The great astronomer, Kepler, said, in studying the heavens, "O God, I read thy thoughts after thee." Kant remarked, "Two things fill me with sublimest awe, the

THE AESTHETIC CONSCIOUSNESS

starry heavens above and the moral law within." It is related of David Hume, the Scotch skeptic, that once, when viewing the glories of nature from a mountain top, he turned to his friend, Adam Smith, and exclaimed, "Adam, there must be a God." An imaginative viewing of Mont Blanc so stirred the deeps of Coleridge's nature that he found himself in prayer. The physico-theological argument for the existence of a personal God (as Kant calls it) has some of its main roots in the aesthetic nature. If, as we are told by the psychologists, adolescence is a period in which there is a "new birth" of love for beauty in nature and art, we must keep in mind in our educational work this susceptibility of youth to the beauty of nature, and the powerful influence of such beauty in calling forth religious emotion and inspiring religious thought and belief. Here is a challenge to the religious educator to devise some means of nature study by which the beauty of nature can be effectively used to serve religious ends.

Again, the tendency to hero worship, and the altruism so characteristic of adolescence, together with youth's love of fiction, indicate that biography, and character portrayal as we find it in the best works of fiction, can be used to great advantage in moral and religious education during this period. The beauty of good character and good conduct makes a powerful appeal, hence the story of noble lives devoted to noble causes, and the delineation of beautiful characters, should figure conspicuously in the curriculum of church schools. The aesthetic consciousness here is truly the ally of the moral and religious consciousness.

But those religious educators who have regard for the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

psychology of youth note also the adolescent's love for symbolism in religion. Professor Coe says: "Many adolescents welcome symbols for longings that they are not as yet able to understand. . . . For adolescence not seldom brings idealistic longings that crave expression, though they cannot as yet define themselves. Symbols offer one mode of expression, especially symbols that are stately and sounding, but not too literal." Because of this we may feel justified in making a fairly liberal use of ritual in the religious worship of the adolescent. Here too, we need not be frightened by the cry of formalism, as long as we see that the results are good, and good they are likely to be. Anthropologists and sociologists remark on the great power of ritual in religion, and a proper use of it will be attended by good results.

In conclusion let it be said, that the antiquity and practical universality of art, the powerful influence exerted by aesthetic consciousness in all fundamental forms of human functioning, and a careful psychological analysis of man, all testify to the fact that he is constitutionally an aesthetic being. Because of their great and salutary influence in our bodily, intellectual, social, economic, political, moral and religious life, let it be repeated that the aesthetic values deserve a large recognition in our educational schemes. Religious education, especially, noting the valuable service that the aesthetic nature can render to the moral and religious life, should heartily welcome its aid in establishing the Kingdom of God, which is a kingdom of righteousness, remembering that many, and indeed all, to some extent, enter that glorious Kingdom through the Gate Beautiful.

CHURCH HISTORY AND PROGRESS

ROLAND H. BAINTON

CHURCH HISTORY AND PROGRESS

ROLAND H. BAINTON

I PRESS forward that I may attain." The hope of achievement is the spur of effort. Nothing so slackens the speed of the racer as the fear that he may run in vain. The Christian minister is willing to spend and be spent so long as he believes that the world may be bettered. What justification is there for this confidence in progress?

We most naturally turn to history for an answer. If we have progressed in the past we may expect to do so in the future. But we must first be assured that there is a future. Some are dubious of progress because they expect Christ to come soon, or the earth to become uninhabitable through collision or cooling. In their view we are like men living on a frozen lake surrounded by cliffs which permit of no escape. The ice is slowly melting. The day will inevitably come when the last vestige will disappear and all will be ignominiously drowned. According to Bertrand Russell, we must face the fact "that all the labors of the ages, all the devotion, all the inspiration, all the noon-day brightness of human genius, are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system, and that the whole temple of man's achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the debris of a universe in ruins." J. B. Bury tells us that we must be assured of ten times the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

historical period, or sixty thousand years more, if the idea of progress is not to lose its appeal.

That is true only for those who regard the next life as non-existent or static. Russell prefaces the above proclamation by the statement that "no fire, no heroism, no intensity of thought or feeling can preserve an individual beyond the grave." Early Protestantism, which dispensed with purgatory, ushered men directly into either heaven or hell, where there could be no further change. For such views progress must be on earth or not at all. But modern Protestantism has carried the idea of development over into the future life. Man may continue beyond the grave to grow indefinitely in wisdom, if not in stature, and in favor with God and man. If the future life be so conceived neither a second coming, nor a collision, nor cooling need be fatal to the idea of progress. Whether here or hereafter we are assured of a future and that is enough.

Before turning to history we must also know in what sense the past is a criterion of the future. We can prophesy on the basis of previous progress only on the assumption of uniformity in the universe. On the other hand, if we have deteriorated in the past, there is hope for the future only if nature is not absolutely uniform. Dean Inge sees no indication of progress in science or history, but believes, nevertheless, that hope will not be belied. But it assuredly will, if the future is not radically different from his estimate of the past. We are faced with a problem which science must help us to solve. Fortunately she has in a measure already done so. We feel assured of a sufficient measure of continuity for the conservation of the good and of enough discontinuity for the elimination of

CHURCH HISTORY AND PROGRESS

the bad. But, in any case, one must not base predictions for an infinite future on recorded history, which is but a fragment of the past.

When we turn to history we find the most divergent estimates of the reality of progress. Every one is prepared to admit that we know more than our ancestors. "The temples of Thebes had no electric lights and the statues of the gods could not employ the phonograph to address believers." Alfred Russel Wallace in *The Wonderful Century* piles up a list of the great discoveries and inventions of all time. He attributes twenty-four to the nineteenth century and fifteen to all preceding ages. Among others, he mentions the compass, the telescope, printing, the law of gravitation, the circulation of the blood, the railway, steamship, telegraph, telephone, Röntgen rays, spectrum analysis, anaesthetics, antiseptic surgery and the germ theory of disease. An imposing list!

But what good has it all done? Physically we have deteriorated. Edward Carpenter quotes Captain Cook on "the perfect and uninterrupted health of the New Zealanders." Dean Inge informs us that, not to mention the Cro-Magnons and the Greeks, the Zulus, Samoans and Tahitians are the envy of Europeans for strength and beauty. Are they? It is rather hard to make comparisons on the basis of bones, but when it comes to our contemporaries it may not be out of place to call attention to the fact that the Yale swimming team defeated the Hawaiians. The question, however, is not of great moment. It is not very distressing if our bodies are even a trifle inferior to those of the savages, when the invention of new tools in-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

creases our capacity as no process of biological evolution could ever hope to do.

There is equal doubt about intellectual progress. In the great battle of the seventeenth century between the claims of the ancients and the moderns, it was customary to make a distinction between knowledge and art. In the first we have progressed, but not in the second, for our imagination is not a whit superior to that of the ancients, and its exercise may be restricted by the increasing necessity of conformity to fact. On the other hand, as Perreault pointed out, the growing body of fact may supply the imagination with a wider scope. Our richer knowledge of psychology, for example, enables us to "penetrate more deeply into the recesses of the human soul and, therefore, to bring to a higher perfection the treatment of the character, motives and passions of men." But again the question is not of transcendent importance. It matters little whether our inherent powers are greater than those of our forefathers, so long as we are able to retain and build upon their knowledge.

It is when we turn to moral progress that the debate is most keen and the question of greatest moment. Some see uninterrupted improvement. Where now is cannibalism, human sacrifice and slavery? Everything that has happened has brought good, including wars, revolutions and persecutions. "Always towards perfection is the mighty movement—towards more complete development and a more unmingled good." Others reverse the process and think with Horace that our fathers were better than we and our sons will be worse. Alfred Russel Wallace, after piling up the list of discoveries, gives the reverse of the picture:

CHURCH HISTORY AND PROGRESS

poverty, greed, crime, mortality; in London seven people living and a child lying dead in one underground kitchen; in a single room a man ill with the smallpox, his wife recovering from her confinement and the children running about half naked and covered with dirt. Add to this war, imperialism and exploitation. The savages are better, "liberal and brave, open and candid, without either suspicion or treachery, cruelty or revenge." For Edward Carpenter civilization is a disease. The organs of the social body are at war with each other. Some are abnormally developed at the expense of the rest and the organism is consumed by a mass of parasites. Others see neither progress nor decline, but endless cycles, the ebb and flow of the tide. Royce tells us that "At any time in the past or future we should expect to find much such a universe of striving and imperfection as we now find, the forms infinitely various, the significance wearily the same." Dewey says that "There's no reason for thinking that civilized man has less natural aggressiveness or more natural altruism—or ever will have—than the barbarians." Nordau before the war could say that we were no less cruel than our ancestors, witness Napoleon's Spanish campaign and the Armenian massacres. Since 1914 there have been no boasts of superiority. Dean Inge concludes that "It is very doubtful whether when we are exposed to the same temptations we are more humane, more sympathetic, juster or less brutal than the ancients. . . . Absence of temptation may produce the appearance of improvement, but that is hardly what we mean by progress."

Why not? There is no sense in comparing wars as if progress consisted in growing nicer about killing each

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

other. Lord Fisher well said, "There are no amenities in warfare. It is like trying to fight with one hand behind your back. The other comes out damn quick." A mere modification of the manner of extermination would, if possible, be a sorry sort of progress. What we want is the growth of that spirit which eliminates the temptation to fight at all.

Has there been any progress in this sense? Here Church History may make a contribution. Religious intolerance, once the source of the bitterest conflicts, has now almost ceased to exist. We may be as cruel as ever, but one temptation to fight has actually been eliminated. To understand how the change has been brought about let us briefly review the history of religious persecution. We shall find a process which will seem at first to fit in best with the cyclic theory, progress, decline and progress again, but the oscillation is only apparent.

The Jews and Greeks were alike guilty of religious persecution. The Pentateuch called for the extermination of idolaters, and the people put to death the prophets. The spirit of intolerance continued into the Christian era, and a Paul could persecute the church of God above measure. The Greeks made martyrs of their sages from Anaxagoras to Socrates. But speculative liberty was achieved before the decline. In Rome strictly religious persecution was short-lived. In the Republican period foreign subjects might practice their own religions only if they stayed at home. The Jews were expelled from Italy in 140 B. C. and the devotees of Isis in 59 B. C. But the policy of the government became increasingly lax. Otho himself celebrated the rites of Isis, and Vespasian worked miracles with the aid

CHURCH HISTORY AND PROGRESS

of Serapis. Absolutely new cults were welcomed. Claudius attempted to transfer the Eleusinian mysteries from Greece to Rome, and Nero allowed Tiridates to worship him as Mithras. Such persecution as occurred was based on political, not religious grounds. Whatever was subversive of the state must be suppressed. Tiberius crucified the priests of Isis because a Roman matron had been seduced. Caius was about to persecute the Jews for refusing him the political honor accorded by other nations, but the religion was unmolested and a Roman soldier was actually executed for tearing up a roll of the law. Druidism was suppressed by Claudius because of human sacrifice. But absolutely non-religious bodies suffered in the same way. The astrologers, magicians and philosophers were all banished as fomenters of sedition. Christians were persecuted on specific grounds such as the burning of Rome, incest and cannibalism, refusing to worship the emperor, a purely political act, and sometimes for refusing military service. The name itself became an offense only because of the crimes supposedly associated with it. The governors were so far from religious intolerance that, when a whole village presented itself to a magistrate for martyrdom, he inquired whether they could not find enough ropes and precipices without bothering him. A few were punished and the rest dismissed. Constantine continued the Roman policy and repressed dissenting sects for purely state reasons. The quarrel over a diphthong seemed to him intrinsically trifling and the whole contention the outcome of a misused leisure. He desired peace in the empire and was ready to suppress whichever side

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

seemed to be fostering contention. Strictly religious persecution had long been obsolete in the Roman empire.

This was not at all because the Romans were humane. Three thousand men fought in the arena under Titus and ten thousand under Trajan. Claudius delighted to compare the expressions of dying men. Abortion and infanticide were regarded as legitimate. The very Chremes who uttered the immortal lines on human brotherhood, reproached his wife for having exposed instead of killing their daughter. Slavery was bad enough, even if it was rare for an Augustus to crucify a slave for having eaten a favorite quail, or for a Pollio to feed his slaves to his fish.

Christianity was to reverse the situation. The gladiatorial combats were abolished; abandoned children were cared for; the condition of the slave was ameliorated; the gold of the church was melted to ransom prisoners of war. Christians risked their lives to attend the heathen in plagues. But the spirit of religious intolerance was early manifest and soon exceeded that of pagan antiquity. Progress was apparently followed by decline.

Even the New Testament contains the germs of intolerance. "If a man refuse to hear the church let him be as the heathen and the publican." Paul had delivered one of the Corinthians unto Satan for the destruction of his body. "He is Antichrist who denies that Jesus is come in the flesh." "Reject the heretic." The Leucian Acts of John relate that the apostle, finding himself in the bathhouse with the heretic Cerinthus, rushed out naked lest the building should collapse on the just and the unjust. Tertullian said that of all the evils of the inhospitable Pontus

CHURCH HISTORY AND PROGRESS

the worst was that it had given birth to Marcian. The orthodox would not die with Montanists, but went off to a separate corner of the amphitheater for a martyrdom of their own.

When the state became Christian, attitude was converted into act. Constantine punished the concealment of an heretical book with death. The Arian Valens placed eighty orthodox objectors on shipboard, ostensibly to be sent into exile. When well out in the bay, the crew set fire to the ship and jumped into the tender. The heathen suffered as the heretics. Hypatia, the distinguished philosopher of Alexandria, was supposed by the Christians to have prevented the reconciliation of the civil governor and the bishop. One night she was dragged from her chariot to a church, stoned with tiles, her body torn to pieces and burned.

For a time after the barbarian invasions energies were otherwise consumed than in devising heresies, but the spirit of persecution continued. Clovis made Arianism an excuse for conquering the other kingdoms of Gaul, even by conniving at the murder of a boy king. When all the claimants were eliminated, Clovis appeared before the kingless people with the suggestion that he would be glad to serve them, if they desired. They did. "And thus," says Gregory of Tours, "day by day the Lord advanced the kingdom of him who walked rightly before him, and did that which was pleasing in his eyes." Charlemagne converted the Saxons by a warfare of thirty-three years and the deportation of over a third of the population. Einhard tells us that "no war was more prolonged or fierce, because the Saxons, like the rest of the Germans, are rude and

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

ferocious, devoted to demons and opposed to our religion." The devout crusader, Godfrey de Bouillon, when riding in triumph through the streets of Jerusalem, saw a Mohammedan babe wriggling at the breast of its dead mother. He leaned from his horse, picked up the child by the ankle and dashed out its brains.

Innocent III determined to exterminate the Cathari of southern France. The northern peasants were promised the remission of the sins of a lifetime if they would engage in indiscriminate slaughter for forty days. So they came, tearing out eyes, cutting off noses, burying alive and burning "with unspeakable joy." When the papal legate was asked how the Catholics should be distinguished from the Cathari in a conquered village, he answered, "Kill them all. God will know which are His." The sect was absolutely exterminated and the culture of Provence destroyed. Out of this crusade came the Inquisition. The ecclesiastical tribunal would not put a heretic to death, but turned him over to the civil arm with the petition that "he be punished as mildly as possible and without effusion of blood," which was interpreted to mean by burning. Llorente, who had access to the archives, assures us that in Spain alone thirty-one thousand were burned and two hundred and ninety thousand condemned to lesser punishments. Under Charles V fifty thousand perished in the Netherlands. Philip II confirmed the sentence of the Holy Office which condemned all the inhabitants to death as heretics. "Three millions of people, men, women and children were sentenced to the scaffold in three lines."

The Reformation brought no change. Calvin's honor

CHURCH HISTORY AND PROGRESS

is forever stained with the burning of Servetus. The French wars of religion were unutterably cruel. The Catholic commander of Rouen asked why the dungeons were crowded. "Is the river full?" Another threw the bodies of his victims into the Rhone, with a note to the toll keeper of Avignon to let them pass, since they had paid already. The Huguenots cooked a priest and served him to the dogs, buried Catholics up to their necks and played ninepins with their heads, and wore strings of priests' ears. Des Andrets lamented such necessities, but "The first acts are cruelties. The second are mere justice."

In England the first Protestant king passed the act called "The bloody whip with the six strings," and his Catholic daughter earned the title of Bloody. Prynne lost his ears for his condemnation of long curls, the drinking of healths and the theater. George Fox was locked in Doomsdale prison for refusing to swear and to remove his hat. He lighted a little straw to "take away the stink" of the excrement which had not been cleaned out for years. The smoke annoyed the jailer in the room above, who retaliated by pouring a pot of excrement through a hole on his head.

When persecution by force was declining, that by word continued to be bitter. Rowland Hill described Wesley as " 'a designing wolf,' 'a dealer in stolen wares,' 'as unprincipled as a rock, and as silly as a jackdaw'; 'a grey-headed enemy of all righteousness,' 'a venal profligate,' 'a wicked slanderer,' and 'an apostate miscreant.' " Only in our own day have bad manners become a disqualification for theological controversy.

This is, of course, not universal. The Roman Church

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

retains the medieval attitude. Pius X excommunicated all the Modernists. But even here a change has been effected. John Henry Newman said that, though he had defended the punishment of heretics by the secular arm, not in his fiercest moments could he have cut off the ears of a Puritan, and the sight of a Spanish *auto-da-fé* would have been the death of him. In one place, however, it must be admitted there has been stagnation. Greek and Latin Christians in the Near East are held from one another's throats only by the bayonets of Turkish soldiers, who maintain a perfect *sang-froid* under fanatical vituperation.

The victory is not complete, but surely there has been a vast gain both over the Middle Ages and antiquity.

If we are inherently as cruel as ever how has it been brought about? By the elimination of temptation. Reason may cast doubt on the value of persecution, and the religion of the Spirit may give a new worth to human life so that to harm it will be repulsive. In either case temptation will disappear. The Romans, though cruel, persecuted only for the sake of this life, because they were too doubtful about the next. They could say no more than Socrates, "If death be sleep, few days have been happier, and if continued life, the good man may converse with the sages." Persecutions are not based on ifs. Christianity introduced a new certainty of immortality and with it a new temptation. Unfortunately that certainty was tied up with a dogma. Only the divine was immortal. Hence the human must put on divinity to gain immortality. Christ is the pledge of that change because he is both human and divine. We may partake of his nature by eating his flesh and blood, and thus gain immortality. Any view which

CHURCH HISTORY AND PROGRESS

made Christ less than fully human and divine imperilled eternal life. Other doctrines were thought to endanger one's state in that life. Who could be more dangerous, then, than the man who disseminated opinions that jeopardized eternity? A new spirit of love alleviated the lot of the slave, the child and the sick, but it took a long time to eliminate the temptation to exterminate the heretic. The process of that elimination, however, was not so much a decline as a stage in progress. .

We shall the better understand how the temptation arose and how it was overcome if we glance at the apologies of those who defended and of those who rejected persecution. The Catholic Augustine was troubled by a sect who so greatly valued martyrdom that they would have nothing to do with those who received back the lapsed into the church. If these heretics could not secure the crown for themselves in normal ways, they would jump by thousands over cliffs or demand death at the hands of the passer-by. If he refused they would kill him with a club, not with a sword, which was forbidden by the gospel. Augustine believed that they should be reclaimed by compulsion. Death was their desert, though mercy might dictate a milder form of punishment. The use of force was legitimate, because heresy is the worst form of murder, being the murder of souls, and because persecution succeeds. He had seen whole villages reclaimed through fear of the edicts. The discrepancies between religious persecution and the gospel of the other cheek are only apparent. If a man in a delirium were about to jump over a precipice would it not be kindness to restrain him? Would he not be grateful when he recovered? Not every

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

one who is indulgent is a friend; nor is everyone an enemy who smites. The physician must use the lancet.

Protestant persecution was defended in similar fashion. Servetus was burned by the council at Geneva as a pantheist and Unitarian, and because he gave the lie to Moses by asserting that Palestine was not a land flowing with milk and honey. Calvin had desired a milder death, but both he and Beza defended what had been done. Salvation, they said, depends on dogma. How can Christ be our savior and sanctifier, the victor over sin, death and the devil, if he is not God, and how a mediator and helper, if not man? The infidel Turk and Jew who have not known this are to be pitied, but the heretic who has known and lapsed is to be punished. If he propagate his views he is worse than a parricide, for the one destroys the body, the other the soul. Punishment is not inconsistent with love. Calvin had been actuated by no personal rancor and had treated Servetus with all humanity. Since punishment does the heretic no harm, one's natural aversion to persecution must be overcome. Besides the heretic alone is not to be considered. What about the simple folk whose souls he destroys? What clemency is this, to be merciful to the devouring wolf, that he may destroy with impunity the innocent sheep redeemed with the blood of Christ?

How could men who believed this do anything but persecute no matter how repulsive it might be?

A glance at Sebastian Castellio will show how the temptation was removed. He was a school teacher at Geneva, who offered to go as chaplain to the plague hospital when the ministers declared that they would "rather

CHURCH HISTORY AND PROGRESS

go to the devil." When he sought to enter the ministry Calvin rejected him for unsound views on the Song of Songs and the descent into hell. This man launched a mighty protest against the burning of Servetus. His reaction was partly rational, partly spiritual. To begin with, he said, we do not know enough to persecute. Christ is like a king who told his subjects to be prepared for his coming in white robes, but they spent their time discussing whether he was in France or in Spain, and whether he would come on a horse or in a chariot. We know that God requires us to love him, our neighbor and our enemy. That is the white robe. But what do we know about the exact relationship of the Son to the Father, the nature of his coming, predestination, free will, God, angels and the state of the soul after death? These things are not necessary for salvation. They can be known only by the pure in heart and when known make us no better. Calvin talks about them as if he had been in Paradise. In view of our ignorance the heretic can be only the man with whom we disagree. If we are to destroy him where shall we stop? It is not easy to persuade men. Every sect thinks it has the truth. Calvin says his doctrines are inescapable. For whom? For Calvin? If we are going to kill those whom we cannot convince, we should have to exterminate all but one sect. And what could we say to those who persecute us? Calvin could never convince the Catholics that he was not a heretic. To what could he appeal but toleration?

But apart from our ignorance persecution is ineffective. Calvin says he must speak because the views of Servetus are spreading. He has only himself to thank.

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Who had heard of Servetus before he was burned? Calvin says that his views are absurd ravings. Then they will evaporate in smoke without burning their author. To kill a man is not to defend a doctrine. It is to kill a man. Constraint makes no one better. It serves merely to reveal the nobility of those who will not save their bodies by concealing their beliefs. If Servetus had lied to his conscience he had been saved. Because he followed the witness of the Spirit within him, Calvin put him to death.

We are verging now on new ground. It is not merely because of our ignorance, not merely because persecution is ineffective that we should refrain, but because we owe respect to every honest man, who is loyal to the Spirit of God within him, and because the only test of that spirit is love. "The doctrine of piety is to love one's enemies, not to have right views on the trinity." "The poor folk who are killed are not the wolves, but they who kill them." "How can we follow Christ," he exclaims, "Who forgave seventy times seven? Who would not think Him a Moloch if He desired men immolated and burned alive? Oh, Creator and King of the world, dost Thou see this? Art Thou become so deaf, so contrary to Thyself? When on earth none was milder, more clement, readier to endure injury. As a sheep before the shearers Thou wert dumb. When cut with lashes, spat upon, derided, crowned with thorns and crucified among thieves, Thou didst pray for those who did Thee this wrong. Art Thou so changed? I beg Thee by the name of Thy Father, dost Thou command that those who keep Thy precepts be burned by the magistrates, be cut with lashes to the entrails, then sprinkled with salt, cut with the sword and burned with a slow fire? Dost Thou,

CHURCH HISTORY AND PROGRESS

Christ, do these things which ought to be left to the devil?"

Grant that there was no fundamental difference in character between Castellio and Calvin. Something had happened. Temptation was gone. A new spirit was to go over Europe. Rationalism penetrated France. Montaigne, Descartes, Bayle and Voltaire were to blast with their skepticism the doctrine of salvation by dogma. The political inexpediency of persecution impressed L'Hôpital and Lord Baltimore. The religion of the Spirit passed through Germany and England to America. The Anabaptists, Baptists and Quakers were by their sufferings to lead men out of temptation. From Rhode Island and Pennsylvania religious toleration entered into the constitutions of the colonies and passed thence to France and all Europe. In 1903 the Calvinistic churches erected on the field of Champel, where Servetus was burned, an expiatory monument. After forgiveness penitence is the divinest act of man. Explain it as you will, we have made progress when we cry, "God be merciful to me a sinner."

One temptation to war is gone. We can still be unspeakably cruel, but not in the name of religion. Progress for the future lies not in pulling men's teeth, but in eliminating the other temptations to use them improperly. We shall see some day that it is as foolish and as wrong to fight over national honor and commercial aggrandizement as over the person of Christ or the authority of the Bible.

Progress in a measure we have made. Now let us ask what is the law of that progress, for degeneration is also a fact. One does not need to go to the fall of Rome, which raises questions of a diminishing rainfall or of the defec-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

tive cultivation of the soil. Religious orders furnish sufficient evidence of decline. Father Tyrrell was so disillusioned by his experiences with the Jesuits that he counselled the disbanding of every organization after the death of the last companion of the founder. Monte Casino had to be reformed by Cluny, and Cluny by Cîteaux and Clairvaux. Many are they of Ephesus who have left their first love, and have not repented in time to save their candlestick.

Yet this must be said with many qualifications. Sometimes decline is only apparent. The original ideal has not been lost. Sometimes decline is real, but a stage in progress. Sometimes it may be progress itself, because the original ideal was undesirable, or pursued with more heat than light.

The appearance of degeneration may be created by an idealization of origins. Father Tyrrell's disappointment with the Jesuits was due in part to highly colored lives of the founders. The present order seemed to him morally innocuous but intellectually banal. When had it intellectual power? Loyola himself counselled his followers to have such distrust of themselves and such confidence in the church that they would believe what seemed to them false if she pronounced it true. They should obey as dogs obey.

Again the appearance of decline may be due to an increase in numbers. The order grows and the majority fail to live up to the original standard. But in reality there has been improvement. Those who fall short of the ideal are better than they were. The fact that they joined the society at all meant a breach with the past and a reach after

CHURCH HISTORY AND PROGRESS

a loftier standard. Moreover the order contains quite as many zealous men as the original founders, though their presence is obscured by the weaker brethren. A crisis may show that they are there. When the Knight Templars had reached their decadence, Philip Augustus determined on their extermination ostensibly on the ground of gross immorality. But there were not wanting many who endured excruciating tortures and long imprisonment rather than besmirch the honor of the order. The first Knights of the Temple could not have conducted themselves more nobly.

Sometimes degeneration is a step to a higher condition. Few are the trees of knowledge whose fruit may be tasted without the loss of some Garden of Eden. But when Paradise is regained and knowledge retained the second Adam is superior to the first. For the Christian the law might seem to have been a needless fall from an earlier freedom. "Not so," said Paul, "it has been our schoolmaster to lead us to Christ." From Adam to Moses man sinned without knowing it. From Moses to Christ he became conscious of sin though unable to overcome it. This stage was necessary to prepare him for the salvation of Christ. The history of religious persecution falls into the same scheme. The Romans were tolerant because they were dubious about immortality. Christianity brought a new value and a new temptation. The temptation has been overcome, but the value remains. Edward Carpenter speaks similarly of civilization. At first man was in unconscious harmony with nature, his fellows and with God. Civilization meant self-consciousness and separation. Unity must be regained, but it will be the higher unity of conscious harmony. Lowes Dickinson talks in the same way about the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

loss of Greek culture. "With the Greek civilization beauty perished from the world. Never again has it been possible for man to believe that harmony is in fact the truth of all existence"—but, "in spite of the fascination which constantly fixes our gaze on that fairest and happiest halting-place in the secular march of man, it was not there, any more than here, that he was destined to find the repose of that ultimate reconciliation which was but imperfectly anticipated by the Greeks." God is like the Irishman who, building in a swamp, made his wall three feet high and four feet broad so that, if it fell over, it would be a foot higher.

Some decline has been real enough, but it may be regarded as positive progress by the introduction of a new criterion of value. The original ideal was undesirable. The early monks, for example, sought to mortify every healthy bodily craving and human feeling. Macarius slept for six months naked in a marsh to be stung by venomous flies. The Grazers, like Nebuchadnezzar, lived on grass. Baths were tabu. St. Anthony lived to be a hundred and five and had never washed his feet. Ammon had never seen himself naked. Simeon Stylites employed a friend to replace the worms which fell from his sores, saying to them, "Eat what God has given you." No woman could be seen, not even a sister or mother. When a mother came to visit the six sons who had left her, they ran into their cell, and slammed the door in her face. The elder asked why she cried. "It is because I long to see you my sons. What harm could it do? Am I not your mother? I am now an old and wrinkled woman and my heart is troubled at the sound of your voices." The saintly brothers consoled her with the

CHURCH HISTORY AND PROGRESS

hope of seeing them in heaven. Is it any pity that such men lost their first love and did not repent in time to save their candlestick? Poverty and celibacy are wrong ideals. A fall into beggary and immorality may have had the advantage of reducing the whole thing to an absurdity.

Again the characteristic of all new movements is warmth, but extreme heat is as bad as extreme cold. Religious fervor may lead to moral aberrations and positive insanity. Men and especially women among the early Anabaptists would act as little children that they might enter the Kingdom of Heaven. They would jump up and down, clap their hands, sit naked on the ground, allow themselves to be washed, and throw apples at each other, or string fir cones on a thread. Men and women would parade naked like truth. A woman prepared to give birth to Antichrist; a man persuaded his brother that it was the Lord's will that he should cut off his head, and he let him do it. The Quaker James Nayler, with eight companions, staged a triumphal entry into Bristol through mud knee deep, "so that the rain ran in at their necks and they vented it at their hose and breeches!" Poor Nayler afterwards regained his poise, and the movement was greatly sobered. The Moravians put their "Sifting Time" at the beginning. The early converts sang hymns of so crude a character on the marriage with Christ that the editor would put out no more. The first Methodists frightened people into madness with the prospects of hell. Wesley describes a visit to a girl of nineteen, who was held on her bed by three people and cried, "I am damned, damned, lost forever. Six days ago you might have helped me. But it is past. I am the devil's now. . . . There he is, ay, there

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

he is! Come, good devil, come! Take me away." Even Dickens' caricature of the red-nosed Mr. Stiggins is not without some justification. All of these orders have declined in emotional fervor and grown in moral effectiveness.

But when all is said and done there is such a thing as decadence of an undesirable sort. The most conspicuous example is the deterioration of Christianity after the New Testament period. Progress is by volcanic eruptions. There is that much of truth in the cyclic theory, save that each eruption brings us a little farther along. Each time a bed of lava solidifies above the Herculaneums of error and evil. Every age requires the belching forth of new streams of liquid fire.

Nor can we trust to fate for such upheavals. There is no inevitable progress. We stand where we now are because of the efforts of those of whom the world was not worthy. Only a like effort will save us from the greed, the sordidness, the sorry compromise, and the short-sighted vindictiveness of our time. Progress depends upon a new eruption that shall send forth molten streams of living flame.

THE FUNCTION OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMI-
NARY IN THE ENTERPRISE OF
MISSIONS

JOHN CLARK ARCHER

THE FUNCTION OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN THE ENTERPRISE OF MISSIONS

JOHN CLARK ARCHER

THE theological seminary is under distinct obligation to share in the spread of the Gospel of Christ throughout the earth. As an institution for the graduate training of Christian leaders it is bound to look upon no smaller parish than the whole world. Although there is not yet complete provision for meeting this obligation, the seminary, nevertheless, has very generally recognized its responsibility in a definite way by the organization of the department of missions. In this way it proclaims itself an agent in the evangelization of the world.

There are two major aspects of the full program of the department of missions. It is concerned, on the one hand, with the special training of men for missionary service, and, on the other hand, with the cultivation of local, home forces in co-operation with such men and the work they establish. It is the former which has seemed to be the department's great task. The latter, also, is part of its proper function, and we are yet to see some significant development in this direction.

It is not surprising that the emphasis and often the sole attention has been fixed upon the training of missionaries,

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

especially for foreign service. The need for properly equipped men for the foreign fields became, scarcely more than a decade ago, strikingly apparent and very pressing. The Church became aware that more should be required of the foreign missionary than "proof of a good general education, a superficial knowledge of the Bible, and personal zeal in the service of the Gospel." It ceased to be willing to leave the preparation of its representatives abroad to a theological seminary whose curriculum was adapted wholly to the home field. As a result not only were effective steps taken toward the necessary training of these men, but also the whole curriculum and outlook of the seminary were affected. At the Church's call the seminary ceased allowing its students to exclude the subject of missions from courses they took in preparation for home service. Therein an emphasis was laid upon the second major aspect of the department's obligation to which increasing attention must be given. The missionary consciousness must be a common possession of all, whether at home or abroad, who engage in the service of Christ. The minister of the Church at home should not lack a strong sense of responsibility to non-Christian peoples in any part of the earth.

It is the purpose of this article to survey in some detail the situation which now confronts the department of missions, and to discuss matters of policy in connection with the department's present and future usefulness. It may not seem inappropriate in this connection to take the Yale Divinity School and its Department of Missions as typical of the seminary's developing consciousness of world-obligation. The Yale department is the oldest in America, hav-

THE ENTERPRISE OF MISSIONS

ing been organized in 1906, four years before the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference. The fact that it was organized by one who had served efficiently as a foreign missionary and who thereafter had done notable work as Mission Study secretary of the Student Volunteer Movement indicates that the new department's program represented what was then the most advanced view of missions in relation to the work of the theological seminary. Prior to Professor Harlan P. Beach's coming the Yale Divinity School, in common with certain other similar institutions, had made some slight provision for the study of missions. There were a few elective courses in the School and some more or less general University courses in kindred subjects to which the student's attention was called. The School's Bulletin of 1905 says that it was "the purpose of the Divinity School to offer each year"—as, indeed, it had done for several years—"a carefully arranged elective course providing for lectures, the investigation of special problems, and directed reading, which will serve to deepen and define the interest of the students in the history, working conditions, and pressing claims of the enterprise of Foreign and Home Missions." Among its subsidiary means of instruction the School then had a Library of Foreign Missions which contained about 7,000 titles aside from periodicals and reports. The courses offered were, History of Missions, one hour a week for one term, and, Study of Mission Fields, one hour a week throughout the year. The former was given by the Professor of Ecclesiastical History, the latter, by a graduate student. The Bulletin of 1906 records the establishment of a chair of the Theory and Practice of Missions and

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

names four courses offered by the incumbent. Two courses were prescribed, Mission Fields and Problems, one hour a week throughout the year for Juniors, and, Missions in Relation to the Non-Christian Religions, one hour weekly for the Middlers. The other two were, Sinitic Ethics and Religions, one hour weekly throughout the year, and, a Course for Missionary Candidates, two hours a week throughout the year. The first introductory statement of the new department explains the departmental aims by recognizing the essential value of the study of missions "in the preparation of the minister for the missionary activities of the modern church, and more important still for the increasing number of men who are looking forward to actual service on the foreign field." The School's comprehensiveness of view in these early years of its missionary interest may be seen in its including within the scope of its Department of Missions both foreign and home missions, and in its missionary instruction of candidates for the home ministry along with its training of foreign missionaries. Subsequent departmental development has brought changes of emphasis and alteration of both subject-matter and methods of treatment, but the present organization is largely the fruition of the original seed. The present members of the Department's faculty offer twenty-one hours weekly throughout each year—fifteen courses in all. Over two hundred other courses in the School and in the University, which pertain to missionary preparation, are available through the Department. All students preparing for missionary work receive, of course, the general theological training. As the special departmental work stands now there are three groups of studies, aside from

THE ENTERPRISE OF MISSIONS

certain courses in history, language and literature, each group being introduced by a general course:

I. Comparative Religion, introductory to The Religions of India, The History of Mohammedanism, and The Religions of China.

II. The History of the Expansion of Christianity, introductory to The History of the Christian Church in China, The History of Christianity in India, and The History of Christianity in the Near East from 500 A. D.

III. A Survey of the Missionary Problems of the Church, introductory to Missionary Education, India as a Mission Field, and The Near East as a Mission Field.

The development thus indicated is to a large extent typical of what has occurred at other centers which have dealt seriously with the subject we are here discussing. It is fair to say that the emphasis everywhere has been upon foreign missions rather than home missions, and, in the matter of foreign missions, upon the missionary candidate rather than upon the home pastor and his parish as they are related to the foreign enterprise. The cultivation of missionary interest in the home parish has been left heretofore largely to such organizations as the Young People's Missionary Movement (now the Missionary Education Movement), the Laymen's Missionary Movement, and others, with which the department had no immediate connection. Rather, the department of missions in the theological seminary has been virtually an agent of the Board of Missionary Preparation, by which we mean foreign missionary preparation. We raise no question regarding the propriety of all this that has been done. Our question has merely to do with what has been left

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

undone. We are wondering if the department of missions has not failed to do some things which might properly fall within its scope, even some things which were clearly indicated in the initial program of the first of all missions departments when this was established at Yale. Home Missions as such was introduced this past year for the first time in the Yale department, although—thinking of an item usually wanting in the missionary department's curriculum—there has been for many years at Yale a course in Missionary Education. In short, we wonder if the department of missions may not further develop, not only in intimate relation as of old with the Board of Missionary Preparation (now known as the Committee of Missionary Preparation), but also with the Home Missions Council and the Missionary Education Movement. We use these terms not merely as applied to actual organizations, but rather *for what they represent*. The department is rightly concerned with both foreign and home missions and with those common aspects of work which link the two. The writer of this article has not thought his way through the whole problem of the department's relation to home missions; he ventures, therefore, to discuss only such matters as may fall into these two divisions, (1) the relation of the department of missions to the foreign field, and (2) the education of the home parish in matters of missions.

The foreign missionary obligation is still binding upon the Christian Church, and will be binding until the Gospel of Jesus Christ has been preached to all men, and all have been taught the way of the Lord "more perfectly,"—which we take, in this instance, to mean in sufficient meas-

THE ENTERPRISE OF MISSIONS

ure to enable the learner to proceed to perfection under his own initiative, in co-operation with all the forces by which the Kingdom of God is to be realized upon the earth.

This Christian obligation is by no means recognized by all men, even by all Christians, or even by all students of theology. The department must take this situation into account. It is quite unlikely that a special course in Apologetics is needed for the purpose, but a justification of the enterprise is altogether necessary. There are many reasons for this; in some instances they are weightier now than ever before. It is not hard to meet the critic who is ignorant, and even the one who is prejudiced—enlightenment for the one, and for the other a change of heart. There are courses for such, but, though one should fail in administering these remedies, he may nevertheless rest confident that great harm cannot come to missions through ignorance and prejudice. It is the thoughtful student, within and without the seminary, the keen student of human progress, from whom the real challenge comes. We have him in mind as we examine the character of the missionary obligation and the ways in which it is binding.

Such a student, concerned with the historical study of the great faiths of mankind, may question the idea of universality in the minds of the founders. Did Mohammed, for example, think of Islam as a faith for all the world? What did his first followers think about it? If the Prophet had a message for all men, why did the Caliph Omar call a halt in the Persian campaign? Did he wish the army to halt, and not the Faith? The student of Christianity may find himself at times confused with regard to the program of Jesus. He may discover that the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

genuineness of the Great Commission is doubted by competent Christian scholars,—that is, they doubt that Jesus ever uttered the missionary command in so many words. Is there then no Great Commission? Furthermore, the student will discover some scholars who have doubted Jesus' intention to apply Christianity to other than the Jewish constituency. Harnack, for example, questioned the Gentile mission, and quoted in support of his doubt such verses as "Go not into the way of the Gentiles" (Mt. 10:5), and, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt. 15:24). On the contrary there *was* a Gentile mission. Did the disciples misunderstand their Lord's plan? Rather, were they not mindful of words and acts of the Master, the memory of which had gone far to obliterate all traces of temporary restrictions upon their mission? Indeed, if we appeal to Jesus' companions and early followers, especially to the apostle Paul, we may be assured that Jesus did have in mind a faith for all the world.

Again, the student comes to discover in non-Christian peoples qualities which they ascribe to their faith, and which appear to reflect genuine spiritual character. He finds evidences of true spiritual satisfaction enjoyed by adherents of non-Christian religions. They appear to have "found peace" as truly as have Christians of various times. There may not be evidence of that great confidence which expresses itself in such words as "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day"; evidence may be lacking of devotion to a *personal* ideal; their confidence may be after all in *the highest they know*;

THE ENTERPRISE OF MISSIONS

but there is, nevertheless, sufficient display of satisfaction to raise the question as to whether they might not develop further and sufficiently in response to the yet-to-be-created ideals of their own faith.

Then there is the poverty of our own Christian faith as we view it in the forms it has assumed. Our saints have sinned and the Church has now and then fallen upon evil times. She has seemed occasionally to have had much to do to preserve her own life. These are facts which stand revealed not only to us but also to the non-Christian, and we both, Christian and non-Christian, join in wondering whether Christendom has any wealth to spare in distribution to the millions who do not follow Christ. We Christians may be reminded that in our times of poverty we have been constrained to think of Him. Then we have seen the Real, the True. But is the non-Christian to be persuaded of His value before we ourselves have remembered Him! And can we assure *ourselves* of the Church's wealth when we have forgotten *Him*! The study of Church History and of the history of Christian Doctrine may be expected to raise questions regarding the ability of the Church to establish itself throughout the earth.

Further, there is the logical student who says that the missionary enterprise cannot go on forever, and that it may be the point has already been reached at which *our* effort should cease. He may doubt the wisdom of mission work longer in Japan, may wonder if indeed China and India are not now in a position to evangelize themselves. He may be content to have the missionary continue his work in certain backward areas, but he is not so sure regarding the above-mentioned lands where two-fifths of

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

the world's missionaries are now laboring. He is not objecting to the whole enterprise, but to a major portion of it. However, his very hesitation with regard to the exact point at which our direct missionary obligation ceases makes his state of mind one which demands consideration. He has propounded a serious question.

While these are by no means all the issues which the critic of missions will raise, they are certainly typical of those which the teacher of missions meets in his experience within and without the theological seminary. So far as the seminary student is concerned, he finds the solution of his difficulty in various ways, here a little and there a little. It is the department's business to show him in detail that all the resources of the seminary are really at the bidding of the cause of missions. It is not a matter of a single, specific course in Apologetics, but rather one of all the studies which the student pursues. If he will but see it, every course exhibits and confirms something of the missionary obligation. It is the special task of the teacher of missions to show him the truth of this imposing fact,—a fact which the teachers in other departments have little time to emphasize, but to which they testify as opportunity is offered. In addition, certain distinctively missionary courses may be relied upon to furnish the bulk of evidence in support of missionary activity. On the whole the student, if he avail himself of the opportunity, should find under the guidance of the department ample assurance through various channels that it is the spirit and the will of Christ that all the world should be evangelized, that it is of the very essence of Christianity that all men everywhere should find their salvation in Him. The very nature

THE ENTERPRISE OF MISSIONS

of Christianity as love and of the Christian God as a God of love establishes its universal validity, and accounts more than does any external authority for the Christian missionary motive.

When the student takes the total view of Christ's earthly ministry; when he weighs altogether the discourses of Jesus with the men and women of his time; when he scans the aggressive activity of the early apostles in behalf of the extension of the Gospel, and reads their words of interpretation and apology; he can no longer hesitate at the few words ascribed to Jesus by which the Master seems to have set limits upon the work of evangelization. Jesus was the express image of God's love for the world. The missionary work of the Church was and still is the continuation of God's incarnation in Christ. As the Father sent Him, even so has He sent His ministers even to the uttermost parts of the earth (Acts 1:8). The love of God and the will of Christ are one. After all, who are we of this far Western land, that we should ever hesitate over the cause of missions and to that extent repudiate our own inclusion within the household of faith!

There is yet another aspect of Jesus' missionary spirit. All men are sons of the Father, and therefore brothers. God has never been without a witness amongst them. In the phrase of Rabindranath Tagore, man is "incorrigibly religious." There are fundamental agreements amongst all men with respect to God and the necessary relation which men sustain to him. There is religious kinship which in the Christian view may be developed more fully, even to the point where men may realize their kinship in Christ. We hold the view that the Christian

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

brotherhood is essentially one of religion, a spiritual brotherhood. It was the apostolic declaration that God had made of one blood all the nations of the earth, but that he had set the bounds of their habitation. We have no warrant for a rigid, literal interpretation of either portion of this declaration. It is really a very keen observation that men may—and even must—vary in human qualities and characteristics, and yet may live and work together in mutual respect and love as one family. There is place within the Kingdom of Christ for many of those values which men have discovered in their search after God, although they have yet to find the God of Jesus Christ. And there is room within the Kingdom for appropriate divergence of development after all men *have* found the God of Jesus Christ.

Now with reference to the objection that our Christianity is weak and that, in any case, the time may have come for us to pause in the work of missions, let us observe that the Christian seminary believes in Christianity as the final religion, although it may be unwilling to assert what the final form of that victorious faith will be. It lends itself to the spread of the Gospel in the confidence that the Gospel is adequate to meet the needs of the developing world. As times of severe testing have arisen in the past, so they will arise again. It is not for us to know the times or the seasons; in His good time we shall arrive. There are many things to be taken into account, some of which we have reckoned with too little, if at all. We must rediscover the indispensable things of the Kingdom, the things which abide, and lower our estimate of non-essential things we have exalted. In doing this we of the West will come to

THE ENTERPRISE OF MISSIONS

see that it is no evidence that Christianity has failed in mission lands merely because it has not assumed there the forms which to us are natural and most pleasing. On many mission fields developments are yet to take place—in industry, for example—which, in many respects, must run parallel with those which have already occurred in the West. There will be, of course, developments also which are not closely parallel with our own. Christianity must meet the tests of the days ahead. It is not a mere matter of the evangelization of the present world. If Christianity is to be the victor in the final stages of human progress, it must be ready to meet the growing needs of developing humanity.

If the missionary obligation is binding in ways we have indicated, we have some clue to the kind of preparation with which the missionary should be equipped for the task that yet remains. It goes without saying that if there is work to be done there should be workers. If there are different kinds of work to be done there should be different kinds of workers. In other words missionary preparation is in the end a matter of specialized training. Therein is indicated a further function of the department of missions, which it may discharge in a fourfold way.

First of all is the need of attention to matters of personal religion. The missionary candidate must realize that God is not far from him, for in him he lives and moves and has his being. "Personal consecration comes before apologetics and social righteousness." No surer evidence of the constant need of the nourishment of one's own personal faith is to be found than in the testimony of missionaries in actual service. They say the difficulties which

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

inhere in the life itself of the worker are greater than the outer objects of trial. The missionary enterprise calls for self-discipline in a high degree. A competent authority asserts that "the chief part of missionary preparation consists in a very careful and prayerful and pertinent dealing with this first of all needs." To some extent the candidate's training may aim at the centralization of the act of worship and the primacy of intercession in the personal life. To a large extent the nurture of devotion is a matter of the spiritual atmosphere of the training institution. The seminary's first aim should be the education of the student in a faith that is intellectually acceptable and morally adequate, and which he can cherish with satisfaction in the inner life.

And then there comes the need of defining the Christian religion in relation to the non-Christian faiths. This gives the student his philosophy of missions. The missionary stands related to virtually a whole world of varied forms and varied demands. How shall he succeed in that whereunto he was sent? How shall he change the minds of men whose allegiance is to other gods, who are sons of their fathers and children of their times? It has long been said that the careful, sympathetic consideration of non-Christian ideas and institutions is indispensable. Yet as late as 1910, at the Edinburgh Conference, it was said that "the average missionary of to-day has no reasoned conception of the relation of Christianity to other religions, except the good old contrast of the one truth and the many errors"; that "he is not prepared in any sense for estimating an alien faith." A subsequent decade, however, has seen significant changes for the better. The native sym-

THE ENTERPRISE OF MISSIONS

pathy of progressive Christian leaders, along with wholesome forms of self-assertion on the part of progressive non-Christians, has brought us into the open. We are not developing an attitude of easy tolerance toward other creeds which is a virtual assumption that all religions are equally good, or, if they are not all equally good, each is, nevertheless, best for its own people and its own land. There is a point well beyond dogmatic exclusion, but yet far this side of easy tolerance, where we take our stand. At neither extreme is missions possible. At the point of easy tolerance there is no incentive, as there is indeed no ultimate truth; at the point of dogmatic exclusion there is no sufficient opportunity, for the other faiths will neither condemn themselves nor submit to unqualified condemnation.

There is no place for compromise in fundamentals, nor for lack of confidence in the outcome. The Christian is, as Bishop Gore rightly says, "bound to be a radiant optimist as to the last issue of things." We are sure of the ultimate end, the God of Jesus Christ, the God of love, in whom men may put implicit trust. Our immediate concern is the *process* by which the goal is to be won. We are ready to question any means which does not bring nearer the end we seek,—any means but Him who is the Means, and who is also the End. Which leads us to say something at once of the relation of Christ—as distinguished for the moment, for convenience, from Christianity—to the non-Christian religions. It seems perfectly reasonable and proper to believe that Jesus revealed a new spirituality which was peculiarly ethical both in origin and in manifestation, that in Him there was the revelation of an essen-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

tially new power and a new way of salvation. To that extent we may not believe in His Gospel at the time of its final victory as the consummation of *other* religious movements, in the sense that the goods of other faiths may be taken over *as goods* by Christianity and given full recognition as *Christian* goods. In the process of missions the good in other faiths may be generously and properly recognized without implying that there need be no transformation of that good in order to fix its place in the final Christianity. Furthermore, whatever the form of final Christianity, its content at the time will not be altogether the result of development; its essence will always lie in that permanent and changeless revelation which came newly into the world through Jesus Christ. It is this to which the convert is expected to give explicit assent. This is the channel of his conversion. This is the heart of Christianity. The sons of all lands, the heirs of all ages will live out their lives in their own peculiar ways, but they will not be made fully alive apart from Christ.

In this particular the missionary problem of to-day is not unlike that which the apostle Paul faced and solved in so marked a fashion. Christianity was to him a new doctrine and a new life. He himself was a Jew; he lived and died a Jew; but he became a new man in Christ; and he had to do as an agent of the new faith with many men, "whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free." He was able to distinguish Christianity from the Jewish elements in its origin, and from the Jewish forms in which it had been first presented. As a leader among the early Christians who went out to face a world in which they were greatly outnumbered, he saw not only the necessity but

THE ENTERPRISE OF MISSIONS

also the propriety of preaching Christ in a language which that world could understand and assimilate. He was ever "on the alert to meet every disposition of mind that seemed likely to provide a channel for the entrance of the gospel which he proclaimed."

The world of Paul was full of diversity, not unlike, for example, the present Indian Empire or the Mediterranean world of to-day. In it Greek culture provided a measure of intellectual unity, and Roman rule assured something of political solidarity. We have reason to think that the apostle took his reckoning from the entire situation. The mysticism of the East and the materialism of the West were in conflict, contending, blending and reacting upon each other. Greek culture had peculiar affinity for oriental forms of thought, but passing through Western development, offered itself, nevertheless, as a basis for materialistic expansion. Beyond it all Paul saw another and a greater unity, the unity of the world in Christ. To bring about this consummation he entered upon the mission of preaching Christ as the divine wisdom of God, pre-existent and personal and loving, and a power sufficient for the salvation of all men. His Christology makes Christ the fulfiller. Through the idea of the Logos there was place for the past spiritual achievements of a people, as in the theology of Clement of Alexandria there was through the same idea place for the ancient philosophies. He preached not merely in the interest of synthesis, but for the sake of conversion also. He himself had met God in Christ.

It is not too much to say that our primary concern to-day should be with an interpretation of Christ, in the manner of Paul, as the Logos, the wisdom of God. We are

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

depending more upon the form which our Faith has assumed in its later development, than upon the Christianity of the New Testament which exhibits its essential character in the proclamation of Jesus Christ as the Logos of God. If we may venture to put it in one further word and without comment, it is this Pauline gospel rather than the nativity stories of the Synoptics which will prove the solvent required in the present conflict of religions. The Moslem, especially, will heed no overtures which might imply in his mind a surrender of Monotheism, the cardinal principle of his faith.

There is a third function of the department, the provision of a wide variety of intellectual materials for the sake of missionary preparation. However convenient it may be, it may not be altogether necessary for the missionary to be an expert in one subject. At least he needs to understand all subjects. By which we mean a wide, general view of the principles which underlie them all, and of their aims, rather than a knowledge of their contents. As phrased in the Report of the Edinburgh Conference, it is "capacity to understand and width of outlook," the former of which, continues the Report, the man does very often get from his studies, the latter, from intercourse.

It is the "university man" to which reference is made. The facilities and atmosphere of the university seem almost if not altogether indispensable,—“the wide culture and the open air.” The foreign missionary lives in a more diverse and a more exacting world than does the home minister, and is in greater need than he of sensitiveness to his environment. He should enter his field with the largest possible intellectual equipment, for, having entered, he is

THE ENTERPRISE OF MISSIONS

soon so engrossed in his task that he has little time to reconsider and revise the stock with which he came. If, for example, his training be originally inadequate, he is likely to be less concerned than he should be with the question of the theological reconstruction demanded by the situation in which he works. The greater his equipment the more sensitive is he to his environment and the more quickly is he affected by causes for change in his own thought.

One naturally thinks of the university as the center where such preparation may be secured in fullest measure. It is partly a matter of courses of study. Missions cannot be viewed rightly apart from other aspects of human progress, nor considered intelligently without regard for the permanent results of modern scholarship. It stands related to Biblical and Systematic Theology, to Biblical Criticism and Interpretation, to historical studies, including the history of the Christian Church and the history of Christian Doctrine, to the increasingly important studies in Religious Education, and to the problem of co-operative effort for the welfare of the social order, not to mention the history and comparison of religions, and modern science, which, arising in many fields, is shaking non-Christian systems to their very foundations, and challenging the Christian messenger and his message!

It is a matter of libraries, with books in abundance, both old and new; of reading rooms where all the important current periodicals may be consulted; of music and art and drama; of lectures by eminent visitors. It is a matter of human associations, which provide for an interchange of views with men of varying schools of thought,

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

who gather from all parts of one's own land and from the ends of the earth; of ancient and honorable traditions; and even of chiselled and storied stone. Dr. A. E. Garvie once reviewed the case for the location of the missionary training institution and concluded that "it is not good to isolate those who are preparing for work in the foreign field from those who are preparing for the home ministry, or to isolate both from the wider culture of the university." The wisdom of the conclusion cannot be denied.

There is yet a fourth aspect of the department's direct obligation with respect to the training of the missionary candidate. It not only follows closely upon what has already been said, but leads to further important considerations. It has already been implied; yet it needs explicit mention. We refer to flexibility, the asset of adaptable Christian personality and graces. It is an all-inclusive term. It is the climax of the candidate's training. As it points back to the preceding discussion it might be called docility. In the light of certain acute present demands it must express itself as humility. A quotation will explain the meaning here. Says C. T. Wang, "The Church in China cannot be made indigenous unless the missionaries are content as a body to work deliberately and determinedly behind the scenes. They should take upon themselves the rôle of advisors and counsellors and make themselves helpers to the Chinese workers rather than as it is now in most cases the reverse." Working not only with but under the native Christian leader is a severe and legitimate test of the missionary's devotion. He should be prepared to meet it.

In following further the problem of the department's

THE ENTERPRISE OF MISSIONS

relation to the foreign field, two items must be mentioned which are already determinative of the department's policy. The one affects that policy only slightly, the other, very decidedly. The one is the training school on the field itself. Certain efficient schools have been established, and a strong case has been made out for the candidate's pursuit upon the field, within the natural environment, so to speak, of certain preparatory studies. There is no agreement as to a complete list of studies which might best be undertaken or pursued abroad. Common consent does, however, include within the list the languages of the mission fields. In addition it is conceded generally that there is very great value in lectures which describe manners and customs in their own peculiar habitat. It is noticed, however, that, by reason of the limited amount of time at his disposal for preliminary studies on the field, the candidate's opportunity is almost solely restricted to language study. Intensive work in other disciplines is scarcely possible. Serious and extended work in, for example, the history, literature and religions of mission fields must be left to home institutions, where materials and facilities may be found in abundance. It does not appear that any large percentage of the missionaries yet to be sent out will find it advisable to do on the field itself more than a small portion of their preliminary work. In addition to the handicaps to be met on the field, there is the fact which may not be ignored, that preparation for missionary service is best made in connection with general theological training. The latter is not to be had in foreign fields. When the time comes that adequate theological education may

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

be obtained there, there will then be in those fields no need of the foreign missionary.

Of more far-reaching effect is the second item, the growth in independence of indigenous churches. One might infer from this the cessation of the missionary enterprise and the consequent dissolution of the department of missions. The development of the Japanese Church is well known. Dr. John McKenzie notices that "there is now in India a considerable body of Christian men and women of education and culture who are alive to the problems and needs of their community; in whose minds the conception of the Indian Church has come to occupy an important place. An article has just appeared whose title reads, "At Last—A Chinese Church," being an account of the Shanghai Conference of May, 1922, and declaring that "when the conference adjourned . . . the end of the period of foreign control had been marked." *The Journal of Religion* has announced for a forthcoming number an article entitled, "The Passing of Paternalism in Foreign Missions."

We all know that the developing consciousness of the Christian in the non-Christian land is a part of the general stirring of the nations. A spirit is troubling the waters, and there are many who would enter into them and be healed of the various ills, real or fancied, from which they have suffered. The East is very much inclined to draw away from Western dominance. The awakening of the spirit of nationalism in a land affects all its peoples. If there be a considerable Christian community the nationalist spirit could not leave it unaffected unless the Christians chose to renounce their national inheritance altogether. In

THE ENTERPRISE OF MISSIONS

India, at least, the consciousness of the native Christian had made some progress long before the present national awakening. What of the Christians of St. Thomas, for example, with their ancient indigenous episcopate? Yet the awakening of the present day, because it is so general and so acute, raises to peculiar prominence the whole question of the missionary motive. We agree to the principle of the self-propagating Gospel. Are we overfearful of the supposed *inability* of the Christian in certain mission lands? Are we overcautious about withdrawal from certain fields in deference to the native Christians there?

There are, to be sure, many factors in the situation, not the least of which is the theological state of mind of the Christian community. Independence of administration is after all a secondary matter. It is likely that we have not gone nearly as far as we should have gone in the transfer of administrative rights and powers. The real issue is not one of administration but of intellectual independence, not one of organization but of spiritual power. As yet the Christians of the mission fields have scarcely begun to pass Christianity through their own minds, to attempt the task of rethinking it by their own processes of thought. "Their theology has been for the most part an echo of the words of Western teachers," says Dr. Macnicol, with reference to Indian Christians. We have no doubt that the same is true of other fields. This is a grave concern. There is place, therefore, for the missionary as the teacher of essential Christianity. Practically speaking, this is a new type of missionary. He will be unusually acceptable to the Christian community, even to the most advanced. He will come to them not as director, but as assessor and

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

counsellor. He will begin with original elements in his interpretation of the Christian faith. For illustration he will draw freely upon their own storehouses rather than upon those of Israel, of Greece and the West. He will train his people to think God's thoughts in ways that God has made natural for them. He knows that Christianity as it develops in their midst must take on forms peculiar to them, forms into which may be incorporated certain essentials of the non-Christian order. To this type of missionary there can be no objection. He will be greater than the Roman centurion, for he will minister and not command; but he will be judged by the same standard. "He loveth our nation, and he hath built us a synagogue." A Roman, yet he built a Jewish house of worship!

There is tremendous interest nowadays in the Orient in the conservation of old values through their reinterpretation to meet the needs of the present. The missionary candidate who is equipped for the peculiar sort of *leadership* which the day demands will make his program of education in Christianity harmonize with this vital interest. He will succeed—and by his very success will hasten the end of the missionary enterprise as we have heretofore understood it. What then?

We are not yet anywhere near the end of the enterprise. Although we might cite conditions in certain advanced fields as evidence that we are, it is nevertheless a far cry from them to the conditions prevailing in the less advanced areas, and in the unoccupied fields. We shall have, therefore, for some time to come a definite obligation in these latter directions. And we shall have opportunity and occasion to put at the disposal of *indigenous* leaders who

THE ENTERPRISE OF MISSIONS

may come to us for training the resources which have accumulated in Western centers for the interpretation and extension of the Christian faith. The department of missions does not face in any immediate sense the necessity of less stress upon the training of missionary workers, but rather the need of more emphasis upon the sort of missionary preparation demanded under present circumstances. The ultimate end, however—by which we mean the final cessation of missions as such—must be taken into account in any long view of things, and so we raise the issue for whatever it may imply in the way of present policy.

At this point we turn from considering the relation of the department to the foreign field,—which relation we have viewed in the two aspects of apology and missionary training,—and give our attention to the second major phase of the department's work, namely, the education of the home constituency in matters missionary. The department may look in this direction for unique and hitherto almost uncultivated opportunities for service, and by entering vigorously into this fruitful field it may thereby offer abundant further justification for its existence.

It must be recognized very definitely that we are now in the period of co-operation. The native churches everywhere as well as ourselves should recognize this, although in the nature of the case more is incumbent upon us than upon them. Something of what it means for us in the way of missionary leadership has already been seen. Something further remains. There is the education of our home churches in ways that fully harmonize with the training given the new type of missionary who represents them.

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Our ideal is the fullest possible co-operation in the christianization of the whole world. From the point of view of the home churches this may be aimed at through a program of what we may call, using an already current term, missionary education. By this we mean, providing the home constituency with varied and full knowledge of the mission fields, the cultivation of right attitudes toward the peoples and problems of those fields, and the enlistment of our home forces in active co-operation with those peoples, especially with the Christians among them, that the world may be one in Christ. This is not a new enterprise, save as it is now dominated by new motives. The need of it has been emphasized by the Student Volunteer Movement, the Edinburgh Conference, and the Missionary Education Movement, in particular. To-day all the leading Christian denominations have organized special means to this end.

The question arises at once as to the place of the department of missions in this connection. If the emphasis is to be, as it should be, upon *education*, the answer is plain. Obviously, the department of missions, and the *university* department, in particular, is in an altogether unique position as a possible agency. The work of the various denominational agencies, including the Missionary Education Movement and the Central Committee on the United Study of Foreign Missions, which are clearing houses for the denominational boards, is and must be in the nature of things emphatically promotional. Various limitations thereby indicated prohibit their doing directly the necessary intensive work. For one thing, they are engaged in the gathering of funds each year for the support of the whole round of work in all the fields. It is not expedient, there-

THE ENTERPRISE OF MISSIONS

fore, to spend a disproportionate amount of time in the study of one field. They are precluded from undertaking missionary education in the full sense of the term. What they do is indispensable, but some provision should be made otherwise for work they cannot do. We venture to suggest that some co-operative plan be worked out by the Church by which the agencies of promotion and those of education may unite in the more effective prosecution of the missionary enterprise. For example, let the department of missions be recognized for the training of men for distinctively missionary educational positions under the various Boards of Missions. Administrative secretaries are now sent to the various mission fields for the sake of invaluable insight into conditions there. It would not be too much to assume that invaluable insight might also be gained by their residence for a time in the midst of a great university and their resort to materials of study available through the department of missions.

In addition to such aspects of work, there are ways in which the department may enter directly the field of missionary education. First of all, there is the course in Missionary Education, offered in the seminary to candidates for the home ministry. Something of the kind has been in operation in seminaries for many years, but the possibilities of such a course have not been greatly developed. It should be a required course for men preparing for the home ministry and for positions of religious educational leadership, and available for others who might be concerned. It should be in part a subject-matter course. Each year a particular field might be studied, for the sake of an understanding of the field itself, and for the establishment

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

of criteria of judgment with regard to its peoples and their manner of thought and life. Christian leaders in the home churches stand much in need of adequate control of the subject-matter of missionary education. They should be able to think on and to present the subject of missions intelligently and fairly. They need to know what the missionary enterprise really is in terms of the great wealth of materials involved, materials which have enormous cultural values for the student. The course should be, also, a study in methodology, in harmony with the best views of religious education in general. Neither matter nor method can stand alone. As method is of no avail for education if the materials are unfair—and much recent missionary educational literature is open to severe criticism for its unreliability and unfairness of statement—so also the materials depend for their proper effect upon the method of education.

This is not the place for a detailed discussion of method, or of methods. With regard to the former it may be sufficient to say that missionary education is an integral part of religious education, but that the religious educationalist, in the technical sense, is not qualified *as such* to deal with missionary education, which demands an expert in missions. As far as methods are concerned, they are matters of local interest, in the main. Those methods should be used which meet the needs of the local situation. It may be said, however, that the course of which we are speaking should provide an adequate program for the local parish. It should be flexible enough to include interests fostered by the denominational boards which may not be ignored during any one year, but it should aim at work intensive

THE ENTERPRISE OF MISSIONS

enough to promote true education. It might confine itself to one topic or one field a year. It should be comprehensive enough to include all the parish in its scope, looking toward the development of a democratic consciousness in missionary activity. It should aim at the cultivation of local initiative, discovering and developing local leaders and leavening the whole community with new interest. There are individuals with capacity for teaching, drawing, dramatics and other activities. To show them that the program is worth while, that their share in it would be self-rewarding as well as promotive of a great cause would be to win their willing co-operation. Out of it all would grow programs of activity truly representative of the local field and sufficiently appreciative of the world-wide task.

There is a distinct and direct service which any department may render to a parish or to a community through lectures, the conduct of missions institutes, and conferences for the training of local leaders, but it must be, in the nature of the case and under present conditions, all too limited. The service, however, which it may render through the missionary education of the seminary student who is to enter that parish or that community is great and will widen with the years. Nevertheless, the direct service to the local parish or community is worthy of far more attention than it has received. It is a very definite field of operation for the department of missions.

The department, therefore, stands in a threefold relationship to the home church in behalf of the cause of missions: through the promotional agencies, denominational and general, of the Church; through the seminary stu-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

dents who are to be her ministers; and through her local branches in various communities.

We Christians are set the task of understanding this world of ours, and this our own era, in order that men may escape the ill and apprehend the good. There is no set program for the universe. Creation itself is in process. We are not merely watching things evolve to an end whose form has been predetermined. We are participants in the process, who may under God exercise some control of it. We are working out our salvation. We are ministers for the salvation of others.

We are workers together in the process, we, the peoples of all lands and tongues and dispositions. The end we do know; it is the Kingdom of God. And more than that is known to a conquering host that marches under the banner of the Cross; it is the Kingdom of God realized through his Love and Wisdom, even Jesus Christ. This is the ultimate objective of the department of missions in the theological seminary.

THE EDUCATIONAL SERVICE OF THE
CHRISTIAN CHURCHES IN THE
TWENTIETH CENTURY
LUTHER ALLAN WEIGLE

THE EDUCATIONAL SERVICE OF THE
CHRISTIAN CHURCHES IN THE
TWENTIETH CENTURY

LUTHER ALLAN WEIGLE

TWO well-known English observers and interpreters of contemporary life have recently expressed themselves concerning religious education. Mr. Graham Wallas sees in it the recourse of Christian churches which are no longer able to appeal to the interest or command the respect of mature minds. We must begin with the children, their leaders say; and the result is the present emphasis of these churches upon the importance of religious education. Mr. H. G. Wells, on the contrary, holds that unless education can be inspired with religious motives, and religion given a place in education, under the new conditions of modern life and in the light of modern science, comparable to that which religion once held, human civilization is in danger of further disaster and final ruin. For Mr. Wallas, religious education is an expedient whereby a dying church seeks to save itself; for Mr. Wells, it is a means whereby the church can, if it will, save the world. For the former, it is an instrument of the church's attempted self-perpetuation; for the latter, an important, if not the central, aspect of its possible service to mankind.

We must not let dissatisfaction with the deity which

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Mr. Wells propounded a few years ago, or surprise at the courage with which he now proposes the construction of a new Bible, stand in the way of our understanding and appreciation of the truth of his fundamental position. His is the voice of a secular prophet which the churches will do well to heed. Mr. Wallas lets his discontent with the sacramentalism of certain churches, which he chances to know best, blind him to the fact that there are churches which prize intelligence and the freedom of thought and its expression quite as much as he himself does; and he is even led to question the place which Jesus Christ may ultimately hold in human history. Mr. Wells better understands the significance of Christ, and has at least enough faith in the Christian churches to proclaim to them his vision and summon them to service.

The nineteenth century will be remembered as one of the great missionary centuries in the history of the Christian Church. In this century the white races explored continents hitherto pathless to their feet, and thrust open the doors of kingdoms that had been closed to influences from without; while the development of machinery and of systems of rapid transportation and almost instantaneous communication, knit the various parts of the world together in social and economic interdependence, and made possible those processes of cultural interpenetration, amalgamation and assimilation which bid fair to render of one civilization, if not of one blood, the nations upon earth. And always in the van of these movements, pioneers of civilization as well as of the gospel, went the missionaries of the cross of Christ, sent forth by the churches which confess His name.

EDUCATIONAL SERVICE OF CHURCHES

It is probable that the work of religious education will engage the interest and enlist the resources of Christian churches in the twentieth century in a degree comparable to that in which the missionary enterprise engaged their activity in the nineteenth century. Not that the work of missions is over, or that the churches of Europe and America will take less interest in their brethren across the seas or give them less aid. But it is becoming increasingly clear that the great need of the world in the years immediately before us is for Christian education, and that in this field lies the opportunity and the duty of the Christian churches. This is true even in lands hitherto non-Christian, for the missionary enterprise itself is passing from the stages of exploration and propaganda to the less adventurous, slower and more constructive processes of cultivation, assimilation and education. Not so to pass would be evidence of failure. The missionary enterprise cannot remain a crusade. Its success, ultimately, is to be measured by its establishment of responsible, self-supporting and self-controlling, native Christian churches, which express, as well as help to create and sustain, a culture at once indigenous to the life of the people and Christian in principle and motive.

That better religious education is a primary need of the nations which have been deemed Christian, is clear to any observer who reflects upon the contrast between what is and what might be, and who perceives the essentially pagan character of many of the dominating motives of modern civilization. The likeness between our own time and the period preceding the fall of the Roman Empire is too startlingly real to be explained away by soothing state-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

ments of the great differences which modern science, modern big business, and modern politics are supposed to make. The civilization of the so-called Christian nations is headed straight toward disaster and ruin, which it can escape only by becoming Christian in deed and in spirit, whole-heartedly and completely, rather than in partial and perfunctory profession. "A Christian world is not only practicable," writes Professor Charles A. Ellwood at the close of a penetrating study of the present world-situation in relation to religion, "in the long run it will be found that no other sort is practicable."

It does not lie within the purpose of this paper to undertake an analysis of the perilous situation into which the part-Christian, part-pagan life of the now dominating races of the world has drifted. Let us but bring to mind certain facts which are patent enough, and have been described at length by some of the more clear-visioned among us. These are: (1) The delicate balance of a world-order as interdependent as this has become, and the magnitude of the destructive forces which science and invention have placed in the hands of men, whether of good will or of ill. (2) What has been aptly called "the sickness of an acquisitive society": the inequalities, injustices, exploitations, rivalries and wars which are the actual and possible results of the practical dominance of the economic, industrial, social and political organization of human life by motives of gain, self-seeking and pleasure. Yet such motives are almost universal; and even folk who are better intentioned in private purpose are involved in the enterprises of systems which emphasize rights, privileges and rewards rather than functions, obligations and

EDUCATIONAL SERVICE OF CHURCHES

service. (3) The prevalence of the doctrine of the absolute sovereignty and non-moral or beyond-moral character of the state—a doctrine which is not confined to Germany, and is more widely practiced than it is professed. (4) The risks of democracy, as a form of political organization which is at the mercy of possible majorities of unintelligent, irresponsible, food-hunting and amusement-loving people, the easy prey of demagogues, whether unscrupulous or merely fatuous. It seems to be a custom of human history that democracies finally pass over into tyrannies; and Plato thought it must always be so. It yet remains to be seen whether the democracies of the world's present aspiration, which are undoubtedly in many respects better conceived than those of earlier times, can succeed and endure. (5) The disintegration of family life incident to the present economic and industrial organization of human society, the prevalence of divorce, and the tendency to regard the relations of the sexes as a range for the assertion of individual freedom and the gratification of individual desire, rather than as the field of the highest of human affections and the most creative of human responsibilities.

The hope of the world, in the face of these facts, lies in the fuller development, more thorough application, and wider spread of intelligence on the one hand and good will on the other. Both are needed, for intelligence without good will is but the "enlightened" self-interest which has plunged the world into its present welter, and good will without intelligence remains blundering and ineffective.

Yet the tragic fact is that for a considerable portion of

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

humanity to-day intelligence and good will are sundered, if not actually in conflict, and education and religion are drifting apart. Here in America, to take the case which most directly concerns us, a situation has developed with respect to the relations of education and religion which is ominous.

The most obvious feature of that situation is the secularization of public education. The public schools of this country, which were conceived with a religious purpose and in the earlier days taught the Bible, the catechism and the principles of Christian living, now almost wholly omit religious teaching, and grant to religion such recognition only as is involved in the still fairly common custom of beginning the day's work with the reading of a brief selection from the Bible and the recital of the Lord's Prayer.

This secularization of the public schools is an incidental result of the working out, under conditions shortly to be mentioned, of two principles which are fundamental to American life and never, we may hope, to be surrendered. These are: (1) the principle of religious freedom, which insures the separation of Church and State, and guarantees to all the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences; (2) the principle of public education for citizenship in a democracy, which lays upon the State itself the duty of securing its own perpetuity and shaping its own future by the education of those who, as citizens and voters, constitute its sovereigns. The fulfilment of these principles, throughout the almost one hundred and fifty years of our national history, has brought about, on the one hand, a constant increase of

EDUCATIONAL SERVICE OF CHURCHES

emphasis upon civic, social and industrial aims in public education as contrasted with religious aims; and, on the other hand, has put the public schools at the mercy of minorities with respect to matters of religious conviction. Whenever a group or an individual has chosen to object, on what are averred to be conscientious grounds, to any religious feature of the program or curriculum of these schools, that feature has usually been eliminated, and nothing else of a religious sort has taken its place. The result is our present situation, with the public schools almost completely stripped of religious elements.

Yet neither of these principles would have involved, or would now necessitate, the present situation, were it not for a condition for which the churches must be held responsible. The secularization of American public education is due chiefly to the wide differences among us in religious belief, and especially to the fact that we have held our different religious views and practices in so jealous, divisive and partisan a fashion. It is in the name of religion that religion has been taken out of the public schools of this country. Avowed infidels or secularists have had little or nothing to do with it; and the Jews almost nothing. Christians have done this; and they have done it in the interest, each of his own particular brand of Christianity. Foreign immigration was a large factor in bringing about the present situation; and the breach between Catholic and Protestant has had more to do with it than the quarrels of the Protestant denominations with one another. But the process had begun long before the flood of immigration set in and before the Catholic Church became strong enough to raise much protest. The seculari-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

zation of the schools of Connecticut, for example, was begun as a result of the conflicts of Congregationalists, Separatists, Episcopalians, Baptists and Methodists, before the Catholic immigration had reached a point where that church was a force to be reckoned with.

The question as to who is to blame for the present situation is not nearly so important, however, as the other question: What is to be done about it? For something must be done, and that as soon as good sense shows the way. The practical exclusion of religion from the public schools of this country is fraught with danger. This situation will imperil, in time, the future of religion among our people, and, with religion, the future of the nation itself. Our children cannot but note the omission, and mark the discrepancy between the elaborate provision which society makes, through the public schools, for their education in everything else, and the poor provision which it makes, through the Sunday schools, for their education in religion. Even though neither they nor we may be fully conscious of them, impressions are being made which will operate inevitably to discredit religion in the minds of children, as being relatively unimportant, or irrelevant to the real business of life, or unintelligent, or a mere matter of personal taste or preference, or the private possession of a select group. It is hard to say which of these conclusions is the worst; there is real danger that our children will believe them all.

The danger is but increased by the growth of the public schools and the enrichment of their curricula. As late as a generation ago, these schools did little more than drill children in the three R's and transmit to them a meager

EDUCATIONAL SERVICE OF CHURCHES

conventional heritage of book-knowledge in the fields of geography, history and literature. Now, the schools not only keep children for more than twice as long a period as the schools of fifty years ago (over 1200 days, on the average, as contrasted with 582 days in 1870); they touch children's lives and influence their development at many more points. They afford to the children of to-day instruction and training in such subjects as the physical and biological sciences and their applications; cooking, sewing and household economics; wood-working, metal-working and the various trades; agriculture and stock-raising; stenography, commercial subjects, journalism; the fine arts; personal hygiene, physical education, the principles of public health; etc. They furnish to children regular medical examinations and care for physical defects and irregularities, supervise their diet and their play, provide vacation activities and holiday excursions, and furnish vocational guidance. We have thrown upon the public schools a multitude of new duties. We are relying upon them very largely, not only to impart to children the new knowledge and power with which the progress of science, invention and discovery is so richly endowing our time, but to afford to them much of the sense-experience, motor training and moral discipline, the educative contact with things, and the opportunities to handle and make things, to work and to play, to bear responsibilities and to share in group activities, which under simpler social conditions were afforded to children by the incidental activities and contacts of everyday life in the home and in the community. The schools of to-day are expected to constitute a sort of epitome or reproduction, on a small scale, of life itself.

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

No one has done more to interpret the educational significance of the changed conditions of modern life, and to determine the functions of the schools in view of these conditions, than John Dewey. For him, education faces toward the future rather than toward the past. It is the process whereby society reproduces its own life, perpetuates its interests and ideals, shapes its future and insures its progress. The end of education is not knowledge merely or power, but social efficiency, which includes, in a democratic society, the development of individual initiative, responsibility and good will. Such social efficiency can be acquired only by actual participation in the life and activities of a democratic society. It is the business of the school, therefore, to foster such a society and to induce such participation on the part of children. The school should thus be a miniature world of real experiences, real opportunities, real interests and real social relations. It must, of course, be a world simplified and suited to the understanding and active powers of children; it should be a world, moreover, widened, balanced, purified and rightly proportioned in comparison with the particular section of the grown-up world that lies immediately without its bounds; it is a world, again, which contains a teacher who is at once leader, inspirer, interpreter and friend. But it is a real world which reflects the fundamental, truer interests and values of the world without. Within this school-world children learn by working rather than merely by listening or reading; develop originality, initiative, responsibility and self-control by engaging in projects which call forth these qualities; and fit themselves for life by living and

EDUCATIONAL SERVICE OF CHURCHES

working together in co-operative, mutually helpful relations.

The schools of our present practice are fast approximating fulfilment of Professor Dewey's theory. For such schools to omit religion is a matter of far more serious consequence than for the schools of a generation ago. The older schools obviously afforded to children but a fraction of their education; the larger, and in many respects the more important, part of education was left to the home and the community. The omission of religion from the curricula of these schools would seem natural enough in view of the fact that so many other vital, everyday interests and occupations were omitted; and it would convey no suggestion that religion is unimportant or nugatory. But just such a suggestion is inevitable under present conditions. When the public schools provide for the education of children in every other sound human interest except religion, the suggestion is unavoidable that religion is a negligible factor in human life, or else so divisive a factor as not to lend itself to our common educative purpose. When schools which undertake to afford to children a transcript in miniature of life itself, and to constitute for them an educative environment which is widened, balanced, purified and better proportioned in comparison with that afforded by the particular locality and social group in which they chance to be born—when such schools ignore or slight religion, there is but one conclusion for sensible children to draw. The very vitality, efficiency and educative richness of the present public-school system constitute a source of increased danger to religion, so long

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

as these schools give to religion no more effective recognition than they now do.

What shall we do about it? No one fully knows. There is room and urgent need here for the sort of creative thinking which Professor James H. Robinson has so forcefully propounded as the world's real hope in social reform. It must be creative thinking which calls into question and puts to the test established conditions and assumptions. In three directions, at least, such thinking and experimentation is needed.

(1) The churches should seek to offset the negative suggestion of the public schools' omission of religion, by undertaking to establish church schools for the teaching of religion which will match up, in point of educational efficiency, with the public schools, and will appear, to the minds of the children themselves, to be their correlate and complement. This the churches have already begun to do. This purpose lies back of the present widespread movement toward better religious education through graded Sunday schools and weekday church schools.

(2) There is need for a more definite facing and a more thorough thinking through of the problem of the educational relations of Church and State. The present degree of secularization of the public schools of the United States has been brought about by processes which were incidental, rather than purposed. We drifted into the present situation; we never set sail for it. The principle of the separation of Church and State is fundamental and precious. But surely it must not be so construed as to render the State a fosterer of non-religion or atheism. We have too easily acquiesced in the dogma that, because of the

EDUCATIONAL SERVICE OF CHURCHES

separation of Church and State, the public schools can have nothing to do with religion. It is time to call this dogma into question; to inquire just how far the present degree of secularization follows logically and inevitably from the principles to which we are committed, and how far, on the other hand, it is due to adventitious elements of circumstance which are open to revision. We must determine just what the separation of Church and State implies, and what it does not imply, with respect to the education of children, which is so clearly a function of both. It may yet be necessary for the State to include the teaching of religion in the curriculum of its schools; if not, it would seem at least to be necessary for the State, in its educational program and policy, to afford to religion such a sort and degree of recognition as will offset or wholly void the condemnatory suggestion of the present situation, and help children to appreciate the true place of religion in human life.

(3) It is clear that the one circumstantial condition which has been most responsible for the present situation, is open to revision; and that revision is in the hands of the churches themselves, and can be brought about as soon as they acquire intelligence and good will enough to accomplish it. The sectarianism and partisanship which have taken religion out of the public schools, will block or hold back from full success any effort, whether on the part of the churches or the State, to make religion a more effective part of the education of our children. The plain fact is that we have made of religion so divisive a factor in human life that it could not lend itself to our common educative purpose. And it is equally plain that the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

churches must now come together in mutual understanding and must co-operate, more largely and more responsibly than they have yet thought of doing, in a common educational policy. So only can they compete with the public schools for the attention, interest and respect of children. So only can they rise above the necessity of competition, and make it possible for the public schools to co-operate with them instead of ignoring them. No less urgent than the call to Christian unity which comes from the mission fields of the world, is the call to Christian unity which issues from the present educational situation in the United States of America.

The second outstanding feature of the present situation is the obsession of many of the churches by the Uniform Sunday School Lesson system. In the quarter century following the initiation of this system in 1872, it largely displaced not only other systems of Sunday school lessons, but all other forms of religious education. Throughout the last quarter century there has been increasing dissatisfaction with the system, and in 1908 the International Sunday School Lesson Committee began to issue Graded Lessons which have been slowly, but steadily, displacing the Uniform. Yet the Uniform Lesson system is still firmly entrenched in at least half of the Protestant churches of this country; and it constitutes perhaps the greatest single barrier in the way of the development by the churches of an effective policy and program of religious education.

The word "uniform," as applied to Sunday school lessons, has always had two meanings: (1) that the lessons should be uniform over the whole country, being adopted

EDUCATIONAL SERVICE OF CHURCHES

by all churches, schools and publishing agencies; (2) that the lessons should be uniform within each school, the same section of Scripture material being assigned for all pupils, of whatever age or grade. In the discussions which led finally to the adoption of the system in 1872, the primary issue was concerning uniformity in the first of these senses, while uniformity in the second sense was rather taken for granted. What B. F. Jacobs fought for and won was the aim "to unite all the schools of our whole country upon one and the same series." From that point of view, the establishment of the International Uniform Sunday School Lesson system marked a real step forward. It gave a great impetus to Bible study; it brought about what is probably the most widespread and significant instance, in the history of Protestantism, of co-operation between the churches; and it has undoubtedly done much to promote the cause of Christian unity, in whatever form that may ultimately be realized.

Uniformity in the second sense of the term, we have said, was rather taken for granted. At the Convention in 1872 which established the Uniform system, but one voice, that of the Rev. P. S. Evans, called it into question. He favored the adoption of a series of lessons in three grades, with distinct material for each; but little attention was paid to his proposal. It is probable that, had more heed been given to his argument, and had the principle been adopted for which he stood, we should now be much nearer the solution of the problems of religious education than we are.

The main defects of the principle of uniformity, in the second sense of the term, which have emerged in the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

course of the fifty years of experience that we have now had with it, are:

(1) A uniform lesson, the material of which is necessarily chosen without reference to the abilities or to the moral and religious experiences and needs of any particular grade or age-group of pupils, is often beyond the comprehension of younger children and unsuited to their needs. One mother took her four-year-old boy to Sunday school for the first time, on September 16, 1906, only to have her high hope turned to despair and disgust by discovering that the lesson for the day concerned the question whose wife a woman would be in the resurrection, if she had married seven men. The so-called Improved Uniform Lessons, which have been issued since 1918, avoid such absurd infelicities by seeking, within each Uniform assignment, the particular segment which is best adapted to the understanding and needs of pupils in each department in the school, and, if none can be found which is so adapted, by providing for the younger children wholly different material for that particular day. Yet even when this has been done, it remains true that the general outlines of the series, and the character and order of the topics, have been determined without reference to any particular age-group; and that the lessons therefore do not provide such ordered Christian nurture and systematic, understandable instruction as the younger children need. Neither do they afford such special nurture and guidance as is needed in certain well-recognized critical periods in the moral and religious development of children and adolescents.

(2) A uniform series of lessons contains no principle

EDUCATIONAL SERVICE OF CHURCHES

of progression whereby the pupil is able to measure his advance from grade to grade. He studies the same thing as everyone else in the school. Instead of a steady march up, such as he is making in the public schools, he plods along on the level, or feels himself to be caught in an endlessly repetitious cycle. It is impossible, moreover, for the teacher fully and effectively to correlate uniform lessons with the work of the pupils in the public schools and with the rest of their education. A six-year-old boy, a few months after entering the public school, asked to be excused from going to Sunday school, and, when asked why, answered, "Oh, you don't learn anything there."

(3) The principle of uniformity does not provide an adequate basis for the teaching of the full range of Biblical truth. The attempt to choose passages from the Bible which can serve as a common body of lesson material for all in the school, results necessarily in an overemphasis of the narrative portions of the Bible, especially those shorter passages describing incidents which lend themselves readily to the drawing of distinct moral inferences, and in a relative neglect of the Wisdom literature, the Law, the Poetry, and, worst of all, the Prophets of the Old Testament and the Epistles of the New Testament. The portions of the Bible thus slighted are, next to the Gospels, the highest in religious value.

This point is worth a more detailed statement, for the argument put forth in the beginning for the Uniform system was that it would promote what B. F. Jacobs, at the Convention in 1872, called "a complete and comprehensive study of the Word of God that shall be like the curriculums of our school and colleges"; and the argu-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

ment is still put forward that the Uniform Lessons "take us through the Bible once in every seven years." The truth is rather that the Uniform Lesson system has served to prevent a complete and comprehensive study of the Word of God on the part of the common run of folk.

Under the direction of the chairman of the Commission on Policy of the International Sunday School Lesson Committee, Mr. W. E. Uphaus and Mr. W. E. Powell, members of the Yale Divinity School, have made careful studies of the Uniform Lesson system, with a view to determining its adequacy as an instrument of the study of the Bible. They have counted every verse assigned for study throughout the fifty-four years from 1872 to 1925, inclusive, due account being taken of the differences between the older Uniform system and the new Improved Uniform scheme. Their figures show that sixty per cent of the Biblical material has never been assigned for study. The whole of the Acts of the Apostles has been used at one time or another, and almost the whole of the Gospels. One-half of the Old Testament narrative material has been assigned; one-third of the material in the Epistles, one-sixth of the Prophecy, and less than one-eighth of the Poetry and Wisdom literature.

Merely quantitative statements like these, however, do not tell the whole story of the fragmentary and ineffective treatment of the Bible in this system of lessons. From the book of the prophet Amos, for example, ten lessons have been assigned in fifty-four years. Of these, three lessons, each dealing with the same material (6:1-8) were marked as special lessons for the teaching of temperance; and another (5:1-15) as a special home missionary lesson. A

EDUCATIONAL SERVICE OF CHURCHES

fifth citation (8:4-7) forms part of the Biblical material for a topical lesson on "Poverty and Wealth." Another lesson, meant to be historical, with the title "Israel Reproved" (5:4-15) got inserted, by some mischance or slip of ignorance, between six lessons on Elijah and five on the exploits of Elisha—which puts Amos a hundred years ahead of his real place in history, and makes his message hard to comprehend, to say the least! A seventh citation assigns the whole of the two books of Amos and Hosea as the material for a single lesson! There are left, out of the ten lessons, three which give to Amos his proper historical place and a real chance to convey his message to the minds of the pupils who study these lessons. One of the three lessons was in 1877, and the other two in 1891. It is further to be noted that never, even in these lessons, was the heart of Amos' message concerning God's rejection of ritual religion when unaccompanied by moral justice and righteousness of life (5:21-24) assigned for study; nor were the visions of chapter 7. One might have stayed in the Sunday schools of America for fifty-four years, and have studied faithfully the lessons assigned, without arriving at any real understanding of the prophecy of Amos, or its place in the revelation of God.

Facts such as these may be discovered for himself by any reader who cares to study the complete list of lesson titles and materials from 1872 to 1924 as this is contained in the convenient Handbook of the International Uniform Sunday School Lessons which is published by the American Sunday School Union. Twice only in these years lessons were taken from the book of Job—two lessons in 1879, and four in 1893. Micah 6:6-8, which has been

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

called the greatest saying in the Bible save one, was never assigned for study. The New Covenant passage from the book of Jeremiah, which is another of the high water marks of Old Testament religion, was assigned only once (1892). Among the Psalms which were never studied are 15, 34, 42, 46, 90, 91, 95, 96, 100, 104, 111, 115, 116, 119, 127, 128, 146, 147, 148. Six lessons were devoted to the story of Cain and Abel, and six to the cities of refuge; while only six were taken from the book of Job. The Golden Rule has been assigned for study eight times, the Psalm of Love in the thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians eight times, the Beatitudes nine times and John 3:16 ten times; while Daniel in the lions' den has been studied nine times, Gideon's exploit ten times, and the construction and ritual of the tabernacle eleven times. In the same period forty-nine lessons were devoted to Joseph; ninety-four to David; thirty-nine to Solomon; fifty-one to Elijah; and forty-seven to Elisha. The lessons on Elijah and Elisha total almost one-half of all the lessons on the history of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah from the division to the captivity, a proportion which throws quite out of perspective the study of this most important period in the history of the Hebrew people and the development, under the leadership of the great prophets, of the Hebrew religion. The one great virtue of the Uniform Lessons is the relatively large place which they have always given to the study of the life of Christ. Outside of that, one must conclude that the character of the system is such that it can afford to pupils but a fragmentary knowledge of Old and New Testament history, and almost no conception of the richness of the literature contained in the Bible and of the

EDUCATIONAL SERVICE OF CHURCHES

sweep and perspective of God's progressive revelation of Himself in this literature and in the life of which it is the expression and record.

It is not simply the children who suffer from these defects of the Uniform Lesson system as an instrument of Bible study. It is even more the grown folk, who should be led forward into the rich fields of the truth of God as it is contained in those parts of the Bible which are neglected by this scheme, and who should study the whole Bible in the larger, broader, deeper way which their more mature powers and riper experience make possible. The scheme of the Uniform Lessons has arrested the spiritual development of these folk, in so far as that depends upon their study of the Bible, at about the level of early adolescence.

We frequently hear the complaint that children, college students or people generally do not know the Bible as well to-day as in former generations. It is doubtless true; and the churches have themselves to blame for it. Little wonder that the Bible is a misunderstood book, when one reflects upon how it has been taught. The churches have dealt with it as a mere collection of proof-texts for their dogmas; and have failed to avail themselves of the new resources for its interpretation which the Spirit of God has placed within their reach through the results of modern historical investigation. Then they have tied themselves up to a scheme of uniform, lock-step study which omitted three-fifths of the Bible entirely, and so handled the rest of it as to prevent, except in the case of the Gospels, any coherent understanding of its message. In the present ignorance of the Bible we are reaping the

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

fruit of fifty years of commitment to a mistaken plan of Bible study.

It is the present ignorance of the Bible, moreover, which has made possible the waves of superstition and the transient successes of strange new cults among us; and which has made it possible, even within the Christian churches, for pagan allegorism and Pharisaic literalism and apocalypticism to make the degree of headway which they have made during the last decade. It has made it possible in our time again for well-meaning and good men, in the name of their misunderstanding of the Bible, to tilt against science and to succeed only in increasing the danger, already too great, of an actual breach between education and religion.

No call of the twentieth century upon the churches of Christ is clearer and more urgent than for the more effective teaching of religion. The world's dire need can be met and the ruin which threatens it averted only by the development of intelligence and good will, by education and the religion of Jesus Christ. In answer to that need we have to offer, as our inheritances from the nineteenth century, public schools which omit religion from their curriculum and Sunday schools upon which rests the incubus of an unpedagogical and ineffective lesson system. Upon the churches rests the responsibility, not only to provide better religious education in their own schools, but to make it possible for the public schools to grant a degree of recognition to religion which they do not now give.

Happily, the churches are hearing and heeding the call. They are assuming full responsibility for their Sunday

EDUCATIONAL SERVICE OF CHURCHES

schools, establishing correlated weekday schools of religious education, employing some paid directors and teachers, and training a great host of volunteers for this educational service. They are seeing that education in religion, like all education, must be psychological in method and material, and graded in such fashion as to provide for the awakening within the pupil of an expanding succession of moral and religious experiences. They are seeing that such experiential education in religion not only involves far better instruction in the Bible than the Uniform Lessons afforded, but includes both instruction and training in a great deal besides—in the principles and practice of worship; in the problems, habits and attitudes of Christian living and Christian service under the conditions of the modern world; in missions; in church history, Christian doctrine and the meaning of church membership; in the relations of science, business and politics to Christian convictions and Christian living; and the like. For the past twenty years or more an educational revival has been slowly but surely gathering way among the churches of this country, which is now beginning to reveal its power.

Into the detailed manifestations of that revival we have no space here to go. One aspect should be mentioned, in view of what was written above concerning the Uniform Lessons. The International Sunday School Lesson Committee has taken action declaring its policy to be, as soon as practicable, to issue only graded lessons; and it has projected, for the use of schools which find it impossible at present to adopt a system of lessons graded by years, a simpler series of lessons graded by three-year age-groups. These group-graded lessons it will substitute, be-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

ginning with 1924, for the Uniform Lessons in the Primary and Junior departments of the Sunday school, which correspond to grades one to six inclusive in the public school. The Uniform Lessons will be continued, but will now be recognized, in the publications of the Committee, as an alternative course, moving in a six-year cycle, for the use of pupils who are twelve years of age or more.

The intimate relation of the Divinity School of a great university to this educational revival is so clear, and the character of the contribution which it should make to the educational service of the churches is so obvious, that one forebears the attempt to describe these relations. There is no part of the curriculum of a Divinity School, provided its curriculum is of functioning material, as it ought to be, which does not have direct bearing upon the problems and the service of religious education. It would be a woeful blunder to assume that religious education concerns itself primarily with methodology. It is useless to inquire how to teach religion unless we learn also what to teach and to what purpose. To the full solution of the problems of religious education every department of the Divinity School contributes.

The particular functions of the department of Religious Education in the Divinity School are: (1) to train men for professional employment in the teaching ministry or educational service of the churches; (2) to afford to men who are entering the pastoral service of the churches such training as shall fit them to understand the educational problems and possible educational service of their churches, so that they may plan wisely and co-operate

EDUCATIONAL SERVICE OF CHURCHES

intelligently with the director or superintendent who has immediate charge of this work, and that they may be able themselves to supervise or direct it in case that should be necessary; to give them also such an understanding of what education is, and such a view of the relations of education and religion, that they may conceive the whole of the life and work of the churches which they serve in terms which are genuinely educational because soundly constructive of human well-being and human character, and co-operative with all community forces making toward the same good ends; to help them so to understand the meaning of family life in its relation to the whole superstructure of society as well as to morality and religion, that they may as pastors enlist the parents of their congregation to be teachers of religion to their own children, and may give them helpful direction and aid; (3) to undertake, through graduate students and members of the staff of the department, research, investigation and experiment in this comparatively new field, where much pioneer work is to be done; and, through association in such research, to fit a few men to take charge of like departments of religious education in colleges, universities and theological seminaries.

Horace Bushnell, a graduate of Yale College and Yale Divinity School, did more than any other one man to awaken and to determine the character of the churches' purpose in religious education; and the chair of Christian Nurture in this School fitly bears his name. May we not pray that a double portion of his spirit may rest upon us in these troublous days! Converted in a revival, he combated the revivalism which ignores the natural channels

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

of God's grace; elaborating a doctrine of Christian nurture through those channels, he never lost sight of the ultimate dependence of all good upon the converting power of the Spirit of God. Not evangelism *or* religious education, but evangelism *through* religious education, is the expression of his conviction—a conviction which the churches of to-day must make their own if they are to meet the challenge of the twentieth century and render to it the service which it most needs.

THE STUDY OF CHRISTIAN EVANGELISM

HENRY BURT WRIGHT

THE STUDY OF CHRISTIAN EVANGELISM

HENRY BURT WRIGHT

HENRY DRUMMOND once defined Evangelism as the methods of presenting truth to men's minds in any form. Object though we may to the all-inclusiveness of this definition, we cannot dismiss it without serious consideration. Yet one must be careful not to be misled by it. The mere presentation of a truth carries with it no guarantee of its acceptance. Under certain conditions the presentation of truth to men's minds in any form may be evangelism, but it need not always be. Preaching, pastoral work and religious education can be carried on with or without the evangelistic note. It is one thing to reveal truth to men and women, either as individuals or in groups, in such a way as to arouse in them intellectual convictions regarding that truth. It is another, and very different thing to prevail upon them to act deliberately and whole-heartedly upon those convictions to obtain in their own lives certain definite results. In the first instance we are dealing with the presentation of truth; in the second, with the securing of its acceptance.

Evangelism, as a specialized discipline of Practical Theology, is the science of the second of these two functions of the Christian ministry. The ultimate concern of the evangelist is, not that people should merely know about life, but that they should *have* it, and have it abun-

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

dantly. Just as Homiletics—the art of making and presenting a sermon—rests upon certain definite and established principles, so Evangelism—the art of getting folk to accept the truth that has been presented—has a special technique of its own. Proficiency in Evangelism as in Homiletics depends largely upon the amount and intensity of conscientious study and practice which has been devoted to the mastery of these fundamentals of technique. It is beside the point for men to argue, as many Christian workers have, that they do not possess the evangelistic gift, unless they can first produce the evidence that they have subjected themselves to a rigid and thoroughgoing training in evangelistic method.

Homiletics, the science of the presentation of Christian truth, has a well-developed and constantly growing literature of its own. During the past decade an amazing number of books have appeared by competent specialists on its history, theory and practice. We are fairly well agreed as to “the fundamental principles of public discourse as applied to the proclamation and teaching of divine truth in regular assemblies gathered for the purpose of Christian worship.” Somewhat less extensive, but by no means inadequate, is the literature of the administration and care of a parish—the technique of “the conservation, direction and utilization of the body of Christian impulse created by worship and preaching so that it shall find useful expression in the varied forms of life to which the Church is called to minister.” The rapid development of the literature of the history, theory and organization of Religious Education—that new science of the nurture of the soul

STUDY OF CHRISTIAN EVANGELISM

through graded study—is so striking that reference to it seems scarcely necessary.

Meanwhile how fares it with the science of securing the acceptance of Christian truth by those to whom it has been proclaimed and taught? At the present time no department of Practical Theology shows as wide divergences of opinion among students of the theory in matters of definition and goal, classification, methodology, and the whole question of relationships to other fields as does Evangelism. In recent encyclopedias of religious knowledge Evangelism as a discipline is either left out of account altogether, or treated doctrinally under the head of Evangelicalism, or relegated to the discussion of such an abnormal phase as Revivalism, with which it is regarded as identical. There exists to-day no adequate critical survey of the attempts made in the past to secure from men and women the acceptance of Christian truth as distinct from its presentation to them. In other words we still lack "The History of Evangelism in the Expansion of Christianity." Few theological seminaries offer thoroughgoing seminars in evangelistic theory, or adequate courses in its practice. The literature which is appearing is, for the most part, hortatory, emphasizing the fact that something ought to be done, but with little clear grasp of what should be done and how. Meanwhile, in the world of action, the technique of advertising and salesmanship, based upon a mechanistic psychology of appeal and response, has developed with such startling success, that Theology in many quarters seems ready to barter its God-given birthright of soul transformation for a pottage of temporary success with

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

what have been well characterized as "psychological substitutes for the spiritual."

It is unfortunate that the commonly accepted connotation of the word "Evangelism" springs from a figure used, it is true, by our Lord at the very beginning of his ministry, but never used save on that one occasion, and employed then solely to arrest the attention and enlist the interest of men of a certain occupation by talking in terms of that occupation. To two fishermen (Peter and Andrew) Jesus said: "Come ye after me and I will make you fishers of men. Hereafter ye shall take men (rather than fish) alive." No one would deny that this is what is incidentally accomplished by the evangelist. But the catching of men cannot be accepted as even a partial definition of the purpose of evangelism. Not all those who fish for men are evangelists. Such expert anglers as the book or insurance agent, the solicitor for investment securities, the financial canvasser, the membership drive committeeman, trained in the psychology of advertising and of salesmanship, are not, save in rare instances, evangelists. Too often, it is to be feared, the only "good news" and "glad tidings of great joy" connected with their operations is the glow of satisfaction in their own hearts because they have landed a big fish or a big string of fish at the close of the day's work. What "good news," pray, can it be for the fish to be told that it has been caught and is to be exhibited as a victim of the triumph of human wile? Such personal exultation on the part of the practitioner Jesus promptly checked and rebuked when the Seventy, returning from an evangelistic campaign, began to boast about their catch. "Re-

STUDY OF CHRISTIAN EVANGELISM

joyce not," He said, "that you have subjected others—even devils."

And yet, despite this unmistakable rebuke of our Lord, and in the face of His own clear statement of the object of His evangelistic effort—"I came that *they* may have life and may have it abundantly"—we persist in allowing what might be called the salesmanship theory of evangelism to color all our thinking and to influence much of our practice. "Evangelism," according to Harry F. Ward, "is the aggressive attempt to secure individuals for organized Christianity"; in other words, a fishing operation,—a membership drive for an ecclesiastical social club. And largely because we approach men with our eyes upon the catch—to *get* life for our own organized purposes, with incidental stars for *our* crowns—rather than to give life to those for whom we work, Evangelism, which ought to be the most cheering and heartening word in our language, is to-day avoided and looked upon with distrust by many men, including both laity, who instinctively shrink from being caught, and such of the ministry as possess that greatest of all the spiritual gifts, an innate reverence for other peoples' personalities.

Now the primary object of evangelism is not to get, but to give. The good news, the glad tidings of joy, the great light, are for the subject, not for the practitioner. In the radiance of this ultimate truth, the figure of the fisherman, used but once by Jesus, fades from sight, and those of the physician, the teacher and the shepherd, employed constantly by Him, come into abiding prominence. Evangelism, from Jesus' standpoint, is the art of influencing men and women to lay hold on a more complete life. The

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

good news is that men and women can attain that more complete life—that one consciously inferior, wrong, divided or unhappy, can become consciously superior, right, united and happy by a deliberate act of his will in laying hold of a divine power outside himself. “You and I cannot make men righteous, or peaceful, or joyful. God does that if a man will let Him come in. Our task is simply that of guides to point the way and of persistent advocates of that way. Whether or not a man will take the way depends, after all has been said and done, solely on his own conscious act of decision. We may help a man to come to the place where he is ready to make that decision, or we may hinder him from it. We may through undue pressure persuade him to say he has taken the way when he has not. We may even force him into the way for a little season; but we cannot compel him to travel it for long unless he deliberately and wholeheartedly chooses to do so. The object of evangelism is to influence men and women through the application of certain definite principles which underlie the psychology of all Christian appeal and response to decide deliberately and wholeheartedly to take that way which leads to fulness of life.”

The commonly accepted classification of evangelism is into two kinds—personal and public—a purely quantitative distinction, depending upon whether the evangelist deals with one single individual or with a group of men. In actual practice, these terms personal and public have come to be synonymous with private and public. Personal evangelism is supposed to be a strictly private interview, with one single individual apart from all others, something occult, intimate, secret, with doors closed and with

STUDY OF CHRISTIAN EVANGELISM

all possibility of interruption entirely removed. Nothing will do more to convince one of the inadequacy of this quantitative definition, and of its serious practical psychological consequences, than a study of the evangelism of Jesus. If we except three groups of cases—(1) His formal evangelistic addresses to masses of men, (2) His dealings with the Scribes and Pharisees, and (3) His training of the Twelve—which, as we shall presently see, were distinct specialized types of evangelism, there still remain at least seventy cases in the gospel records of what may properly be termed His personal evangelism. And it is a striking fact that in not over a half dozen of these seventy or more cases did he hold what could be designated a private interview. In the attempt to recall cases of private interviews, the mind reverts at once to Nicodemus and to the Woman of Samaria, but it stops there. And it must not be forgotten that the environment of the Nicodemus interview was not of Jesus' choosing, while the well at which He met the Woman of Samaria was the public service station of the town where one would be most liable to interruption. It was merely chance which secured conditions of intimacy for a few moments, nor were these long maintained or considered essential by Jesus. But beyond these two, what others? In others which we have instinctively come to regard as personal, largely because of the prominence of the person addressed—Zaccheus, the Rich Young Ruler, Simon the Pharisee, Martha—there was invariably a periphery of interested auditors and observers; and one often queries with which of the two parties, the person addressed or the onlookers, the personal evangelism was most effective.

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

Clearly the meaning which we have come to attach to the word "personal" is wrong. Our definitions of different types of evangelism must not be quantitative, but qualitative, depending not on how many people were addressed—whether one or a group—but on what kind of approach was made. For personal evangelism, according to Jesus' way of thinking, could be carried on with twelve men at once just as well as with one man. Who would deny that the washing of the disciples' feet was an instance of personal evangelism! If the approach made to the wills of twelve men at once, or to the will of one man alone, is personal—in other words, if the methods employed are the intimate personal processes of friendship—then personal evangelism has been attempted. Otherwise not.

From a qualitative standpoint, then, we shall recognize at least four different kinds of evangelism—four ways of bringing good news to men. The first of these is *formal evangelism*, often inadequately defined as "public evangelism." Formal evangelism is the attempt to influence a single human will or the corporate will of a group to lay hold upon more abundant life through formal persuasion. It seeks to give men the information on the basis of which a right decision may be reached, and its aim is the establishment of truth. John Watson, to distinguish it from revivalism, used Drummond's phrase, "The New Evangelism." It is concerned largely with Apologetics, and is often the only approach that is necessary in dealing with intellectually honest men. It is pre-eminently the type to be used at the start with the student class. The case of Philip and the Eunuch, persistently classified in the handbooks as a perfect example of personal evangelism simply

STUDY OF CHRISTIAN EVANGELISM

because no third party was present, is in reality not a case of personal evangelism at all. There is no evidence that Philip employed any of the intimate personal processes of friendship in dealing with his man. We are told that he sat down with him and preached unto him Jesus—a formal presentation of an apologetic. At the close of the statement the Eunuch, an honest man, without further urging, said, “Behold, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?” Generally, however, since just as effective results can be obtained when formal apologetic appeal is made to a number of men as when the argument is repeated to each individual alone in turn, and since there is a greater gain in the saving of time and effort in mass apologetic preaching, formal evangelism is employed with groups. Yet every Christian worker can recall cases where he has spent an hour or even an evening with an individual in the seclusion of the study pressing home the claims of Jesus in purely formal fashion.

A second method of evangelism might be called, for want of a better term, *dynamic*—the attempt to influence a single human will or the corporate will of a group to lay hold upon more abundant life through direct action. It is at the basis of much of what is technically called “social evangelism” (a misnomer, since all real evangelism of whatever type must be social), but it is just as essential in dealing with certain classes of individuals. Its aim is the securing of justice and it is concerned primarily with removing—often with the knife—those causes which prevent a man or a group from coming to a right decision. A careful study reveals the fact that it is the underlying method in most public revivalism of the orthodox type,

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

which is generally designed to arouse the public conscience against some one outstanding sin in a community. The lawyer and the courts—including the court of public opinion—the dean in a college or university, the father in the family, are suggestive of its necessity and illustrate its field of action. Jesus employed it largely in dealing with a special class—the Scribes and Pharisees—and it is the kind of effort most generally effective with the hardened heart. At the start the dynamic evangelist does not appear to the subject in his true light as a bringer of good news, a reason for the opposition which dynamic evangelism, especially revivalism, often arouses. It is good news of which the subject is not as yet cognizant. He must first escape through the travail of personal suffering from the miasma of the fool's paradise in which he has been, and still is, blindly living. But when he is once released, his gratitude knows no bounds for the hidden good news which the application of the inexorable laws of justice to his case has opened his eyes to see and his ears to hear. The evangelist must here anticipate the future mental state of his subject.

A third type of evangelism is *educational*—the attempt to influence a single human will or the corporate will of a group to make that decision which leads to fulness of life through nurture. Its aim is growth and it strives to create an environment in which it is easier for one to come to a right decision. It relies much upon suggestion and the stimulation of imitation in the subject. This was the method employed by Jesus in dealing with the Twelve, both as individuals and as a group. Its field is illustrated by such types as the teacher, the nurse and the mother. It

STUDY OF CHRISTIAN EVANGELISM

has sometimes been wrongly regarded by its sponsors as an end in itself, not as a means. There are those who have argued that nurture can, through its processes, furnish fulness of life to the subject unconsciously to him and with no effort on his part. But without challenging any of its other claims as extravagant—even the one that it is the most effective type with the majority of normal human beings—we cannot grant that educational evangelism at its best can do more than lead men and women to the point of decision or enlistment with a somewhat greater antecedent probability that their final decision will be right than is the case with the other methods. No man or woman oozes unconsciously into the kingdom of God. In the final analysis, all enlist and every soldier knows when he enlisted. No one to-day insists on sudden, catastrophic spiritual experiences, but we must still insist on definite ones. The processes leading up to the enlistment may have been gradual and extended over many months, but the final act of decision was a conscious one made by the individual himself. "No thoughtful man can look into the eyes of a group of school boys or college men, as they stand on life's threshold eager, ingenuous, responsive, with powers unabated, without picturing to himself in fancy what they may become. Some are to make a success of life; others, complete or partial failure. So much is certain. But no man, not even the most skilled analyst of human character, can predict in which of even these two broadest of divisions—the successes or failures—any one of the group will be found when life's work is done. Gladly would we give our all to make just this one fundamental choice between success or failure for even the least of the group,

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

but this we are sadly conscious we cannot do. This lad who sits before me with the intuitive response to a new truth as I speak, with all the advantages that wealth and education and environment can offer, I may find ten years from now a blear-eyed club man in some great metropolitan center, cynical, restless, indifferent to all higher aspirations. Educational evangelism of home and school and church made it easier for him to enlist on the right side; but after all was said and done, he was master of whether he would enlist or not. The blood of many families and tribes and races was mingled in his veins. There were many men potential in him, and which of them was to emerge he himself irrevocably chose by a thousand silent moral preferences. Before the sovereign power of decision of a lad of seventeen, even the educational evangelist stands helpless."

How, then, shall we distinguish from the three methods of evangelism already described—formal, dynamic and educational—the fourth and last, which we designate as *personal*? Personal evangelism is the act of influencing a single human will or the corporate will of a group to make that decision which leads to greater fulness of life through the processes of friendship. At least four of these stand out with distinctness in the practice of Jesus,—gift, self-revelation, the wounds of love, and vicarious suffering. Whenever the evangelist opens his heart to others and takes them into his confidence, so that what he is, as much as what he says, speaks to men, whether he be addressing himself to one man or to a thousand, he is employing personal evangelism. Practically all of Dwight L. Moody's and Henry Drummond's public evangelistic addresses were

STUDY OF CHRISTIAN EVANGELISM

of this sort. This method of approach leads more immediately to the heart of a man than formal persuasion or direct action, or nurture, and deals more intimately with the final decision itself than with the processes leading up to it. The object of personal evangelism is the evoking of loyalty, and it is the most nearly universal of all the methods, for while the first three types—formal, dynamic and educational—require in general the professionally trained specialist, personal evangelism can be practiced by any man without special academic training. Although there is no inherent necessity for the fact, it is probably true that the most effective examples of it are to be found among the underprivileged. Jesus chose the Twelve from that class. The generosity, open-heartedness, directness and self-sacrifice of some of the woodsmen with and through whom the writer has worked for a quarter of a century in the Massachusetts hills find few parallels in urban and academic life. And the same was often strikingly true of the American doughboy in the army, when contrasted with the officer. It is time that the Church of God, instead of relying almost entirely in its great task of securing the acceptance of truth upon a few highly trained formal, dynamic and educational specialists, should capitalize the wealth of evangelistic gifts of will and heart, as distinct from those of intellect, which lie undeveloped and undirected in the average man.

Having formulated our definition and classification of evangelism, we may next ask what effect the scientific study of human consciousness has had, and is liable to have on its theory and practice. One thing is certain,—that it has not mitigated the awfulness of the consequences

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

of sin. A study of human consciousness and its physiological background reveals a possible hell for transgressors so scientifically certain that one might well hesitate to preach it in all its fulness. A single paragraph from Angell's *Psychology* will suffice:

To make of the body, in which our habits are conserved, a friend and ally and not an enemy, is an ideal which should be strenuously and intelligently held out to every young person. One can never say at what precise moment it may become literally impossible to shake off a bad habit. But we know with perfect certainty that our nervous tissues are storing up every day the results of our actions, and the time is, therefore, sure to come when no amount of merely pious intention can redeem us from the penalty of our folly.

In the face of such facts as these, there is but one thing that can save a man in the grip of habit from complete despair, and that is the assurance of the possibility of the entrance of the almighty redemptive power of a living God into his own life.

A scientific study of human consciousness has restored to the evangelist his right to stress individual sins. For, after all, it matters and it matters tremendously whether a man be personally pure and honest and unselfish. The Hughlings-Jackson law, with its revelation of what stimulant, narcotic, sex in artificial contexts, surfeiting, the greed or gambling passion, and the self-passion actually do to the higher functional levels of a man's brain cells—the progressive paralysis beginning with the highest levels of idea and ideal, then descending into the level of initiative, continually creeping downward until the judgment level is affected, and finally mastering the lowest level of

STUDY OF CHRISTIAN EVANGELISM

automatic functions—puts the whole subject of so-called negative Christianity, so extensively and so unfairly discredited in recent years, in an entirely new light as the indispensable preparation for positive Christian service and reveals a key to the solution of the whole problem of indifference in religion. Indifference is paralysis due to sin, and it begins with the highest levels. The new evangelism, instead of repeating the familiar generalization that sin keeps a man from God, proceeds to tell us what some of the specific sins are that keep a man from God and just how they work physiologically. It was this revelation which finally overthrew alcohol, and it is this which will finally sound the death knell of narcotic, of artificial sex stimulation—however subtly disguised in perverted art or literature or dance or movie—of gambling and the greed passion, and of the self-passion, individual or national.

The scientific study of human consciousness has restored the validity of the claims for the normal mystical sense as distinct from mystical monomania, and this is all-important; for, in the final analysis, the evangelist's task is simply this, to put a man in touch with the living God.

It is when we attempt to define the outstanding human instinct to which appeal should be made by the evangelist in securing the acceptance of truth that we discover another error, serious in its practical consequences, which has persisted in organized evangelism since the early apostolic days, despite the fact that it goes contrary to the general practice of Jesus. It is not difficult to see why so large a number of evangelists, beginning with Peter and John, and continuing to the present day, have put primary emphasis on the instinct of fear in evangelistic appeal and

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

have reasoned of judgment to come. If one's thinking on evangelism is at all under the spell of the salesmanship theory, the appeal to fear can be counted upon to bring more immediate and larger results of a certain tangible sort in human hearts than any other. When fear comes upon every soul, there is no question that numbers can be added day by day to any ecclesiastical organization which promises to deliver from the causes of that fear.

But when one turns back from the well-nigh universal practice of apostolic and post-apostolic evangelism to a study of the evangelism of Jesus, he is struck at once with the calmness which pervades the records. In place of the bustle and drive and pressure of the salesmanship theory, whose main appeal is to the instinct of fear in the desire to catch and get, one senses the calm of the physician or the shepherd, moving quietly from one to another of his charges, bringing hope and confidence and peace with every movement in the sincere desire to give. Rarely, it is true, our Lord plays upon the instinct of fear as a last resort in extreme cases where dynamic evangelism is the only alternative to arouse men to a realization of their actual condition, but the primary human instinct to which He appealed was one which has been for the most part overlooked in summaries of the human instincts, or hidden in such related forms as "acquisition" or "constructiveness." For want of a better term, it might be called the "logical instinct," or the "instinct for perfection or completion." Professor Palmer has well characterized it as the craving for "organic wholeness." It is easily enough recognizable in those quiet words of appeal of Jesus,

STUDY OF CHRISTIAN EVANGELISM

which never failed to evoke response: "If thou wouldst be perfect," "Wouldst thou be made whole?"

Central in Jesus' approach to the human heart was this appeal to the instinct for perfection or completion. "Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father in Heaven is perfect," was the ideal He set before humanity. The man who began to build and was not able to finish had done violence to a natural human instinct. Jesus' prayer was that of all God had given Him, He should lose not one. He finished the work, he insisted, which God gave Him to do. The very figures in which He defined His theology rest upon the same idea. Sin is missing the mark—an imperfect score of sixty when shooting at the target, when it might have been the perfect score of one hundred. Hell is "Gehenna," the rubbish heap where the imperfect and incomplete are scrapped. The salt that has lost its savor is thrown out to be trodden under the foot of man. Holiness is "wholeness." Drummond once said that our ideal of what people are becomes to them the hope and pattern of what they may become. It was the latent perfected Peter which Jesus foresaw in the fractional Simon and disclosed to him which made of the latter the leader of the apostolic church.

And if we were to sum up Paul's ideals for his task of evangelism, it might well be in words which embody the working of the same instinct. "Finally, brethren, be perfected"; "that ye may stand perfect"; "till we all attain unto a full grown man"; "I fill up on my part that which is lacking"; "that we may present every man perfect in Christ"; "unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ"; "when that which is perfect is come, then that

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

which is in part shall be done away"; "I have finished my course."

It was the response to the appeal of this same instinct which marked the inception of the marvelous ministry of America's greatest evangelist, Dwight L. Moody. In recounting the incident, his biographer says:

It was at this time that Mr. Moody heard the words that marked a new era in his life: "The world has yet to see what God will do with and for and through and in and by the man who is fully and wholly consecrated to Him." "He said *a man*," thought Moody, "he did not say a great man, nor a learned man, nor a rich man, nor a wise man, nor an eloquent man, nor a smart man, but simply a man. I am a man and it lies within the man himself whether he will or will not make that entire and full consecration. I will try my utmost to be that man."

Not only is the appeal to the instinct for perfection and completion the most powerful one which the evangelist can employ in dealing with his subject, but it becomes in turn the impelling motive of his own effort with the individual. The ninety and nine are not enough; one must search for the lost hundredth sheep till it be found. This soul which stands before the evangelist in all its unloveliness and incompleteness must be made lovely and complete. The workman has seen the vision of what it may become. He too must finish the specific piece of work that has been given him to do with this particular life. Leave out of account the urge of the instinct for perfection and completion in a man's life—not only for his self-realization, but that others may also realize their full selves—and there is nothing in the world so unreasonable as vicarious suffering. Take it into the reckoning, and the

STUDY OF CHRISTIAN EVANGELISM

mother, the teacher, the personal evangelist simply must suffer vicariously that the wayward son, the dull of intellect, the vacillating Simon may realize the vision of "the boy that might have been," the "mind that found itself," "the soul built on the rock."

No one has sketched more clearly the field of Christian evangelism whether we are dealing with the individual or the corporate soul, than Lyman Abbott in a recent study of Dwight L. Moody.

Every healthful man sometimes—some men at all times—looks back regretfully upon his past. He is conscious of blunders in judgment, aberrations of will, deliberate acts of wrong-doing, which have brought injury upon himself and upon others. He wishes that he could live again his life, or some particular crisis in his life. Sometimes this is a keen sense of shame for some specific deed done or duty neglected; sometimes a vague feeling of self-condemnation without clearly defined specific cause; sometimes a passing shadow, evanescent and uninfluential; sometimes a morbid self-condemnation, depressing the spirits and tending toward despair. He who has never felt this sense of remorse in some one of its various forms is singularly lacking either in his memory, his ideals, or his power of sitting in judgment upon his own conduct and character. It is doubtful whether any desire which the human soul ever possessed is keener or more overmastering than the desire which sometimes possesses us, in certain phases of our experience, to be rid of our ineradicable past and to be permitted to begin life anew, unclogged and unburdened.

The other spiritual hunger of the soul relates to the future. The soul is conscious of undeveloped possibilities in itself; it is spurred on, to it knows not what future, by unsatisfied aspirations. It longs to do and to be more, and rather to be than to do. It suffers what I may call "growing pains." It has in the sphere

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN SERVICE

of moral experience aspirations that may be compared to those which have summoned the greatest musicians and the greatest artists to their careers. This sense of unsatisfied aspiration differs from the sense of remorse in that it relates to the future, not to the past; the one is a consciousness of wrong committed or duty left undone, the other of life incomplete. The cry of the soul in the one experience is that of Paul: "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" The cry of the other is that of Tennyson:

"Oh, for a man to arise in me
That the man that I am may cease to be."

The one is a craving for peace, the other for achievement.

It is because the Christian religion is able to satisfy these two passionate desires of the human soul—the desire for peace and the desire for achievement—that it possesses the attraction which the failures and the folly of its adherents may diminish but cannot destroy.

The business of the Church of God is to train its workers in the technique of helping all men to satisfy these two universal soul desires. Evangelism in the final analysis is neither the science of recruiting for Church membership—essential as this may be for the Church organization—nor the art of the mastery of human wills—flattering as this undoubtedly is to the practitioner. It is the honest attempt so effectively to convince a man or a group of men that his individual will or the corporate will of the group can and should be released from conscious inferiority and energized for more abundant living through the mighty dynamic of God descending from above, that that individual or that group is willing to act on the conviction and fulfil the conditions to secure the result.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

