

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

Coöperation in Christian Work.

THE praise of Christian unity is often chanted now-a-days; the grand chorus of the Evangelical Alliance stately joins in celebrating the excellency of its glory, and there is an unwritten liturgy of pleasant phrases, describing its delights, into which most Christians, in their devotions, spontaneously glide. Of this sort of sentiment there is even a surplusage. The terms in which it is commonly set forth have become so prodigiously inflated that they pass for much less than their dictionary value. Meantime, the schisms increase, the churches are multiplied far beyond the needs of worshippers, and the relation of the sects is practically one of rivalry.

Most of the great denominational assemblies devote a day to the reception of what are called fraternal delegates, and the speeches of these delegates are full of the sentiment of unity. But there is nothing in them more substantial than sentiment. Propositions looking toward the concentration of forces in Christian work are never heard in these places. The applause of the platforms would cease, and a coolness would soon fall upon the meeting, if any such suggestion were heard. Indeed, the speakers on these occasions are generally careful to explain that they do not expect or desire any practical union in Christian work. "Union," said a distinguished speaker at one of these meetings, not long ago, "union is chimerical; union is impossible; it is useless to talk of union at present; but we may have unity—the unity of the spirit; that we ought to pray for and promote in every possible way." Precisely. Union is concrete; unity is abstract; what the average "fraternal delegate" wants is an abstract or sentimental unity that will call for the sacrifice of no sectarian advantages.

Nevertheless, all these love-feasts of Christian fellowship, from the Evangelical Alliance down to the union prayer-meeting in the country villages, bear united testimony that the differences between the sects—between those called Evangelical, at any rate—are not of any real importance. In other words, they bear witness that the sectarian divisions of the Christian church in city and country, by which in so many places its power is destroyed and its glory turned to shame, all rest on non-essential differences.

There is a large body of Christian men in all the sects—mostly quiet men who do not talk much in the union meetings, but whose contributions support, in large measure, the churches and the missionary societies—who have been paying close attention to these useless divisions, and who are beginning vigorously to apply to them their logic and their common sense. "If the differences between these sects are so unimportant as you say," they argue, "why should they be perpetuated at such cost? Why should four weak churches, all substantially alike, be maintained in a small village, when one efficient church could be easily supported? Why should the

sects in the cities struggle on as rivals, rather than as allies, often crippling one another by their competition, getting in one another's way with their mission enterprises, having no stated consultations, and making no concerted effort to secure a harmonious and complete occupation of their common field? Such a waste of power, such a confusion of plans and purposes, would ruin any other enterprise. Why should this greatest of enterprises be crippled by divisions which, as you testify, are of no real consequence?"

These questions are beginning to be asked more and more earnestly, and by a class of men whom the sectarian managers will not wisely undertake to snub. The readers of this magazine have heard them asked more than once. The broad and genuine catholicity of Dr. Holland, and his invincible common sense, led him to urge these questions long ago, and he never ceased to press them upon the conscience of the churches. Almost a quarter of a century has passed since he wrote the essay on "The Lord's Business," included in "Gold Foil," in which he sent the truth home in this trenchant way:

"The call is uttered and echoed in every part of the world for more money and more men; but is it too much to say that enough of both have been squandered in the business management of the Christian enterprise to have carried Christianity into every household? The money expended in church edifices and inefficient governmental church establishments, and bootless and worse than bootless controversies, and the upbuilding of rival sects, would have crowned every hill upon God's footstool with a church edifice, and placed a Bible in every human hand. Further than this, if the men now commissioned to preach the Gospel were properly apportioned to the world's population, millions would enjoy their ministrations who never heard the name of Jesus Christ pronounced, and never will. The towns in Christendom which feebly support, or thoroughly starve, two, three, or four ministers, when one is entirely adequate for them, are almost numberless."

Those who followed the discussions of this department of the magazine through the years of Dr. Holland's editorship, know how often and strongly he struck this chord. Through his teaching, and the teachings of other men impressed with the same conviction, the truth of this matter has become the common property of a multitude of sagacious and influential business men in all the churches, and it is safe to predict that something good will come of it. The wicked and wasteful rivalries and competitions between sects that differ about non-essential matters will not always be tolerated. It will be necessary for the managers of the denominational machines to find a *modus vivendi*. The denominations may continue to exist for a long time, but they will be obliged to come to a better understanding, and not merely sing the praises of unity, but learn to unite in Christian work.

In promoting reforms of this nature, words are often things, and we beg to suggest a word which may help

in the solution of this problem. Suppose we stop talking of union and of unity, and begin to consider the duty of *coöperation* in Christian work. This is the desideratum—*coöperation*. In town and city and mission field, Christians, the disciples of a common Master, ought to *coöperate*. Can they *coöperate*? Who will deny it?

When we come to speak of the methods of *coöperation*, there is much to say. Here wisdom is wanted, but means will not be lacking to men whose hearts are set upon the attainment of the end. In the present number of the magazine begins a short serial by Dr. Gladden, devoted to the discussion of methods of *coöperation* in Christian work. We think our readers will agree with us in regarding it as among the most suggestive, practical, and entertaining studies of the subject that have yet been made. It is to be hoped that "The Christian League of Connecticut" will serve as a model for similar movements in other communities throughout the country.

The Dreaded American Aristocracy.

"WHOM the gods would destroy they first make mad." The insane persistency of the machine politicians in the system of political assessments, in the face of the exposure, protest, and ridicule of the public press, is likely to prove the death-blow of the system itself. During the last few months this whole subject has been elucidated in a manner altogether unprecedented. Nor was it necessary for the critics to argue dryly on general principles; the gentlemen of the machine were magnanimously active in furnishing current and striking examples of the sordid selfishness, hypocrisy, impropriety, cruelty, and absurdity of the proceeding. The pathetic stories of individual hardship with which the papers have teemed have been highly effective in stirring the public anger against this wholesale political robbery; but humor is sometimes a more powerful foe than the deepest pathos or the most savage satire, and from the time that the story started the rounds of the newspapers concerning the prompt and sweeping assessment of the cats in the Philadelphia Post-office, hubbub in America became a difficult occupation indeed. Difficult, but not impossible,—for it is, in a sense, natural for a Hubbell to hubble; just as it is for a singer to sing, a canter to cant, a beggar to beg. But when public opposition to a practice like this takes not only the form of scorn, but of ridicule, it is much less easy to carry it on in the presence of a people whose bump of humor is so largely developed as is that of the people of America.

We have no intention to enter here into a general discussion of this subject, but wish merely to allude to a single phase of it. We have heard a great deal during the past few years about the dangers of an office-holding aristocracy. There is a class of patriots in this country whose thoughts by day and whose dreams by night are racked by the dread of an aristocracy of office-holders. We do not exactly know what the dreaded thing is. We know, of course, what an office-holder of the present day is: namely, a person who, putting behind him all selfish thoughts, all considerations of his own, his family's, or his friends' advancement or advantage, devotes himself solely and

assiduously to the responsible duties of a public office. What the patriots above referred to believe that such a man is to become, when civil service reform (that is, retention in office during good behavior) works its worst upon him, we have no means of knowing. But, from a cursory view of the aristocracy of "the mother country," where the genuine aristocrat is acknowledged to exist, we can imagine that the office-holding aristocrat of the future will hold large landed estates, be driven to his office in an old family coach (with his coat-of-arms on the door-panel), ride over the country on the trail of foxes (or the American anise-seed substitute therefor), sport a yacht, belong to all the best clubs in town, and date his family back, if not to the Conquest, at least to the *Mayflower* or to Pocahontas. Now it is most likely that we are all at sea in our endeavors to get at the idea of an office-holding aristocrat, such as scares the imagination of the American patriot. It cannot be just what we have thought it might be, though this is bad enough; it must be something altogether more nightmare-producing than this.

Yes, the office-holding aristocrat of the future must be an excessively terrible fellow, or he would not be so perturbing to the mind of the anti-reformer, nor would eminent reformers, like Mr. Godkin for instance, take so much pains to allay the fears of the gentlemen of the machine on this subject.* It is evident that if clerks and heads of departments, all through the United States, in the custom-houses, in the post-offices, in the city-halls, in the court-houses, are to be kept in office "during good-behavior," they will immediately begin to behave badly. That is a self-evident proposition.

Let it be acknowledged, then, that without "rotation in office," the principles of American liberty will be undermined. But what, then, has Mr. Hubbell been about? Does he realize what it is to hubble, *i. e.*, to screw money for election purposes out of men, women, children, and cats, who can scarcely live on their incomes? Does he realize that by this process he has been laying the foundations of a gigantic and permanent "office-holding aristocracy,"—an aristocracy which is to perpetuate itself forever by a venal and shameless system?

The Exodus of Lunatics.

IN one of Mr. Charles Reade's enthusiastic novels, an attempt is made to picture the miseries of sane people improperly shut up by designing relatives in English lunatic asylums. So far as we know such cases are rare, either abroad or in America, and when responsible persons are wrongfully committed, it is either through the carelessness or ignorance of medical men who sign their commitment certificates. Of late, nevertheless, a number of persons held in American asylums for the insane have been pronounced of sound mind by Supreme Court judges before whom they have been brought, and promptly discharged,—one judge going so far as to say that the alleged lunatic was not insane, and never had been. This extraordinary piece of judicial assumption immediately raises the question

* See "The Danger of an Office-holding Aristocracy," by E. L. Godkin, "The Century," May, 1882.

The obvious remedy is to extend the system of impartial selection to all places except those by which the policy of the Administration is shaped. But before this can be done, there must be rooted out of the public mind the notion that any public place can properly be bestowed as the reward of partisan service. The great administrative offices must be filled by adherents of the dominant party, not to reward them for their services to the party, but that the will of the majority of the people, as expressed at the polls, may be executed. But, in any broad public view, it is a matter of utter indifference whether the men who fill the minor ministerial, clerical, and laboring places belong to one party or the other. There is no difference in principle between the services required of civil officers and those performed by officers of the army and navy. All that is required in either case is honesty, capacity, and trained obedience to the Constitution, the laws, and the lawful orders of their superiors. The Jeffersonian test covers the whole ground: "Is he honest, is he capable, is he faithful to the Constitution?"

The chief obstacle to the extension of the merit system is the fact that for twenty-four years the public offices have been monopolized by one political party. It was to be expected that the opposition party on coming into power should wish to fill at least a part of these places with its own adherents. But it is plain that some check must be placed on the gratification of this wish, if we are to get any efficient work in the line of "retrenchment and reform" out of the present Administration. After the division of the public offices between the two parties has been in some degree equalized, there will be the best opportunity that has ever occurred of putting the whole public service, from high to low, the few great administrative offices alone excepted, on a permanent, non-partisan footing. To accomplish this, the lower grades in every branch of the service must be thrown open to impartial but searching competitive examinations, and all of the higher places, up to the very top, must be filled by the promotion of meritorious subordinates. This is the natural, logical, and, as we believe, inevitable outcome of the civil-service reform movement. Whether this goal can be reached in one administration remains to be seen; but when it is reached, one of the greatest political revolutions that this country has ever seen will have been accomplished. Our elections will then no longer be mere scrambles for the spoils of office, but, what our theory of government intends they shall be, pure contests of principle.

The Christian Congress and its Fruits.

THE Church Congress, lately held at Hartford, marks progress in the direction of Christian coöperation. It is true that the meeting was only a parliament, a talking convocation; and that the constitution on which it was called together expressly and in capital letters forbids the Congress to do anything whatever except talk. Like the Christian League of Connecticut, of which this Hartford Conference may, by some stretch of imagination, be regarded as the antitype, the rules of this body provide that "no topic discussed in the Congress, nor any question of doc-

trine arising out of any discussion, shall ever be submitted to vote, at any meeting of the Congress or of its Council."

It is not for legislation—even of an advisory sort—that the Congress is established, but for consultation and free discussion. It is not by voting that its power will be exerted; the vanity of voting in spiritual affairs is clearly recognized by those who have the charge of it. They understand that whatever may be the uses of the suffrage in governments whose foundation is physical force and whose ultimate appeal is the sword, a vote, which is merely an expression of will, settles nothing permanently in religion. They know that all substantial gains of Christian truth are made, not by counting heads or silencing minorities, but by free investigation and untrammelled speech.

The uselessness of talk as a means of promoting Christian union has often been asserted; but this judgment is true only of the insincere talk of those who profess unity while practicing schism, and who dissemble disagreements which in their hearts they feel to be vital. It may also be said that the value of discussion, as a means of promoting Christian unity, must be limited so long as the discussion is confined to topics on which the parties have already come to an agreement. Unity is reached by a frank comparison of differences, and a manly recognition by the interlocutors of the right to disagree.

Herein is the gain of the new Congress. "The Council has no intention," as its inaugural statement asserts, "of establishing a society, or organizing a plan of union, or putting forth a creed; it simply aims, by holding public meetings from time to time, to make provision for a full and frank discussion of the great subjects in which the Christians of America are interested, including those ecclesiastical and theological questions upon which Christians differ." Nothing of this sort has ever before been attempted. The former essays toward unity have been confined to those who could stand together upon a platform of doctrine previously laid down. Such endeavors as these have their uses. It is important that Christians who are called by various names, and who often regard one another with suspicion, should find out how many and how important are the truths in which they perfectly agree. To rehearse these agreements and to magnify them is a wholesome exercise. But so long as there remain disagreements which they feel to be important, and so long as they do not feel themselves free to speak of these disagreements, the unity achieved is superficial. When they are ready to meet and engage in a candid and tolerant comparison of their differences, the foundation of a deeper unity is laid.

The Congress at Hartford included not only those sects which have hitherto united in Christian work, but several that have not before been welcomed to such consultations. In the Council, among the officers, and on the list of essayists and speakers, were the names of Baptists, Congregationalists, "Christians," Disciples, Episcopalians, Friends, Methodists, Presbyterians, Swedenborgians, Unitarians, and Universalists. Among the speakers no attempt was made to suppress differences of opinion; each man spoke his own mind, courteously but frankly; every speaker approached the subject before the meeting from his own standpoint; and under so many cross-lights the topic was

well illuminated. Such discussions are of the highest value in an educational point of view. Very little tendency to controversy was observable; those who participated in the conference sought not to confute the views of others, but simply and clearly to express their own. An assembly of clear-headed Christians, of all the different persuasions, from which the polemical demon is exorcised, and in which each one temperately endeavors to set forth the truth as it appears to him, must be a great school in which to study the doctrine and the discipline of the church.

But the gains of knowledge, great as they must be, are less than the gains of charity. It was a wonderful advantage to the Episcopal communion in this country and in England when the Congress of that church was organized which brought Ritualists, and High Churchmen, and Low Churchmen, and Broad Churchmen all together on one platform, and called on every man to speak his inmost thought. The bonds of fellowship in that church have been visibly strengthened by this Congress; the danger of division is greatly lessened; all parties have come to regard each other not only with tolerance, but with respect and affection. It is to be hoped that the same result will be achieved through the Congress of Churches for the scattered and discordant sects. When "Father" Grafton, of Boston, one of the most thorough-going Ritualists in the country, comes upon its platform and frankly recognizes the clergymen of other names round about him not only as Christian men, but also as Christian ministers, those who listen open not only their eyes, but their hearts; and when he goes on to say that worship, in his understanding of it, includes sacrifice, and then to explain what he means by sacrifice, and what relation this sacrifice offered by the worshiper bears to the greater sacrifice on Calvary, a kindlier feeling toward him and those who stand with him at once finds expression. The listeners may not at all agree with his view, but they can see that it is much less preposterous than they had supposed, and that the man who utters it is not only a sincere and manly man, but has something to say for himself. When Dr. James Freeman Clarke sets forth his views of the historical Christ as the true center of theology, and when the Rev. Chauncey Giles, of the New Church, expresses his mind on the same subject, and when President Chase, of Haverford College, unfolds the doctrine of the Friends respecting worship, the assent may not be universal, but the courteous attention and the sympathetic friendliness are. Through the cultivation of this generous spirit, and the comparison of views on subjects that have hitherto been tabooed in Christian assemblies, the meetings of the Congress of Churches promise to prepare the way for a great increase of practical unity among Christians.

For this, it must be remembered, is the thing to be accomplished. The sentiment of fellowship needs to be cultivated, but sentiment without practice is dead, being alone. The Congress of Churches is not called on to devise plans of coöperation, but the men who take part in its discussions and mingle in its assemblies ought to go home and heal some of the unseemly and wasteful divisions existing in their neighborhoods. No difficulty will be found in devising ways of coöperation if there is only a disposition to coöperate.

It is pleasant to hear what seems like an echo of this Congress — that a Conference of Christians in Berkshire County, Massachusetts, where this Congress originated, has just taken in hand one of the little towns where four churches occupy a field barely large enough for one, with an urgent call for their consolidation. There are a thousand little towns in this country where the same conditions exist, and where the same remedy needs to be applied. Nothing is needed for the cure of the evil but a tincture of charity and a modicum of common sense.

The Revised Version of the Old Testament.

THE long, difficult, uncompensated labor of the Revisers is brought to an end. Be the final verdict what it may in regard to the merits of the Revision, it will stand as one of the principal literary achievements of the present generation, and an important index of the state of scholarship in this period. The Old Testament company have had at once an easier and a more serious task than the New Testament Revisers had before them. A translator must, first of all, get hold of the book which he intends to render into another tongue. He must settle the text which he will follow. This, in the case of the New Testament, was the most delicate and responsible part of the work of the Revisers. The advantages for textual criticism and the necessity for it forced on them this preliminary labor. On the whole, their most valuable service, as regards the amendment of the old version, lies just here, in the improvement of the text. Yet here is a matter where there is room for endless divergence of opinion as to particular points, and here is the place where the most fierce onslaught has been made upon them. In this attack, the old dread of admitting any uncertainty in the original text of the sacred volume, and a real, though it be an unavowed, disposition, both groundless and superstitious, to stand by the "received text," as far as it is in any way possible, underlie the angry crusade against this feature of the New Testament Revision. Yet nothing has done so much to shake confidence in it and to lessen for the time its currency and popularity. The Old Testament companies have followed the mediæval "Masoretic" text, as they have no ancient manuscripts to consult. In a few instances only have they been driven to a modified reading. They escape thus the onset of a swarm of unfriendly critics, which would no doubt have arisen had they undertaken to correct the Hebrew. They have, however, occasionally referred in the margin to the Septuagint and other ancient translations. It is worthy of notice that the American company on this subject are even more conservative than their English brethren, and would have blotted out this class of marginal references. While the Revisers have secured immunity from attack by this cautious policy, they have lessened the value of their work as it will be estimated by scholars and by coming generations. There ought to be, and there will be, a great deal done in the textual criticism of the Old Testament. The further study of the Septuagint and the rectification of its text, and the study of later ancient versions which are founded on manuscripts of the original that long ago perished, will in time yield valuable fruit. Whether the condi-

gained and long held office by virtue of this proscription system to urge their length of service as a reason why they should be permitted to keep their places. Civil-service reform would, of course, consider only the efficiency of the public servants, but practical administration cannot blink the fact that the chance to acquire that efficiency has been denied to half the people, and to that half, too, which has just come into control of the government.

President Cleveland was very generally voted for by the advocates of civil-service reform, but it must not be overlooked that he is primarily a Democrat, nominated by a Democratic convention, and elected chiefly by Democratic votes. How to reconcile his duty to the great party whose views and purposes he represents with his well-known and, as we believe, perfectly sincere views concerning the public service, is the problem which he is daily called upon to face, and it is a problem whose right solution calls for all his firmness of character and fidelity to principle. But, although changes in the public servants are inevitable, and even necessary in order to bring about a fair representation of both parties in the public offices, it does not follow that the changes are being confined within proper limits or made with due regard to the public interests. There was one straightforward, business-like way in which a fair proportion of changes could have been made without detriment to the public service, in many cases with positive advantage to it. While a majority of the public servants are honest, capable, and efficient, the selfish, slipshod methods of appointment which have prevailed for many years have foisted into official places many who are idle or incompetent, and some who are disreputable or of bad habits. An intelligent, systematic investigation would have disclosed these weak places, and they might readily have been strengthened with new material of the right sort with benefit to the service. So far as we can learn no such investigation has been made. The President, in the appointments and removals which he has personally made, seems to have acted only after the most thorough inquiry that the agencies at his command enabled him to make, but it does not appear that all of his newly appointed subordinates have pursued the same wise policy.

The result is that there is the widest diversity between the action of the different departments and even of different branches of the same department. In one case an important place is filled by the promotion of a meritorious subordinate, or the appointment of a new man of acknowledged fitness; in another the appointment is bestowed upon a brawling politician. In one bureau all of the faithful subordinates are retained; in another nearly all those without the protection of the civil-service rules are dismissed or degraded, and replaced with inexperienced men. While officers of acknowledged fitness are being turned out of one branch of a department, men of notorious unfitness are retained in places of trust and confidence in another. One new officer declares that he cannot transact the public business unless he is permitted to surround himself with men of his own political faith in whom he has confidence; another threatens to throw up his place if deprived of the services of the trained and faithful subordinates whom he found in office. Facts so incongruous and irreconcilable as these make it very difficult

to pass any general judgment upon the treatment of the civil service by the new Administration. The most that can be said is that the President shows a sincere purpose to elevate the public service; that the letter of the civil-service law is in the main respected; that the spirit of the act has been followed in the filling of many important offices, and in the retention of a large proportion of the officers not protected by its letter; and that, on the whole, the situation is much better than could have been looked for after a change of parties in the national government.

But we greatly doubt whether a man whose convictions are so sound and strong as those of Mr. Cleveland will be content to let so tame a conclusion as this stand as the final judgment upon the treatment by his Administration of the great, vital question of civil-service reform. We doubt whether he will be willing to surrender many more months of his own time and of the time of his chief advisers and assistants to the demands of office-seekers, or to have the civil service kept in a state of perpetual uneasiness and unfitness for serious work by the fear of arbitrary changes for partisan ends. It would be quite consistent with his character and convictions if he should before long revolt against such a degradation of his high office. It is plain that the process of equalizing the offices between the two parties must soon come to an end if the Administration is to find time for any other work than that of distributing the patronage. It would be a most courageous and patriotic act if the President should, after a little, announce that the changes in the offices had gone as far as the public interests would warrant, and should erect a barrier against further removals by bringing within the operation of the civil-service rules a large share of the minor places that are now unprotected. Such a declaration would be hailed with rejoicing by patriotic citizens of every shade of politics.

Converging Lines.

THE questions raised at the late Congress of Churches are stirring devout minds in all parts of the American church. The sin and the scandal of schism, the need and the practicability of a more effective co-operation among the professed disciples of Christ, are forcing themselves upon the consideration of good men as they never have done before. That the peculiarities by which the several sects are distinguished one from another are matters of considerable interest to many minds may be freely admitted; that they are of trifling importance when compared with the great truths in which all Christians agree, and the great ends which they are united in pursuing, is too plain for discussion. When, therefore, the denominational peculiarities are so emphasized that the luster of the great truths is dimmed, and the progress of the kingdom of heaven in any community is retarded, the guilt of schism is incurred, and a heavy condemnation rests on those who thus magnify their "private interpretations" at the expense of common interests. This is now being generally recognized; and men of goodwill in all the sects are manifesting a strong determination to put an end to this iniquity. The Congress of Churches has taken a brave step in this direction by providing for a frank discussion of those differences of creed and ritual on which the denominations sep-

arate. No better method could be devised of showing the world the relative insignificance of these differences. When this fact is made to appear, the path to practical coöperation, if not to organic union, will be made plain.

In the same line with the purpose of the Congress of Churches is a striking article by an eminent clergyman of the Presbyterian Church in the present number of *THE CENTURY*. The historical breadth and the pacific temper of this paper will commend it to all tolerant and charitable persons. That the doctrinal differences among Christians are much less strongly accentuated now than formerly is a familiar fact; that they are approximating to common grounds of polity and ritual, as Professor Shields so clearly points out, is equally true. It would be a most useful exercise for clergymen of the several denominations to make a careful study of the symbols and the institutions of their several sects, in order to discover and make known the indebtedness of each to the others, that the people of every communion may know whence they derived the creeds which they recite, the doctrinal and liturgical expressions by which they convey their thoughts and feelings, the forms they observe, the principles they cherish, the hymns they sing. Such knowledge could but enlarge the sympathies of Christian believers and strengthen the bonds that unite them.

That the churches of the United States will find "liturgical fusion" a shorter road to unity than theological agreement, or political consolidation, may well be true. Surely a devotional fellowship would be deeper and more permanent than a doctrinal consensus or an ecclesiastical combination. But it may be doubted whether this result is quite as near as Professor Shields seems to hope. That there is a tendency among non-liturgical worshippers, chiefly among the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, toward the adoption of liturgical forms, is undoubtedly true; but even in these churches, the number is yet small, we imagine, of those who would consent to a fixed ritual, from which extemporaneous worship should be excluded. Doubt-

less the utterance that springs from the "chance impulse" of the officiating clergyman often fails to be edifying, and "unpremeditated effusions" and "long desultory prayers" are sometimes hard to endure; but the great majority of those who favor some enrichment of the meager ritual of the Puritan churches yet prefer that the leader of their worship shall have some liberty of expression; and while they would not wish that his prayers should be desultory or unpremeditated, they desire that he should be in closest sympathy with those to whom he ministers, and that he should be able to utter the voice of their present need when he leads them in worship. So much as this of priestly function the Protestants have always yielded to their ministers, and they are not yet ready to take it away from them. Probably Professor Shields does not desire such a complete change; at any rate, such a change is yet a great way off. The union of the churches of the United States upon a uniform ritual,—if the extemporaneous element were to be rigidly excluded,—could not, we think, be confidently predicted.

Every essay in this direction is, however, of value; and this suggestion of the fellowship of believers in that part of their religious life which is most distinctly spiritual—in their confessions, their prayers, and their songs—is one that may lead the way toward a visible and real unity.

Professor Shields's paper, so catholic in its view and so full of sweet reasonableness, will be followed by a number of others, prepared by representative men of several of the leading denominations, each of whom will undertake to show what contribution those who stand with him are ready to make toward the accomplishment of this end. It is assumed on all sides that a closer unity and a more perfect coöperation among the churches is greatly to be desired; it is obvious also that some concessions, and perhaps some sacrifices, must be made by each for the good of all. *THE CENTURY* has offered to wise leaders in these various sects the opportunity of pointing out the ways that lead to concord and coöperation.

OPEN LETTERS.

An Exposition of the Three Americas.

ON the principles of persistence of force and continuity of motion, the best results of a great work cannot be computed until after the first impressions produced by it on the environment have disappeared; sufficient time has therefore not yet elapsed since the close of the World's Exposition for a thorough estimate of its beneficent effects upon the country at large and the South in particular. Forces were set in motion last winter at New Orleans that are but now making themselves felt, and that will eventually prove of incalculable value to the development of a firmer industrial life and a higher national sentiment. The Exposition was inaugurated at a time when the tide of Southern affairs had begun to turn, and was the expression of a strong desire on the part of Southerners to assert their industrial equality with

the other sections of the country, and to offer irrefutable evidence that they were full of peace and goodwill toward their fellow-citizens of the North, and had completely adapted themselves to the changed necessities of the times. Assuredly, no one who visited New Orleans when the Exposition was at its height could fail to see that these desires had been largely fulfilled. Even Southerners themselves were astonished at the marvelous resources displayed by their own States,—resources only partially unfolded, it is true, as compared to the higher development of other parts of the country, but nevertheless filled with startling promises of a brilliant future. And still more assuredly no one could fail to be impressed with the unequivocal public and private hospitality received by every well-conducted stranger. The welcome was too warm to admit of any doubt that it was sincere, or that there lay behind it any latent feeling of injury

iant American school, which have frequently been sold as cheaply as fifty cents.

Rising from details like these to a consideration of the general question, it is not difficult to show that the extension of copyright will not seriously increase the price of books. France, for example, is the country giving perhaps the fullest copyright protection to authors of all nations, without distinction. Literature prospers in France, and French authors are rewarded and honored; there are perhaps half-a-dozen French novelists who can be sure of a sale of fifty thousand copies for any new novel they may write. Yet nowhere

are books cheaper than in France; and books have been cheap in France since Michel-Lévy wrought his literary revolution, now nearly half a century ago. A French novel appears generally in one volume at seventy cents, and it is often reprinted later in cheaper form for twenty cents. All the tales of that most delightful of story-tellers, the elder Dumas, can be bought in Paris for twenty cents a volume. American publishing methods are more closely akin to French than to English; and in America as in France the reading public has formed the habit of cheap books, to which no publisher would now dare to run counter.

OPEN LETTERS.

Christian Union.

LETTERS FROM PRESBYTERIAN DIVINES.

From Rev. Dr. Crosby.

THE Rev. Dr. Shields has prescribed a very simple remedy for church separation among Protestants; namely, union on the basis of the Protestant Episcopal liturgy. Coming from a Presbyterian, this is very complimentary to our Episcopal brethren, and very magnanimous for a Princeton man. We have heard of other easy schemes to the same end, as, for example, union on the basis of the Solemn League and Covenant.

But the plan is too easy and simple; that is, it is so easy and simple for one denomination that it would be very hard for the rest. The one denomination that would have to do nothing would enjoy the operation, but those that had to do all the changing might find it a very severe process. We only know of two Presbyterian ministers who could be counted on as venturing on this one-sided consolidation—Dr. Shields himself and my excellent friend Dr. Hopkins. I know a little about Presbyterians, and of them only I speak. They are not in love with the Episcopal liturgy. They cannot extol it in the panegyric of Dr. Shields. They like parts of it very well, and count most of it excellent English, but they object to a great deal in it, and could never make use of it.

1. They object to the breaking up of prayer into little fragments, each beginning with an invocation and ending with a formal peroration. They consider this style of prayer too artificial and leading to a mechanical worship.

2. They object to the open-eyed reading of prayer, as tending to withdraw the mind from the unseen.

3. They object to the stereotyped prayer, however excellent.

4. They object to the Litany *in toto*, as putting the believer far off from God, calling on him to *spare* him as a miserable sinner, when, as an accepted child of God, he should reverently call upon God as a dear Father near at hand, ready to bestow his gifts abundantly. The Litany has no feature suited to the "heir of God or joint-heir with Christ." Many of the features of the Litany (like the prayer against sudden death) are but relics of Romanism, and its repetitions are unmeaning.

5. They object to the absolution *declaration*, which is only a toning-down of the Roman absolution *bestowal*. No minister is authorized to pronounce an absolution on the penitent, any more than one who is not a minister. That grand truth is for everybody to know and to proclaim. The minister has no prerogative here, as this section of the prayer-book would imply. It is a remnant of the priestly idea of a Christian minister, while Presbyterians hold that all believers are equally priests, and that a minister is only an ordained leader and ruler.

6. They object to the repetitions of the Lord's Prayer, as if it were a magical formula, which was effective by frequent repetition.

7. They object to the clear remnants of transubstantiation in the Communion Service and of baptismal regeneration in the Baptismal Service—two doctrines which Presbyterians abhor.

With such objections on the part of Presbyterians (in which, I doubt not, Baptists, Methodists, and Congregationalists would largely concur), how can Dr. Shields's plan of union on the Episcopal liturgy be of avail?

The truth is that Christians cannot be made to agree on the points referred to, nor on secondary matters of doctrine and church government, nor is it desirable that they should agree. Down deep in the fundamentals of Christ's divinity, incarnation, sacrifice for sin, the gift of the Spirit, faith, repentance, the new life, Christians of all evangelical creeds and customs agree, and *on these they can unite*, but on nothing else. A visible union can be brought about only with the liberty of each Christian or group of Christians holding his or their differences in creed and custom. The union would be by periodical congress for prayer and conference, and by coöperative work in Christian associations and alliances for general effort against falsehood and infidelity. This union is feasible, and is, indeed, beginning to be a fact through more enlightened Christendom.

I am an out-and-out Presbyterian, but I find it a delight to work with my Episcopal friends in their admirable Church Temperance Society; I have worked side by side with Baptists and Methodists in City Missions and in Young Men's Christian Associations, and it never occurred to any of us to think of denominational differences; I am a member of two ministerial organizations where ministers of all the Protestant

denominations meet every week or fortnight, and the ties of friendship and esteem are equally strong between all. Here is Christian union of the highest sort. In maintaining and fostering such brotherhood we shall arrive at the perfection of Christian union, without touching the individual differences of view regarding the non-essentials of religion; and, furthermore, such a course will inevitably operate in making us all slough off such differences as are inimical in their spirit to true Christian fellowship. It will promote a spirit of yielding as against the spirit of mere prejudice, and establish true liberty in conjunction with solid and effective union.

The liturgy scheme is very pretty, but there is no substance in it. It is too romantic for plain people who wish for reality. It is a holding together the beams of a house with Spalding's glue. It looks very fair while it sticks, but a breath of the zephyr will bring chaos. We must have something that works from the heart outwards if we would have strength and permanency. That which is plastered on from without is deceptive and transitory.

Howard Crosby.

From Professor Hodge.

THERE are only two generically distinct doctrines of the Christian Church. The first maintains that it is essentially an organized society, its outward form as well as its informing spirit determined by the constitution originally imposed upon it by Christ, and this outward form preserved, through the succession of its officers, in unbroken organic continuity from the days of the Apostles until now.

The second doctrine maintains that the Church is a general term for the whole body of regenerated men, whether of past, present, or future generations. These are constituted one spiritual body by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, which unites them to Christ their head, as all the various elements and members of our natural bodies are constituted one by the indwelling of a common soul. The many members of this body being many are one body; and it is all the more one because of the infinitely various relations which the several members sustain to their Lord and to each other, determined by their various natural faculties, historical conditions, and gracious endowments.

A very slight knowledge of history proves that the doctrine of the Church first stated is impossible. It is simply absurd to pretend that any one of the various competing churches of the present or of any former age since the second century is identical in outward form with the societies founded by the Apostles, or that it has preserved its organic continuity intact by an unbroken succession of officers under an unchanged constitution from that age until now. It is, moreover, precisely in the case of those extant churches which most emphasize the absolute necessity of an identity of external form, and of an uninterrupted continuity of succession, that the absurdity of the claim is rendered the most conspicuous and certain, by the facts of their history and the wide contrast existing between their ecclesiastical order and forms of worship and the apostolic literature and monuments. The more thoroughly this theory of the Church, therefore, is put to the test, the more it is found to be inconsistent with all the providential facts of the case.

On the other hand, it is evident that the second doctrine of the Church as above stated is the one which alone justifies the application to it of the common predicates of apostolicity, catholicity, infallibility, perpetuity, and sanctity. The spiritual body is always faithful to the genuine apostolic doctrine in all its essentials; is infallibly preserved from all fatal errors of faith or practice; is set apart from the world as consecrated and morally pure; and endures through all conflicts and changes, as indestructible, and unchangeably one and catholic, embracing in one spiritual union all saints in all parts of the world, in all successive generations.

It is no less visible. When consummated, it is to be the most conspicuously glorious of all created objects, "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners." It is visible in its essential nature, because it exists in part of men and women living in the flesh, and because these possess a peculiar spiritual nature which is manifested in their lives, so that by the very force of their saintship they are set apart in contrast to the mass of mankind, as "the salt of the earth" and "the light of the world." Moreover, it belongs to the essential nature of this spiritual church, as composed of intrinsically social beings, who by reason of their saintship are loyal servants of their Master in a hostile world, that it everywhere and always tends to express itself in some external organized form, and so render itself the more definitely visible.

This tendency to self-organization is intrinsic, and therefore constant and universal, and acts always spontaneously, springing from the social nature of man, and from the common needs and aspirations of all its members. All the various forms which thence result have been comprehended in God's design, and are necessary for the spiritual development of the Church, and for the accomplishment of the great tasks it has been commissioned to perform. Yet the permanent results of biblical interpretation unite with the history of his providential and gracious guidance of the churches in proving that Christ never intended to impose upon the Church as a whole any particular form of organization. Neither he nor his apostles ever went beyond the suggestion of general principles, and the actual inauguration of a few rudimentary forms. The history of the churches during all subsequent ages shows that these rudimentary forms have been ever changing in correspondence with the changes in their historical conditions. And in exact proportion to the freedom and fruitfulness of the Church's activity in the service of its Master, the more rapidly and flexibly are these organic forms adapted to the conditions of the sphere in which their especial work is appointed. These various denominational forms of the living Church are all one in their essentials, and differ only in their accidents. These accidents have been determined in each case by conditions peculiar to itself, especially by those resulting from national character, and from political, social, educational, and geographical circumstances. Some have sprung from transient conditions, some from the idiosyncrasies of their founders, and some even from the follies and sins of selfish partisans. Other differences are rooted in far more permanent distinctions of nations and classes, and represent persistent rival tendencies in the thoughts and tastes and habits of man. All of

these, since they exist, and are used as instruments of the Holy Ghost, have in that fact a providential justification. And each one, even the least significant, emphasizes some otherwise too much neglected side of the truth, and is therefore, in its day, necessary to the completeness of the whole.

It is evident, therefore, that while the Church of Christ necessarily tends to self-organization under ordinary conditions, and to different forms of organization under different conditions, nevertheless organization itself is not of its essence. The Church exists antecedently to and independently of any organization, and its far larger part, embracing all mankind of all centuries dying in infancy, extends indefinitely beyond all organizations. All the more it is certain that no special form can be essential to the existence or even to the integrity of the Church.

As the outward form should express the true character of the informing spirit, of course, in an ideally perfect state the essential unity of the Church, as well as all other permanent characteristics, must find expression. All radical diversities, all irreconcilable oppositions, all bigotry, jealousy, alienation, and strife must be eliminated. But all unity implies relation, and all relations imply differences, and the sublime unity of the Catholic Church, of all peoples, and of all generations, implies the harmony of incalculable varieties. The principle of the union is spiritual and vital, and hence must be the result of an internal growth. The more perfect the inward life, the more perfect will be its outward expression in form. The final external form of the Holy Catholic Church will never be reached by adding denomination to denomination. It will come as all growth into organized form, alike in the physiological and in the social world, comes, by the spontaneous action of central vital forces from within.

All living unity implies diversity, and just in proportion to the elevated type and significance of the unity will be the variety of the elements it comprehends. In the barren desert each grain of sand is of precisely the same form with every other grain, and therefore there is no organic whole. The life of the world results from the correlation of earth and sky, of land and sea, of mountains and plains. All social unity springs out of the differences between man and woman, parent and child, men of thought and men of action, the men who possess and the men who need. No number of similar stones would constitute a great cathedral. No number of repetitions of the same musical sound would generate music. Always where the most profound and perfect unity is effected, it is the result of the greatest variety and complexity of parts. This law holds true through all varieties of vegetable, animal, and social organisms, and is revealed equally through all the pages of the geologic records.

Certainly God appears to be preparing to make the ultimate unity of the Church the richest and most comprehensive of created forms in the number and variety of its profound harmonies. It would have been a very simple thing at the first to form a homogeneous society out of the undifferentiated family of Adam, numerically multiplied. But for thousands of years God has been breaking up that family into a multitude of varieties, passing all enumeration. In arctic, torrid, and temperate zones; on mountains, valleys, coasts, continents, and islands; in endlessly drawn-out suc-

cessions of ages; under the influence of every possible variety of inherited institution; in every stage of civilization, and under every political, social, and religious constitution; through all possible complications of personal idiosyncrasy and of external environment, God has been drawing human nature through endless modifications. All these varieties enter into and contribute to the marvelous riches of the Christian Church, for her members are "redeemed out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." And all these are further combined into all the endless varieties of ecclesiastical organizations, monarchical, aristocratical, republican, and democratic, which the ingenuity of man, assisted by all complications of theological controversy and of social and political life, has been able to invent.

Who then shall guide all these multitudinous constituents in their recombination into the higher unity? Shall it be accomplished by a process of absorption into some ancient society claiming to be *the Church*? Shall it be helped forward by the volunteered offices of some self-authorized "Church Congress"? A time can never come when many of these differences so evidently designed will be obliterated. But undoubtedly a time is soon coming when the law of differentiation, so long dominant, shall be subordinated to the law of integration, when all these differences so arduously won shall be wrought into the harmony of the perfect whole. The comprehension of so vast a variety of interacting forces must be left to God. His methods are always historical, and his instruments are all second causes. He alone has been cotemporaneous with the Church under all dispensations, and omnipresent with the churches of every nation and tribe, and with Him "a thousand years are as one day."

The sin of schism is unquestionably very common and very heinous. In its essence it is a sin against the unity of the Church. If this unity were external and mechanical, then all organic division or variety would be schism. But since the principle of unity is the immanent Holy Ghost binding all the members in one life to Christ its source, schism must consist in some violation of the ties which bind us to the Holy Ghost, or to Christ, or to our fellow-members.

Hence all denial of the supreme Godhead and Lordship of Christ is schism. All denial of the body of catholic doctrine, common to the whole confessing Church, and embraced in the great ecumenical creeds, is schism. All sin against the Holy Ghost, every breach of the law of holiness and defect in spiritual-mindedness, tends to the marring and dividing of the body of Christ. All pride, bigotry, and exclusive churchism; all claim that the true Church is essentially identical with a certain external organization or form of organization, or with a definite external succession of officers; all denial of the validity of the ministry and sacraments of any bodies professing the true faith, and bearing evidence of the presence of the Holy Spirit, is schism. All party spirit, jealousy, and selfish rivalry; all unnecessary multiplication of denominational organizations; all want of the spirit of fraternal love and cooperation in the service of the common Master, tends to the marring and dividing of the body of Christ.

If this be true, it is evident that the real union of the churches can best be cultivated by promoting the

central spiritual unity of the Church which comprehends them all. For this end all who call themselves Christians must with one purpose seek to bring their whole mind and thought more and more into perfect conformity to the *Word of God* speaking through the sacred Scriptures, and their whole life and activity more and more into subjection to the control of the Holy Ghost dwelling in the whole body and in all its members alike. This process must, of course, proceed entirely from within outward, never in the reverse direction. Organic unity will be the result of the co-operation through long ages of an infinite variety of forces. It cannot be brought about by any system of means working towards it directly as an end in itself. All such unionistic enterprises are prompted by many mixed motives, some of them essentially partisan and therefore wholly divisive in their real effects. But hereafter in God's good time the result will come as an incidental effect of the ripening of all the churches in knowledge and love and in all the graces, and especially of a whole-souled self-forgetful consecration of all to the service and glory of their common Lord.

It appears to us that the very felicity of the title affixed by Dr. Shields to his graceful article renders it all the more illusive. The United States are all similarly organized republics, established in different though adjacent territories. The united churches of these United States, on the contrary, are incongruous ecclesiastical organizations, competing as rivals on the same territory. We differ also from the Doctor in our estimate of the comparative hindrances to union severally presented in the departments of dogmatic profession, of ecclesiastical order and government, and of liturgical culture; and we differ from him seriously in our reading of the tendencies of the age.

In the first place, we believe that doctrinal agreement could much more easily be effected than organic union or liturgical uniformity. Indeed, doctrinal agreement on the basis of a common creed confined to the essentials of the historic catholic Christian faith, relegating all other points of theological opinion to the schools, would be within the limits of English-speaking Protestantism a very hopeful undertaking, if only the great practical questions as to church government and worship were removed out of the way. The most dogmatically conservative and exacting among us freely recognize the common Christian brotherhood of all who cordially accept the essentials of the common faith. This has been practically exhibited on a wide scale, when the simple confession of the Evangelical Alliance received the spontaneous suffrages of all Protestant Christians, whether Lutherans, Arminians, or Calvinists. This dogmatic consensus, although general and confined to fundamentals, must necessarily be in the line of historic catholic orthodoxy. It must recognize a common source and standard of faith in the canon of inspired Scripture, the absolutely and only authoritative and infallible rule of faith and practice. It must embrace not the theories but the great essential facts of the supreme Godhead of Jesus, of his atonement, resurrection, government of the world, of his future and final judgment of all men. There can be no honest mutual toleration between those who hold and those who deny the supreme Godhead of our Lord. If they are right, we are the most gross of idolaters. If we are right, "they have made God a liar, because

they believe not the record that God gave of his Son." And the whole scheme of doctrine and life depends upon the conception we form of Jesus, and the consequent attitude we assume to him.

We believe that the difficulty will be found far greater in the department of ecclesiastical constitution and government; and that not because it is felt to be more vitally important than that of dogmatic faith, but because it is concrete and practical, and because it is the very thing involved in this *organic* union it is proposed to bring about. The several competing principles of church constitution involve antagonistic dogmatic principles, which in this sphere of organic union cannot be ignored, while the very situation demands their practical application. It is worth noticing that the most prominent and confident advocates of organic union are Congregationalists or Episcopalians, representatives respectively of the extremes of the utmost possible organic indeterminateness and independency, and of the utmost possible hierarchical authority and organic immutability. Each of these parties appear to believe that the union of the churches can be effected only by the assimilation of all other bodies to their own. On the same principles, the centers being changed, we would all advocate organic union. It is quite certain that neither extreme will prevail in the universal Church. It is safe to predict that the historic Church will never admit the principle of independency, and that the churches of the Reformation will never organize upon any principle that involves the repudiated dogmas that the Christian minister is a priest, that grace is mediated essentially by sacraments, and that the apostolic office is perpetual. In this I am sure that I speak for the forty million non-Episcopal Protestants of the English-speaking world. It appears to be as certainly true, on the other hand, that communities loyal to historic Catholic Christianity can never organize upon any principle involving the exclusion of the children of professing Christians from church membership. In this I am sure that I truly represent the seventy million Catholic and Pedobaptist Protestant Christians in the English-speaking world.

As to the prospects of union in the department of liturgical culture, we think that Dr. Shields has been misled by his tastes and wishes when he judges it to be the tendency of all denominations in the United States to adopt liturgical forms, and predicts that ultimately all will adopt in common the liturgy of the English Episcopal Church. It is not to be denied that such a tendency may be discerned among certain classes of the inhabitants of our large towns. But a wide induction of the changes which have taken place during the last two hundred years among the entire English-speaking population of the world leads to precisely the opposite conclusion. In the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Protestant inhabitants of the home of our race in Great Britain who adhered to the use of the national liturgy as compared to those who rejected it were in the ratio of five to one. Now, after nearly two hundred years, they stand in the same island in a ratio of rather less than one to one, in the colonies of the empire in the ratio of one to three, and among the "united churches of the United States" at a ratio of a little less than one to twenty-eight. This tendency prevailing among Protestants uniformly

wherever the English-speaking race extends, and for so long a time, seems to render it certain that the churches will not be united through the common use of the liturgy of the English Church.

It is undoubtedly true, as Dr. Shields asserts, that the specific varieties which have subdivided the great generic churches are gradually disappearing, being merged in their respective general masses. But it is also true that the great generic distinctions between the churches, as between Prelatic and Presbyterian, as between Baptist and Pedobaptist, as between Lutheran and Reformed, as between Independents and Churchmen, remain as sharply cut and as rigidly maintained as ever. At the same time new, distinct varieties are being generated among the Africans in our Southern States, and among all the nations of the earth with whom the labors of our missionaries are now beginning to meet with a world-transforming success.

A. A. Hodge.

Timber Famine and a Forest School.

SAVAGES live lavishly as long as their stock of food lasts, although they know they will have to starve afterwards. We say they can never climb out of savagery until they learn to save and to provide for coming want. Yet with respect to the forests — which are, no doubt, the most indispensable product of the soil — we have acted very much as the Comanche does with respect to his store of food.

The value of our forest products is not less than eight hundred millions of dollars a year. Our store of white pine is rapidly approaching exhaustion, and other valuable species will be as ruthlessly wasted when the pine is gone. When the resulting timber famine comes, it will for several reasons be a more serious calamity than would be the failure for ten consecutive years of any other of our crops.

First. No other product has so great a money value.

Second. Any other crop requires only a short time, usually a year, to reach maturity, while a forest needs from thirty to one hundred years.

Third. We know how to raise other crops, but to superintend financially profitable timber-growing requires a long and severe special training, such as is afforded in the state forests of continental Europe and in the professional schools connected with them.

Fourth. Failure, or even great scarcity, of working timber involves the derangement or total ruin of a vast number of important industries which wholly or in part depend upon the forest for their raw material. Some of these are metallurgy, building, wood-turning, tanning and the manufacture of articles made of leather, the making of wagons, carriages, furniture, musical instruments, sewing-machines, etc. In short, almost everything one uses needs wood directly or indirectly for its production.

Fifth. Destruction of the forest, especially upon steep hillsides, causes irregularity in rainfall and other climatic changes very harmful to agriculture, commerce, manufactures, and health, besides the loss from floods, of which during the last few years we have had such sad experience. It is estimated that the last

year's great flood in the Ohio cost sixty millions of dollars; and if the harm done by the much higher water of 1884 was less, it was only because that of 1883 did not leave so much property within reach of inundations.

But we shall never keep the hillsides wooded merely as a preventive measure. We must learn how to make timber-culture in such localities profitable; and that can never be done without skilled labor and such professional training for the superintendents of that labor as the forest schools of Europe afford.

The German Empire has nine such schools of a high grade; and France, Austria-Hungary, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Denmark, Russia, and Sweden have all made similar provision. In most of these countries there are also schools for training the forest officials of lower grades as well as the workmen.

In Germany graduation from a gymnasium, which is equivalent to the training given in most American colleges, is required before one can enter these higher forest schools. The course lasts from two and one-half to three years, and is so severe that only young men of more than common talent and industry can keep their place in the classes.

Then come ten years or more of hard study and practice in subordinate positions, after which, if one has acquitted himself well, he may hope for an appointment as district forester, but generally will have to wait longer before a vacancy occurs.

This long and arduous novitiate secures, of course, a high social rank for those who pass through it, and this creates so eager a desire for the position that there is never a lack of applicants, many of whom are from the best families. A few years since there were not less than thirty-three barons and knights employed in the crown forests of Prussia.

There are, too, many heirs of large landed estates who take this course so as to be fitted to take charge of their own forests, or at least to see that they are properly administered. Then there are many corporations organized for timber-culture, as it has been found that to be done to the best advantage it must be upon a large scale, since aside from other reasons it is only when so carried on that the services of properly qualified superintendents and workmen can be afforded. People of moderate means, therefore, must associate, if they would compete in the markets with rich proprietors and with the state.

A few words as to the nature and scope of the studies pursued in these schools.

First. Physical sciences. Here come in general and special chemistry, both inorganic and organic, physics, and meteorology, with thorough work in geology and mineralogy.

After this investigation of the "stuff" from which organisms are built comes botany in general and that of forests in particular, with microscopy. Next is zoölogy, vertebrate and invertebrate, with special attention to entomology, since insects are perhaps the worst enemies of trees. Withal, the art of making "preparations" of animal organisms must be mastered.

Second. Besides this work in natural science, which takes up about one-third of the school course, about half as much time is devoted to special mathematics, geodesy, interest and rent accounts, measuring wood, surveying, leveling, and plan-drawing.

Third. After these physics and mathematics, which

sist combinations whose object is to usurp or to nullify the state's functions of punishing or protecting the individual citizen.

Who are the Guiltier?

THE scandalous revelations recently made with regard to the Board of Aldermen of the city of New York have simply been a bringing to the surface of facts long known to all familiar with the so-called "politics" of the chief city of the Union. The direct alliance of the criminal classes with parts of the city government has been effectively disclosed; but it is probably true that much in other departments of our local government, that has hitherto remained merely a well-founded suspicion, will continue to remain such, and that the full details of official misdoing are not likely soon to see the light of day.

The rascality of the New York aldermen has lately been the chief topic of local discussion,—this and the alleged shameless bribery of these officials by conscienceless speculators. And yet this side of the ques-

tion of municipal morals seems to us much less discouraging and alarming than the certain knowledge of the fact that there is an endless chain leading from the parlors and offices of many among the better classes of the community, down to the very criminals who have been "running the politics" of our crowded wards, and occupying offices of trust in the city government—a chain that binds them all together in a common guilt. We ask whether there should not be more pity, as there is certainly more excuse, for the rascals who, nursed in poverty and infamy, end by energetic devotion to the double profession of burglary and politics, than for the respectable, often "pious" and "charitable" members of society, who reluctantly but surely consent to the bribing of aldermen and state legislators in the interests of corporations of which they are trustees or managers.

If all the men in the city and State of New York who call themselves moral would cease to-morrow to be parties in or connivers at any sort of municipal or legislative iniquity, the rascals would soon be driven into a corner and beaten to the ground.

OPEN LETTERS.

Christian Union.

A REPLY TO DR. CROSBY BY PROFESSOR HOPKINS.

NO fact could be more encouraging to the friends of a reasonable improvement in the conduct of worship in non-liturgical churches than the discussion on Christian Union now going on in the columns of THE CENTURY. It is but a very few years since such a discussion would have been inappropriate and almost unintelligible; for although as far back as 1867 the General Assembly thought it necessary to sound a note of alarm against "liturgical tendencies," yet it was only the feeble beginning of a movement in that direction. Those beginnings have by this time developed into a stream of sentiment which calls upon the foremost champions of the church's inertia to gird on their armor and descend into the battle. This is just as agreeable to the party of the movement as it was to the church of the second and third centuries to have Philostratus, Celsus, and the other defenders of the lost pagan cause break their contemptuous silence and throw themselves, pen in hand, across the track of the beneficent revolution. In all efforts looking to the improvement of society, whether in civil or religious matters, it is a sign of the beginning of the end when the obstructionists show serious alarm and begin to look about them in every quarter for help. The change already made is a sufficient foreshadowing of the coming event. In the Presbyterian Church certainly, and I believe also in the Congregational body, more progress has been effected within the last ten years in the direction of decorum and beauty of worship than during the previous half-century.

It is only three or four years since a certain preacher thought it necessary to consume his whole hour before the General Assembly in blowing a note of alarm

against the progress of "formalism" in the church; "formalism," in his dictionary, meaning such very dangerous proceedings as the responsive reading of the Scriptures in public worship, the oral repetition of the Lord's Prayer, or other similar usages of the earliest Christian Church. Now let Dr. Crosby go, on any Sunday, into any one of a considerably large number of Presbyterian churches extending from New York city to Buffalo, and he will observe a service which must grieve him to the soul. To say nothing of increased worship by means of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs (that is to say, a good deal more liturgical service in rhyme, to which no objection seems ever to be felt by the most violent anti-liturgical alarmist), he would find both the features mentioned above in common use, and, in some of those congregations, the regular reading of the Ten Commandments, with responses by the choir; and worse still, perhaps, he would find that darling feature in the service, the *long prayer*, broken up into several parts, with singing or reading between.

These changes in the time-honored ritual of the Presbyterian Church have come about gradually and silently, and because of a general conviction that some improvement was demanded by the changed conditions of society since the middle of the century; and they are not going to stop just here or now. A few years ago the General Assembly, in its incomprehensible wisdom, refused to permit the responsive reading of the Psalter in worship; to what effect? The practice prevails in ten congregations now to one then; or where it does not prevail in the church, it does in the Sunday-school; and the children are thus being trained up to love a service of prayer as well as of praise in which they can join their own voices. Reforms which the spirit of an age demands are not checked by fulmina-

tions from doctors of divinity. They move on with calm, irresistible strength; and those who do not choose to join in them are soon left in the rear.

Dr. Crosby rather uncharitably insinuates that those who are urging an improvement in the Presbyterian service are disloyal or treacherous friends to that church. I reply, they are its very best friends. They desire to increase the strength and beauty in her sanctuary. They wish to augment her power to retain her own children, instead of leaving them to wander off to other folds. They wish her to keep up with the march of all true ecclesiastical and religious improvement. Why should Dr. Crosby's congregation worship in a church the superfluous ornamentation of which perhaps doubled the cost of the building? Simply because an improved taste and science in public architecture demanded it. Why should they not then equally yield to the demand for something warmer and richer in worship than the "bare" routine which they have inherited from the time of the Westminster Assembly?

I agree entirely with the distinguished writers in the March CENTURY in their estimate of Dr. Shields's scheme for a union of all Protestant denominations on the basis of a common liturgical worship. I read that article with a degree of interest until I came to the writer's sovereign panacea for the distractions of Christendom; when my admiration suddenly changed into a feeling of rather comic surprise. "No union on doctrinal grounds possible." I fancied we were tolerably united on that basis already. "No union on the ground of a common church government." True enough; nor is that necessary to a vital church unity. What then? Why, that, retaining each our own doctrinal diversities, running from low Arminianism to Supralapsarian Calvinism, retaining all our differences in church order, from low independency to high prelacy, we should make one church by agreeing to use the same prayer-book! I felt much as Doctor Faustus felt at the disproportionate outcome of the swelling and elephantine poodle behind his stove: *Das also war des püdel's kern? Der casus macht mich lachen.*

Any scheme of union among Christians which implies that the Presbyterian Church is to modify in the slightest degree her polity or constitution, with a view of approaching the platform of Episcopacy, is in the highest degree absurd. The Presbyterian Church is unalterably Presbyterian. She has not the least desire to unite herself in any outward way with the Episcopal communion. Whenever, let me hospitably say, the latter is sufficiently tired of her isolation to take Dr. Franklin's advice, given her just a century ago, and "turn Presbyterian," there is room enough for her in the ample bosom of the *μεγαλήν Ἐκκλησίαν*.

No possibility exists of organic union in any other way. But in perfect consistency with this the Presbyterian Church may go on improving her cultus in the line of her own history and traditions. Calvin, Melancthon, Luther, John Knox, all approved of and practiced liturgical worship. The Westminster divines have left us ample directions for public prayer, which, with a few connectives, make up a liturgical form. Stephen Marshall, in reporting to the assembly this part of the directory, expressly recommended it on that ground. The fathers of the American Presbyter-

ian Church, and especially the eminent Dr. Greene were, many of them, favorable to forms of prayer; and antedating all this, going back to the very origins of the church, we find in the "Didache of the XII. Apostles" (which Dr. Schaff assigns to a period not later than A. D. 100) the union of the simplest Presbyterianism with liturgical worship. In the Didache there is no threefold ministry. The only ordinary church officers recognized are bishops (or presbyters) and deacons; and side by side with this simple Scriptural organization appears a full liturgical form for the celebration of the Eucharist, and the injunction that the Lord's Prayer should be thrice repeated each Lord's Day. This should be quite sufficient, so far as authority goes, for any friends of improvement in the worship of the Presbyterian Church.

AUBURN, N. Y.

Samuel M. Hopkins.

Shall Women go to College?

THE "previous question," fundamental to the whole subject of the education of women, so central that the least divergence there will emerge as a large difference of view as to the usefulness of giving women a liberal education at all, is the question — to state it baldly and flatly — *What is woman for?* Has she, that is to say, an independent significance in the universe, such as man is assumed to have; or has she only a subordinate and merely accessory relation to him? It is useless to expect any agreement on the more superficial question of women's education between persons who hold the two opposite views of this underlying question. These two opposite views are:

1. That woman is for herself and for the community; for man, no doubt, but only in the same sense that man is for her. This view implies that the natural relations between the sexes in civilized society are relations of equality. However much they may be relations of difference and division of labor, the difference does not depend on any natural distinction in grade of intelligence, nor the division of labor involve any distinction in grade of education. It implies, in short, that one sex has just as much individual significance in the universe as the other. This may be called the modern view. It is, however, even in modern times, only the view of the most enlightened nations; and in those nations a view chiefly confined to the best-educated communities; and in those communities not apt to be the view of persons wholly unaccustomed to the society of superior women. For this is emphatically one of those subjects on which the old adage is true, that "seeing is believing."

2. That woman is for man, as subordinate and accessory. This may be called the mediæval, Asiatic, or Miltonic view. It implies that the unit and center of this world is man. The air was created for him to breathe, the herb of the field to furnish him sustenance, the beast thereof to do his bidding; and among these conveniences a bountiful Providence added woman. There have been many varieties of this general view, from that which admits that woman has a soul, and regards her as man's vizier, or housekeeper, or adviser in chief, down to that which regards her as his mere slave and drudge. Practically, all these varieties of the Miltonic view have a tendency to reduce themselves to the last. Theoretically, however, they usu-

machinery and of money more keenly felt. Its service calls not for less, but for a different and a more arduous sort of effort. In its judgment relief is not relief, but a snare, until it puts an end to the condition of dependence. Each instance of necessity must be studied by itself; the means of recuperation which may inhere in it are to be sought out even at the cost of months of patient watching and inquiry; it is firmly and wisely to be restrained from following hurtful impulses and using injurious helps. This thing cannot be done until the prudent, the wise, the brave, and the chastened become the household friends of those who

falter and stumble in the rough paths of life, for the face of man answereth to face, and not to purse. Hence Charity Organization emphasizes the worth of personal intercourse between those who would give and those who need; it summons the benevolent to conference that the blundering hand may learn skill, and the truest word may be the guide of them all; it sends out corps of household visitors, and is intent on gaining for every miserable home at least one friend, with whom dissembling is useless, and from whom it can draw the inspiration of hope, the strength of truth, and the guidance of discretion.

OPEN LETTERS.

Christian Union.

LETTERS FROM CONGREGATIONAL DIVINES.

From President Seelye of Amherst.

CHRISTIAN union in the New Testament has its originating impulse and continued inspiration in the Christian's union with God. It belongs thus to the deepest reality of the Christian life. This is expressed in the utterance of the Redeemer, when he prays "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us. . . . I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one." (John xvii. 21, 22.)

This oneness with God and this oneness with one another spring from the same fountain. The blood of Christ is the living source in both. So Paul expressly states in the first and second chapters of his epistle to the Ephesians. It is the blood of Christ through which "we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace" (Eph. i. 7), and it is the blood of Christ "which hath broken down the middle wall of partition between" Jew and Gentile, "for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace." (Eph. ii. 14, 15.) "Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world. But now, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ." (Eph. ii. 11, 12, 13.)

Christianity is thus fellowship, in its innermost meaning,—fellowship with God, and therefore fellowship with man. The love which unites Christians with one another is no more the result than it is the reality of the love which unites them to God. "We love him because he first loved us." (1 John iv. 19.) "And this commandment have we from him, that he who loveth God love his brother also." (1 John iv. 21.)

This is very different from a pantheistic union, which merges and absorbs the individual in the universal. In the truly Christian fellowship, the Christian,

so far from losing, only thus gains his true individuality. He who comes to know himself as distinctly loved of God, comes to a distinct apprehension of himself, and by the power of loving thus awakened gains his highest power of personal life. He only finds his life by losing it. (Matt. xvi. 25.)

By loving his fellow man also, he does not diminish, but rather enlarges and intensifies the reality of his individual life. This is quite unlike the relations existing in the natural world. There the individual exists only as the representative of the species. He has no worth nor end save as the species shall be mirrored and reproduced in him, and when this has been accomplished he disappears and ceases to be. But in human life inspired by love, the loving will lifts the individual into his only true individuality. Self-sacrifice does not destroy, it creates the true self. Love emancipates the self from its bondage, gives it true liberty, and is its only life. What is personally its own, the truly Christian life retains for itself in all purity and excellence, because it has first given all its own to others. This seeming paradox is in reality the profoundest truth of the Christian life.

This fellowship of Christian hearts is the church. As the word used to denote it in the New Testament literally means, the church is primarily an assembly, the assembly of believers, called together not to constitute the fellowship, not to create the love which unites Christian souls, but to express, and thus to perfect and maintain, the living communion—the communion of saints—in which is the reality of the Christian life. As such the church is manifold. There are various assemblies, many churches,—according to the various localities in which they are gathered together. In the New Testament more frequent reference is made to these individual assemblies than to the general fellowship in which they are all participant. But the same word denotes both. We find in close connection, as in 1 Cor. x. 32, and xi. 16, references to "the church of God" and "the churches of God." Christ is "the Head of the church" (Eph. v. 23); it is "the church of the living God" (1 Tim. iii. 15), and there are also "churches of Christ" (Rom. xvi. 16), and "churches of the saints" (1 Cor. xiv. 33).

The unity and the plurality are both distinctly marked, and neither can be to the prejudice of the other. Indeed, as in the personal Christian life the individual does not lose but rather gains his complete individuality by the love which unites him to God and to his fellow men, so the individual church, by the consciousness of its relationship to the church universal, increases also in the consciousness of its own identity and rights and powers. The freedom belonging to the individual church of managing its own affairs—the freedom of self-determination—is not impaired by that fellowship which belongs to “all the churches of the saints.” Neither is this fellowship which constitutes “the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood” (Acts xxii. 28), and “which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all” (Eph. i. 23), any more inconsistent with the freedom of the various churches, than is that fellowship in which individual hearts are united in love to one another and to God inconsistent with their own individual freedom. Freedom belongs to fellowship and fellowship to freedom. Liberty and love grow out of the same root in the reality of their meaning, as in the origin of the words which express them. The individual church is free by virtue of the fellowship of the church universal, and the church universal is a fellowship in so far as it fulfills and upholds the freedom of all the churches which participate in it. The fellowship of all believers is one. They are all members of the one living body of Christ, which is the church,—one body with many members. That union may be the closest which permits the greatest diversities.

The freedom of the churches and the unity of the church are similar, if not identical, with the freedom and the unity belonging to the state. The state is a unit. In strictness of meaning it is the organic unity of mankind. All men are united in the state as members of an organism wherein each member is the means and the end of all the rest. Each man has his manhood only by virtue of this union. He is a man only as he is a means for the well-being of all men, and at the same time an end of their well-being. Considered apart from this union, as alone and separate from other men, he ceases to be a man, as the old proverb puts it: *Unus homo, nullus homo*. This organic unity of mankind which is the state, makes it proper to affirm that there is, in the broadest meaning of the term, but one state. And yet there are many states, with also great diversities in their constitutions and laws. We have monarchies, republics, democracies, all exercising the functions of government, and all claiming a right, which is also universally acknowledged, to the prerogatives of states. This diversity, however, does not militate against their unity. It is equally true that there is but one state, and that there are many states. The universal and the particular complement each other and are not contradictory. The organic unity which is the state requires for its actualization that there be particular states, as geographical or other conditions determine. These particular states are states in so far as they typify the one state, just as individual men are men only as the universal qualities of manhood are mirrored or expressed in them. The particular states together do not constitute the one universal state, any more than individual men in the aggregate make up the one universal manhood.

The state is one and universal, as manhood is one and universal, and at the same time there are particular states as there are individual men. The unity of the state, therefore, does not require—indeed in the actual condition of men would not permit—that all particular states should lose their individuality of government or institutions, and be merged in what might be deemed the visible embodiment of the one universal state. The universal state has no visible embodiment. It finds its expression, in certain degrees, among the different states, but is itself beyond all expression, and higher than any forms can reach. Yet it is not thereby without reality or power. In our modern world nothing has shown itself more real or potent. What we call international law, or the law of nations,—unknown except in the vaguest, faintest way in ancient times,—is recognized in our day as a sovereignty in human affairs, equally majestic and mighty. It has no visible throne; it does not utter itself through the voice of a monarch, or the votes of a legislature or the people; it has no courts to expound, nor any fleets or armies to enforce its dictates; but it guides kings, and legislatures, and peoples, and courts, and fleets, and armies in our times, with an authority whose manifestation of power is steadily increasing. There is nothing so characteristic of modern politics as the sway which international law is continually gaining among the existing nations. There is no other point in which the politics of the present day are so clearly distinct from those of the ancient world. But international law is nothing other than the voice of the one universal state. It is the state in the highest exhibition of it yet given in history. It is one and indivisible, and is uniting through itself more and more manifestly all particular states. But it leaves these states in their separate forms, each to manage its own affairs in freedom, each to maintain for itself a monarchical or republican or democratic government, as its own requirements shall determine. The organic unity is not impaired in the least—it is rather maintained—by this diversity. The organic relationship among men, the principle of human brotherhood itself, which requires in one case a monarchy, may require in another a republic, or a democracy, as it requires in every case the exercise of freedom.

The relation of church and state is not now our theme, but this obvious unity of the state amid all diversities of states fitly illustrates the true unity of the church. The church is one and indivisible. There is but one holy and catholic and apostolic church. But this church has no more definite form or visible embodiment than has the one universal state. It would be as absurd, and an absurdity of precisely the same sort, to affirm of any given form of church organization—Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational—that it and it only is the one church, as to declare that any given state—monarchical, republican, democratic—is the one and only state. The catholic church, like the universal state, is more or less clearly mirrored or fully expressed in particular organizations; but self-direction is as much the law of the church as it is of the state, liberty everywhere being the normal evolution of law, the freedom of the one, in its strictest meaning, being involved in the fellowship of all. Of course by freedom and liberty here I have in mind something quite other than license.

License is lawlessness, while the only perfect conception of liberty is perfect obedience to perfect law. That individual churches should cease to have their separate organizations, or be denied the liberty, under the general law of Christian fellowship, to manage their own affairs, is no more practicable or desirable than that individual states should cease to have their self-direction. Questions of difference, questions of comity or agreement, between the individual churches will be best settled by the enlarging sense of what is required by the communion of saints and the fellowship of the one body of Christ, just as such questions between different states are best adjusted by the larger knowledge of the organic relationship of all states, and the increasing disposition to conform to all the demands of the universal state. The autonomy of the individual church or state is preserved in liberty and kept from license through the autocracy of the universal.

In the common version of the New Testament, our Lord says, in John x. 16: "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd." In the original, however, the "one fold" is "one flock," and is thus rendered in the new version: "And they shall become one flock, one shepherd." The difference is quite apparent between the oneness belonging to the flock, and the oneness secured by a fold.

Julius H. Seelye.

From Professor Fisher of Yale.

It is not the design of this paper to set forth the advantages of any particular ecclesiastical system. The question is how catholic Christianity can be made to prevail over sectarianism. Sectarianism is the taking of a part for the whole,—the spirit that breeds division, separates Christians into hostile camps, hinders fraternal unity in feeling and coöperation in Christian work. Christian union, the inward sense of oneness, may show itself in the cordial intercommunion of different churches, and in their harmonious exertions for the common cause. It may, also, conceivably give rise to an organic unity.

As regards the Church of Rome, the Vatican dogma of the Pope's infallibility has raised a new and high wall of separation. Protestants at present can only abjure the old intolerance which denied that the Roman communion is a branch of the Christian church, recognize and appreciate whatever is good in the Latin church both now and in the past, and unite, as far as practicable, with Roman Catholics in Christian efforts to do good. For anything beyond this we must wait for changes, to occur we know not when or how. In this brief paper it is expedient to confine the attention to the Protestant evangelical bodies.

The groundwork of unity among Christians is religion, the most powerful of all principles of union among men. There is a common relation to Christ, whereby each obedient child of the Father, according to the saying of Jesus himself, is to Him a "brother, and sister, and mother." The bond of unity among His followers is the Holy Spirit, dwelling in all, and to be recognized by the fruits of Christian character and work. Peter was called to account at Jerusalem

for recognizing Cornelius and other uncircumcised persons as brethren. He defended himself by appealing to the fact that "God gave them the like gift"—the gift of the Spirit—"as he did unto" the Jewish Christians. So the Jerusalem apostles and believers joined hands with Paul when they saw that he had been as successful in converting the heathen as Peter had been in converting the Jews. "The same" [Spirit], Paul explains, "is mighty in me toward the Gentiles"; they "perceived the grace that was given unto me." This is the test always. Who can look on the Wesleyan Methodist body, and the great work done by it for God and man, without being constrained to say just what the Judaic Christians were obliged to acknowledge of Paul and Barnabas? Who can look on the Moravian missions, or on the missions of the Congregationalists in all quarters of the globe, and judge otherwise than the Jerusalem conservatives judged of Paul and Barnabas? The Judaizers clamored for other criterions; not so "James, Cephas, and John." External, historical, ritualistic touchstones are fast giving way before the palpable, immediate, irresistible appeal made by the actual fact of casting out devils in the name of Christ.

What are the chief obstacles to Christian union? First, of course, there is the immense bias in favor of some one sect and against others, which we inherit from the past and from ages of conflict. But this prejudice, like the traditional antipathy of nations, slowly melts away. Next, there is the blind bondage to names. People will not only cling to what they have had, but they will have it under just the same name. Many a Congregationalist has a dread of episcopacy, of "prelatical rule"; but no small part—I do not say the *whole*, but *no small part*—of the actual, practical work of a bishop is really done among Congregationalists by an irresponsible episcopacy of theological professors, secretaries of societies, "leading pastors," etc. Moreover, it is a kind of work that *must* be done by somebody. Thirdly, there is the specific hindrance to union arising from dogmatic intolerance. The single truth on which Christ (in his words to Peter) founded the church is not deemed enough as a term of communion. Dogmatic inferences are spun out, and supposed logical implications are piled up so high as to constitute numberless walls of exclusion. If there is to be union, diversities of opinion on a great variety of topics must be genially allowed. Theological narrowness and logical fanaticism will have to be overcome; and this change is gradually taking place.

There are barriers of *rite* as well as of *dogma*. Men have been resolved to insist on uniformity of observances as well as of doctrinal tenets. Why not permit here, too, a wider range of diversity? Why not make room for an orderly variety even under the same organization? Why should not the church be as comprehensive in its ritual as in its creed? Is it absurd to imagine a time when liturgical and non-liturgical churches may be combined under one ecclesiastical régime? When, even in the same sanctuary, there may be in one part of the day a liturgical service, and in another part of the day a non-liturgical? Are not these long-continued varieties of preference as to the mode of worship likely to continue? Are they not founded in diversities of character and taste that will always exist? At least, ought there not to be, and is

it not plain that there will be, some solution of the problem which shall not involve either the extirpation of one of the parties, or chronic ecclesiastical warfare and division between them? It is true that there are disagreements which only alterations of opinion can remove. A difference regarding a single rite parts one great evangelical body from others. The Baptist deduces from his premises, that immersion alone is baptism, and that baptism is the prerequisite of communion, the inference that only the immersed have a right at the Lord's table. If the Church of Rome professes to be founded on Peter, the Baptist Church may be said, without disrespect, to be founded on a syllogism. As long as both premises are conscientiously cherished, there must be this degree of isolation. The difference about the baptism of infants is another point which stands in the way of full communion, not to speak of organic union, with religious bodies which regard this practice as indispensable.

From rite we pass to polity. Here it would be a decided gain if all sects would acknowledge—what has become clear to scholars—that no existing form of polity corresponds closely to the polity of the apostolic age. The congregationalism which establishes many distinct organizations in the same town was not the system then in vogue; no more was diocesan episcopacy, either then or immediately after, whatever may be thought about the date and origin of episcopal government in its primitive form. The same may be said of the other ecclesiastical systems. Much more important—nay, of vital importance to Christian union—it is to discern that, while general principles at the basis of church organization are in the gospel teaching, there are no prescriptions, beyond these, applicable to all time. It is the great service of Richard Hooker to have demonstrated this truth. In other words, the *divine-right* theory of church polity, which has been a grand hindrance to Christian unity, must be exorcised. The Presbyterians in England were the first to assert the indispensableness of a particular form of organization. The Episcopalians followed: among them the moderate school of Hooker was ultimately overborne by the mystical school of Laud. Congregationalists have sometimes set up the same lofty claim for their system. Not content with contending that a particular polity is necessary to the *well-being* of a church, it has been often maintained to be indispensable to its *being*. It has been assumed that we must find out and take as a model the precise state of things on the last day of the last apostle's life. The controversies between Episcopalians and other evangelical bodies could be simplified, and perhaps brought nearer to an adjustment, if the distinction between the idea of a *governmental* and the idea of a *sacerdotal* episcopacy were kept in mind. This is not the place to approve or to condemn either of these theories. Enough to say that to a multitude of Christians a *governmental* episcopacy, with limited and defined powers, contains in it nothing formidable, while they recoil from the *sacerdotal* or *mystical* theory as involving the notion of a priesthood, a sacerdotal class, a close corporation,—a notion which, in their view, would rob the church at large—the Christian laity—of their reserved rights, and assimilate the gospel dispensation to the Old Testament economy. In justice to the Protestant Episcopal Church, it should be

added, however, that within its pale both theories exist side by side, their respective adherents being satisfied with episcopacy as a fact, in the absence of agreement as to its theoretical basis.

If organic unity is ever to occur, it is not likely to be through the surrender to any one church of all that is distinctive and is prized in other communions. Each sect is ready enough to swallow up all the rest. The Presbyterian will embrace you if you will only take his Westminster Confession and his synods; the Episcopalian, if you will take his prayer-book and his bishops; the Baptist only asks you to be immersed and to stop baptizing children; the Congregationalist simply demands that you will lodge all authority in the local congregation of believers, the professed Christians, or a fraction of them, in a town or village. There is little prospect of unity until the sundered communities mutually recognize their common Christianity and their equal standing as branches of the church of Christ. Plainly we can hope for no immediate visible union beyond a cordial coöperation and non-interference in Christian activity. It is a gain, however, to perceive that the present divisions of Christendom are a crying evil, and to put far from us the offensive idea that emulous sects help forward by their rivalries the cause of the gospel; that is, that Satan can be harnessed and made to do good work for Christianity.

If organic unity is ever to occur, what form will it take? It is unsafe to predict, but one may venture to think that as it was natural for the early church to follow the lines of political division, so if unity should be restored a like arrangement would emerge. Then as nations are united by various bonds, and we aspire after a "federation of mankind," so the churches of the nations might have their forms of union.

There is a powerful incentive in the direction of Christian union in the opening of the heathen world to missions. In the presence of the nations which are to be conquered to the religion of the cross the divisions of Christendom, and of Protestants in particular, present a disheartening spectacle, and are felt as a disgrace. Christ prayed for the unity of his disciples, that the world might know that the Father had sent him. The sight of discordant sects is not adapted to impress the heathen mind with this truth.

In different ways Christians of the various religious bodies, of their own motion, are uniting in distinctively religious and Christian work. Voluntary associations of this character attract to them numerous members from denominations distinct from one another. Books of devotion, like the "Imitation of Christ," find a welcome among the disciples of different creeds. If Christian people do not say the same prayers, they sing the same hymns. The centrifugal age of Protestantism is closed. The centripetal reaction has begun. Polemics may sound the old war-cries, but "the stars in their courses fight against Sisera."

George P. Fisher.

The Character of the New English House of Commons.

BY AN OLD MEMBER.

ENGLISHMEN accustomed to compare the working of their own assemblies with those of the United States often wonder whether there is the same kind of difference between one Congress and another which they observe between one Parliament and another.

OPEN LETTERS.

The Union of the American Churches.

FROM A METHODIST EPISCOPAL POINT OF VIEW.

THE discussion in *THE CENTURY* of the feasibility of a more perfect union of the American churches has taken a wide range, and included a great variety of topics. It is not clear that the writers of the articles already printed are aiming at the same object. Doctor Shields* is asking, or at least hoping, for an organic unity of our churches, to be effected hereafter by common consent. He defines organic unity to be "such unity as inheres in their internal organization." Is there not here a confusion of ideas? The unity of the churches is an established, a divine fact, and that unity is necessarily organic. The church is already one by virtue of the life which pertains to all its members, as members of Christ. Paul's account of this unity is very clear. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? . . . Now ye are the body of Christ and members in particular (severally members thereof)." If such opposites as Jews and Gentiles could in the Pauline period be one body, much more can the Christian opposites of the modern period enter, through the life-giving Spirit, into the composition of one body. Paul's idea is then of a divinely created unity of the church, which subsists in all ages, which remains the same, whether Christians recognize it or not. As the human race is one, being of one blood, notwithstanding the wars which nations wage with each other, so the church is one, notwithstanding the conflicts, spiritual and carnal, which Christians are waging with one another. As in the one case the conduct of men, so in the other the conduct of Christians, is out of harmony with divinely established relations. And that this unity, created by the Spirit, is organic, Paul additionally shows when he says to the Ephesians: "[That we] may grow up into him in all things which is the head, even Christ: From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

There is small hope of profit from a discussion which begins with a confusion of terms; which sets out to create by human means a condition already established by divine means, and which asks men to do what it is not in the power of all men, however combined, to accomplish. The Christian Church is not a dead but a living body; and its unity consists, as already stated, in the life which it has derived from its head, through the ministrations of the Holy Spirit.

Dr. Shields, looking for organic unity by human means, proposes to find it for the United States in the

combination of the American churches, Protestant and Catholic, under one government or confederacy. They would then be the united Christian churches of America. He proposes as a means to this end an agreement either in doctrine, or in polity, or in liturgy; the first two are, however, dismissed as being, for the present, unattainable. The respected representatives of the Protestant Episcopal Church concur in this suggestion of a visible organic unity, and offer, as the readiest means of attaining it, the acceptance by the American churches of Apostolic succession. We cannot doubt that this offer is made in all sincerity. But it involves several difficulties. First, it makes the unity of the church consist in an external organization. If this be so, the church has been without organic unity ever since the Greeks and Latins separated from each other; and has been much worse off since the Protestants broke away from the Latin Church. Again, only one of the three successional churches, Greek, Latin, and Anglican, can be the true church; for there is only one body of Christ, and if unity consists in an external organization, it rests in one only of the three. Which shall it be? † But a third and more important difficulty is found in the fact that the majority of the Protestant Christians of the United States attach no value to an Apostolic succession derived through bishops. They do not see how the bestowal of it can effect the unity of Christ's Church.

We might well pause here to ask the question, "Suppose all the churches of our country to be under one government, what would be the good of it?" Would we really be better off? Would we not have in place of our present elastic ecclesiastical mechanism one so cumbrous that much movement would be well-nigh impossible? Does not the gain which we derive under our system of the separate action of churches more than balance the supposable loss from the lack of administrative unity? The progress of Christianity in the United States during this century has been one of the most amazing facts in the history of the century; and is not this largely due to the independence of action enjoyed by each group or family of churches? Must all this abounding energy be tamed down under the pressure of a dull, dreary uniformity? For my part, I should dread the effect, conceiving the thing possible, of bringing the American churches under a single administrative unity. Where would Methodism have been, if, before proceeding upon its career of evangelism, it had had to wait for orders from some central power? That system which leaves most room for spontaneity of action is far the best, at least for Protestantism. For myself, I have a dread of over-much ecclesiasticism; the trouble we had to get clear of Rome ought to be a reminder to us Protestants that a concentrated ecclesiastical unity is sure to be a concentrated ecclesiastical tyranny.

I confess that I rubbed my eyes when I read Dr.

† Cyprian holds that salvation is possible in *one* external organization only, which alone is the church.

* In *THE CENTURY* for November, 1885.

Shields's proposal to unite American Catholics and Protestants in one ecclesiastical government, as though it were conceivable that Catholics would recognize any other authority than that which is seated at Rome. But I was still more astonished when I found him calling Protestantism one extreme, and Roman Catholicism another, and asking if we may not "look somewhere between these extremes for the path of wisdom and safety." Has he fully weighed the import of these words? Let us see what they really mean. There are, and for the purposes of this discussion it may be said that there can be, only three forms of Christianity. First, that which recognizes one mediator only between God and man; second, that which recognizes human mediators, as necessary to salvation; and third, that which denies the need of any mediator. The third of these forms, known in America as liberal Christianity, may be dismissed from present consideration; the questions of modern life pertain to the other two. Now I think that the essence of Protestantism consists in our deliverance from dependence upon human mediators and human mediation. In other words, Protestantism has taught us that every Christian is his own priest, and can go directly to God through Jesus Christ, for the blessings of forgiveness of sin and a new life. He does not depend for pardon on the judicial act of a human priest. This may seem to the secular mind a small distinction, but it has most important consequences in the civil, social, and political life of the world. The doctrine that all Christians, as priests, are equal before God has as its corollary the doctrine that all citizens are equal before the law. The church governed by the universal priesthood, all whose members are thus equal, precedes in modern history the state governed by the body of equalized citizens. The divine republic is the parent of the political republic. Under the sacerdotal system of a limited human priesthood, the believer remains morally a child; under Protestantism, he grows to manhood, being educated in a sense of his direct responsibility to God. Under the one system he is taught that he must give answer for his conduct to God and his conscience; under the other, that he must give answer for conduct to a human priest, who can bind or loose the soul at pleasure. All that the modern world has gained of progress has been achieved by the overthrow of sacerdotal Christianity. We but state a truism when we say that but for such overthrow there would have been no modern world. Modern civilization has been made possible solely by the denial of the right of the human priest to absolve man from sin. Politically, as well as spiritually, we are the children of the Reformation. Not only is this true of Protestant states, but Catholic states, in order to enter upon the path of progress, have begun by the overthrow of sacerdotal Christianity. Italy, as a state, breaks with the church in order to recover her autonomy; Mexico does the same; united Germany the same; France did the same in the revolution of the last century. The sacerdotal principle is, in these cases, denied as far as the state is concerned; for sacerdotal Christianity claims supremacy over the state as well as over the individual. All modern progress has, therefore, been conditioned upon the rejection of a human priesthood.

What Doctor Shields asks of us is to look somewhere "between the extremes of Protestantism and

Catholicism for the path of wisdom and safety." Safety in what? In religion? Surely not. In morals? Again surely not. In politics? Shall we forsake the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and again be subject to bondage? We maintain that in the matter of progress Protestantism has the right of way, and that to it alone we must look for the solution of the spiritual and political problems of the age. There is no middle ground between Protestantism and Rome, because there is no middle ground between the principle of one only divine mediator and the principle of a body of human mediators reconciling man to God.

It is startling to hear a Presbyterian speaking of Protestantism as an "extreme." I have always read that Protestantism is the recovery of New Testament Christianity; and if it is extreme, it is only so as the New Testament is extreme. Its formal principle is the rejection of the coordinate authority (with Scripture) of human tradition in matters of faith and practice, and a very precious principle it is. How is it possible to bring into the unity of one administration systems of such opposite ideas as are the Protestant and the Roman? It may be asked, Is, then, our outlook for the future an outlook upon a never-ending series of theological and ecclesiastical conflicts? My own opinion is that as the states have overthrown the sacerdotal principle in order to recover their autonomy, so will the individuals composing the states follow in the same line of direction. The states have taken the first step, the individual members of Catholic nations will follow. I cannot believe, therefore, that the drift of American Christianity, or, for that matter, of the churches of Europe, has been towards a middle position between the extremes of Romanism and Protestantism. As for the American churches, their drift has been more and more towards Evangelicalism, which we may call Protestant radicalism, inasmuch as it includes a most positive denial of the sacerdotal principle. Statistics prove beyond question that evangelical, as distinct from sacerdotal, Christianity is the faith of the vast majority of the American people.

We come next to the means proposed by Dr. Shields for the organic unity of the American churches, to wit, the adoption by them of the English Prayer-book. We can safely leave the Roman Catholic—for he is included in this scheme—to make his own answer. But we can fancy him saying: "My prayer-book has a central idea, the offering up of the body and blood of Christ for the sins of the people; but yours is a thing of shreds and patches, without any principle of unity whatever. It has borrowed so much from every quarter that its meaning is the perpetual puzzle of the Protestant ages." This would be irreverent, but I fear expresses substantially the Catholic estimate of the English Liturgy. As to the power of this book to become a bond of union among American Protestants, one fact completely overthrows all of Dr. Shields's hopes. The Methodists have inherited the English Liturgy; a revision of it was provided for them by Mr. Wesley when he organized them into a church in 1784. Most of this service-book has been retained, the chief exceptions being the forms for morning and evening prayer. The baptismal, the marriage, the communion, and the burial services, the forms of ordination, have been, with important excisions, in use among the Methodists for a century; but dur-

ing all this period they have been moving farther and farther away from the Church of England and its representative in this country. The Church of England has seen since 1833 a great revival of what are called Church principles; Methodism has been diverging more and more from Church principles. The prospect of a union of Methodists with Anglicans, on the ground of a common liturgy, is *nil*; meanwhile, aggregate Methodism has grown to be as large a body as the total of Anglicanism, yet with each succeeding year Methodists are more resolved to maintain their independent position. The truth is, the two bodies are, in their practical work, moving on different lines, and could not coalesce without injury to both.

Is there, however, no way out of the present merely formally fraternal relations of the Protestant churches with one another? Can we not come to a closer union? It seems to me that we should

I. Recognize the organic unity of the churches as a divinely established fact, and seek not to create that unity, which is impossible for us to do, but to find for it a better expression in our church life;

II. Enter into a closer coöperative union as a means (1) of thereby declaring our essential unity, (2) of cultivating spiritual fellowship, (3) of better maintaining Christian morals as against practical ungodliness, and Christian faith as against unbelief;

III. Recognize for decency's sake, if no more, one another's churchly standing, so that the efforts to obtain a more perfect union may not carry upon their face an aspect of insincerity.

The limits assigned to this article will not permit any elaboration of the second and third propositions.

George R. Crooks.

George Bancroft on the Legal-Tender Decisions.

UNDER the above head, "Topics of the Time" for May contains an article in criticism of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States of March 3, 1884, in the case of *Juillard v. Greenman*. Of this decision it speaks as "the worst possible decision that the subject admits of"; of its "monstrous doctrine"; of it as evincing ability to prove "that a horse-chestnut is a chestnut horse"; and as one readily lending itself to sarcastic treatment.

Beside this, it summarizes, with approval, Mr. Bancroft's effort, in which one is to find justification of the above characterizations. Of this summary the first point is that Mr. Bancroft "shows that when the framers of the Constitution came to that branch of the instrument which treats of the public finances, they solemnly, and by the vote of nine States against two, cast out of it the power to 'emit bills of credit.'"

Passing directly to the consideration which might connect this historical fact with the subject in hand, the very pertinent question is stated: "What were bills of credit?" Then this answer is given: "Mr. Bancroft shows by a careful turning of the colonial records that bills of credit were nothing else than Government legal-tender notes."

This statement it then follows into two distinctions, with a carefulness which would have been highly commendable had the statement itself been correct. But

it is not correct. It is a misstatement, substantial and fundamental, to the matter under consideration — one which turns awry the main argument. It is here, where good standing was absolutely essential to Mr. Bancroft's success, that the ground fails him.

Bills of credit are something else than Government legal-tender notes. They are Government notes. There is the difference. They are Government notes, whether they are legal tender or not. A Government note which is not legal tender is a bill of credit. It is a bill of credit as fully — a bill of credit to all intents and purposes as known to the Constitution — as though it were legal tender. The ordinary treasury note, issued long before our late war, was a bill of credit as much as is the present legal-tender greenback. Every bill of our present National Banks which is now in circulation and serving the wants of our community is a bill of credit.

The pertinent question, which this summary states, has been put to the Supreme Court, and has been answered. The answers are now ancient: given in 1837 and 1830, one by Chief Justice Marshall himself, — answers apparently unknown to Mr. Bancroft and the writer who summarizes his pamphlet. The term "bills of credit," as then judicially defined, comprehended all Government notes issued to serve as currency. No difference was recognized between such paper which was, and such paper which was not, legal tender. It was, all alike, bills of credit. (*Craig v. Missouri*, 4 Peters, 410; *Briscoe v. The Bank*, 11 Id., 257.)

The court did not leave this point to be matter of implication. They expressly decided it. It was urged upon them that the paper then at bar was not a bill of credit, because it was not (as, in fact, it was not) legal tender; and the court declined to sustain the point thus taken. They decided the paper in question to be a bill of credit, when it was not impressed with the quality of legal tender. (*Craig v. Missouri*, before cited.)

Thirty years and more later, the court again considered this subject; and they then definitely declared that the bills issued (as now) by our National Banks were bills of credit. They were bills of credit of the United States, because the United States was responsible for their redemption: that is, ultimately. (It is well known that these bills are not legal tender.) (*Veazie Bank v. Fenno*, 8 Wall., 548.)

Such Government paper — that is, paper issued to serve as currency, resting on the pledged faith of the Government — had been issued by the United States, as occasion required, for more than fifty years.

And now the court declared, on the authority of this repeated practice of the Government and of uniform previous decisions, that the United States was authorized to emit bills of credit.

This decision was announced by the late Chief Justice Chase, who afterwards gave the opinion against the constitutionality of the legal-tender laws; and to the point here stated it was the opinion of a unanimous court. Mr. Bancroft and the writer in the *MAY CENTURY* both see what escaped the attention of the learned Chief Justice — to wit, that that decision carried with it the constitutionality of the legal-tender laws. They rest their case against those laws on the want of power in Congress to emit bills of credit; and Chief Justice Chase, as the mouthpiece of the court, affirmed that power.

with her materials and with architectural materials towards the same great end. He must go through a term of pupilage in a busy office like Mr. Olmsted's to learn how the new problems of our own day may be met, how complicated are the considerations which affect any large problem, and how fully it must be worked out on paper before a spade is lifted. He must cultivate patience and imaginative power,—for his works will grow very slowly to completeness, and their final estate will be scarcely foreshadowed in their first. And he must cultivate tact,—the art of dealing with men,—even more diligently, perhaps, than the intending architect must; for he will have to

meet and often "manage" not only the client and the artisan, but the architect himself.

All this is slow work and costly work. But most of it will be found pleasant work, provided *pleasant* is not thought a synonym for *easy*. And once well accomplished it will open a delightful life, an ample outlet for the broadest and deepest artistic endowment, and, we believe, a surely prosperous career. The day is very certainly at hand when the gardener-artisan must and will be relegated to his proper place,—beside the builder; and wise, we repeat, will be the youth who will then have fitted himself to stand in this artisan's former place,—beside the architectural artist.

OPEN LETTERS.

Church Union.*

FROM A UNITARIAN POINT OF VIEW.

THE simple truth seems to be that Christian Unity exists in America now, for any one who wants it. Those people have it who were born, out-of-doors, in the open-air freedom of the Christian church, and those also who, having been born in one or another Egypt or closed tabernacle, have had the courage to go out into the freedom of the world of God.

This would never be doubted, but that, as I dare say you have seen, people not used to the freedom of the open air are at first a little puzzled by it. It is somewhat as, on your summer "outing," you have seen people who have been so much shut up in the winter that they do not at first enjoy the strong light of the sea-shore or the open pastures. But, indeed, they soon learn. Most people really want Christian Unity. I observe that most of your correspondents do. But some people are hand-tied, and, may be, tongue-tied, by some old shred of what is called a symbol, written in a dead language and in another time, which they are expected by somebody to subscribe in good faith. So you may see a boy on the sea-shore who wants to go into the ocean, but does not, because he is afraid to wet his clothes.

But when there is any real Christian work to do these people almost always strip off enough rags to be able to plunge into God's own infinite sea, and help the others who are doing it. At first, very likely, some stickler, or Pharisee, insists on a formula to say who may come and help and who may not. The word "Pharisee" means sectarian or lover of division. But once past this reef at the harbor's mouth, when they are all out on the infinite ocean, the initial difficulty is all forgotten. I belong to a society which had to meet many times before it could adjust the delicate balance of its formula. It discussed, even to a syllable, the language of its constitution. Finally, all were happily agreed, and it went to work. It has now been at work for nearly a generation. New members have joined it, eagerly, without so much as asking what was the language of its constitution. If they did ask, they would

not learn. For I have put away my copy so carefully that I do not know where it is, and the secretary's was burned in the Boston Fire; but fortunately he does not know that. There are no other copies. The society itself, all the same, does good work for God and for man, every day. It is judged by its fruits, as everything else is judged and must be judged, in the heavens above or in the earth beneath. And yet no man can tell in words what are the conditions of membership.

Any one who wants Christian Unity in America at the end of the nineteenth century has simply to walk out of his own house and go to work with other men in some enterprise which the good God wishes to have carried through. He will find all the unity he wants. This is nobly illustrated in the charity organization societies which are now at work in all the larger cities of the country.

A man may enter any one of these charity organization societies, whether he be Arminian, Baptist, Calvinist, "Disciple," Episcopalian, Free-Baptist, Greek, Gentile, or Galilean, Hicksite, Independent or orthodox Friend, Jew, Karaite, or Coptic, Lutheran, Methodist, New-Church, orthodox, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, or Reformer, Sandemanian, or Supralapsarian, Trinitarian, Unitarian, or Universalist; or, indeed, if he be one of those Variorum or Wild-Cat come-outers, the unorganized and un-creed believers in Xavier, Yahveh, or Zinzendorf, or Et-cetera himself, who bring up the alphabet of the older and the younger churches.

All these people are eagerly welcomed in any of these practical organizations. Dr. Wayland's rule was, is, and will be, the only working rule. "Can they cast out the devils?" he used to ask. If they could, he did not push his questions further. Before the charity organization has been running three months these people are at work together, without a thought of the verbal or technical formulas by which, on occasion, they could divide into their several companies.

It is easy to say that the work of the church is better done by its several sections when they keep up a strict organization among themselves, and each lets the other sections severely alone. But this is only "say so," and Americans are not ready or apt to believe it. They have read their own history enough to understand the lesson taught in the twelve years between 1775 and 1787, when Massachusetts governed herself, and kept

*See Professor Shields on "The United Churches of the United States," CENTURY for November, 1885; also subsequent Open Letters from ministers of various denominations.

up her own army and navy; when New York did the same, and Virginia the same. The common enemies were not kept at bay as they are by the United States. Now there are so many common enemies that the United Church may well wish to act as a unit in the business of advancing against them and securing the advance of God's Kingdom. I suppose it was Dean Stanley who, in England, first of all, devised that real Union of the Church for one purpose, which was brought about when a commission of members, from every communion, united for the Revision of the Bible. The objective result, an improved English Bible, is a great reward for that enterprise. But the great truth, that the church can unite for such a purpose, is a result still nobler.

There is no lack of similar enterprises which the United Church can undertake in America. This of charity organization is one, and the result, in the harmony and good-fellowship which it brings about, is admirable. Such work might be pushed a great deal further, and will be.

Take Castle Garden, to-morrow, for an instance. There will arrive there, probably, one or two thousand exiles from Europe, perhaps five or ten thousand. If by good luck they are Mormons, they will be met at the landing by kind, intelligent, and skillful agents, who know they are coming and where they are going, who are on friendly terms with the officials, who are experienced in the whole matter. Within three hours, perhaps, of their arrival, without one hitch or jerk, they will all be on their route, under competent superintendence, to their new homes.

But what if, by bad luck, they are not Mormons? What if it chance that they are *only* "Christians"? Nay,—it may happen,—by bad luck that they are *only* sons and daughters of the good God. Is there not in the Christian church of America intelligence enough, love enough, tenderness enough, resolution enough, to treat these poor people as well as if they happened to swear by Joseph Smith's Bible, or to believe it? And if the Christians of a dozen different communions chose to unite, to maintain at Castle Garden a ministry of welcome, such as the Mormon church alone does choose to maintain there, does any one believe that the difference between Ultra-Montanism and ultra-montanism will prevent the two extremes of Christianity even from harmonizing in such an enterprise?

Or if this reader, by good or bad fortune, as he may consider it, does not live in the city where *THE CENTURY* is published, let him lay down this journal and look in the Police-Report in the daily paper of the city nearest to him. It is certain that he will read the names of one, two, or three poor creatures who have been sent, on the yesterday, to the nearest House of Correction. Would he not return to his *CENTURY* the more cheerfully if he knew, as he does not, that there was waiting at the court which sentenced these poor criminals an official minister, sustained by the United churches of that city, simply and only to go to the families of the criminals, and to make sure that punishment does not fall where it is least deserved. There is a place where Christianity, pure and simple, may be at work every day, without the slightest danger of quarrel about symbol or formula.

Such are my reasons for saying that when people want Christian Unity they can find it by going

out-of-doors. But if they prefer to live in their tabernacles or badger-skins, they will probably not find it.

Edward E. Hale.

CHRISTIANITY in the concrete, as believed and professed by the various sects calling themselves Christians, consists of Divine truth on its manward side, Divine truth on its Godward side, and the forms and observances by which Divine truth is made efficient for man's moral and spiritual well-being. Under the first head we must of course include the attributes of God so far as man is affected by them, the relation of Jesus Christ to man, the consequences of moral good and evil, and the eternal life of the soul. These all have an essential bearing upon character, furnishing man with adequate reasons for doing, and, still more, for becoming and being all that is just and true, pure and good. God's attributes are motives to trust and love, praise and prayer, obedience and service. Christ in the divineness of his humanity shows all that man can fully know of God, and all that he must be in order to make his own humanity in any humble measure Divine; and by his sacrificial life and death he in the intensity of his love makes the strongest possible appeal to man's emotional nature in persuading him to repentance, virtue, and holiness. The certainty of retribution not only works upon man's hope and fear, but — what is of ineffably more importance — it affixes to moral distinctions the seal and sanction of Omnipotent Wisdom and Love, thus making the characteristics of the right and the wrong not arbitrary and mutable, but intrinsic and indelible. The eternal life alone can attach their true value to objects of desire and pursuit in the present life, so as to give the due preponderance to the interests of man's moral and spiritual nature over those of his brief and precarious earthly being.

As to these truths there is a virtual and — when technical terms are excluded — even a verbal agreement among persons belonging to widely different Christian bodies. It might not seem so at first view. Thus the several creeds of Christendom give statements as to the nature of Christ that appear mutually inconsistent and irreconcilable; but yet the phrase "Divine humanity" expresses all that Christ can ever be to man in this world, and embodies what is felt and owned by those of every name who are conscious of Christian discipleship. So, too, the human side of all the various theories of the atonement resolves itself into this, — that there is between the deserts even of the penitent and believing soul and the pardon and blessedness for which it hopes an immeasurable distance, an impassable chasm, which can be spanned and filled in only by the mercy of God as revealed and manifested in Christ.

Still further, Christians, however far apart they seem, agree in defining the Christian character as consisting in the soul's vital union with Christ, in fine, in its conscious Christlikeness. Now this Christlikeness those who possess it cannot but recognize in every section of the visible church, and with equal distinctness and with equal beauty of holiness in Ritualists and Quakers, Calvinists and Unitarians, Romanists and Swedenborgians. What is common to them all is what they have received from Christ, and this common part of their Christianity is confessedly the greatest part, — that without which the soundest belief or the most

truly apostolic ritual would be utterly worthless. Why should not then the possession of this common element of Christlikeness constitute a bond of union that should far transcend in strength all separating dogmas and rituals?

As to the Godward aspects of Divine truth there are and there probably always will be irreconcilable antagonisms. This is the case in philosophy. From Thales till now many of the strongest minds of our race have made it their specialty; the theories have been innumerable; but in this entire field there is not a single principle or proposition established beyond controversy. The reason is that philosophy has for its scope a realm which no human mind can comprehend. In this sense the Godward side of Divine truth corresponds to the philosophy of mind and of the universe. Its subjects transcend the capacity of the human intellect. They are infinite and many-sided, while man can take in but a finite portion of a single aspect; and who knows but that his errors may often be partial truths, and falsities only because he makes them universal? But these separating doctrines, though worthy and ennobling themes for speculation, have no shaping power over character. Thus the triune conception of God—not without a philosophical basis—cannot be an aid to devotion. Every Christian, however he may formulate his theory of the Divine nature, worships God and prays to him as Father, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. So there is, no doubt, profound truth in Christ's words, "No one knoweth the Son but the Father;" but there is no possible way in which a dogma professing to solve this mystery can enhance or diminish the reverence, trust, and love which we owe to Christ. As to the atonement, there may have been governmental reasons, so to speak, on God's part for the death of Christ; but no theory concerning them can add to or take from the fervor with which he who has received the atonement, in looking at the cross, exclaims with his whole heart, "Herein is love," and expresses the mandate of that love in the simple and sweet words of the old hymn:

"Love so amazing, so divine,
Demands my soul, my life, my all."

As to the ritual of religion we can hardly expect agreement, so long as there remain several tenable theories as to the authority from which that ritual is to be derived, whether from the Scriptures, or from the church, and if from the church, at what age or from what branch of it. But that outward forms, however important, are unessential, is manifest from the fact that the spiritual influences that can come only from Christ have come through very diverse mediums, and with manifestly equal genuineness, to some through the open Bible, to others through the preaching of the Word, to this person through parental example, to that through sacraments and holy rites, to many immediately, as to all the rest mediately, from the Spirit of God, which has avenues of entrance to every soul.

Now the union possible and desirable among Christians is not the ignoring of differences in dogma or in ritual. Each theory of the philosophy of religion has its own natural and accustomed dialect, which its believers may fittingly prefer in the services of Christian worship; and attachment to the ritual which has been the special medium of spiritual benefit is as inevitable

as home-love in a well-ordered family. But the union which is both desirable and practicable is, *first*, a heartfelt recognition, without abatement or reservation, of the Christian estate of all who manifest a genuine Christlikeness; *secondly*, a cordial readiness, on the part of those of every Christian name, to work together in all means and measures for the advancement of Christian righteousness; and *thirdly*, union in worship whenever and wherever the interest of the common faith may be best promoted by such union, or must of necessity suffer detriment by the multiplication of separate churches beyond the capacity of the worshippers to sustain them honorably and usefully.

A. P. Peabody.

Applause as a Spur to Pegasus.

I LIGHTED the other day upon these things in my reading. Byron writes to Murray, his publisher:

"Dec. 10, 1819. I have finished the third Canto [of 'Don Juan'], but the things I have read and heard discourage all further publication,—at least for the present.

"Feb. 7, 1820. I have not yet sent off the Cantos, and have some doubt whether they ought to be published, for they have not the spirit of the first. The outcry has not frightened but it has *hurt* me, and I have not written *con amore* this time."

Moore, biographer of Byron, relates:

"So sensitive, indeed,—in addition to his usual abundance of this quality,—did he at length grow on the subject, that when Mr. W. Bankes, who succeeded me as his visitor, happened to tell him one day that he had heard a Mr. Saunders (or some such name), then resident at Venice, declare that in his opinion "'Don Juan" was all Grub-street,' such an effect had this disparaging speech upon his mind (though coming from a person who, as he himself would have it, was 'nothing but a — salt-fish seller'), that for some time after, by his own confession to Mr. Bankes, he could not bring himself to write another line of the poem, and one morning, opening a drawer where the neglected manuscript lay, he said to his friend, 'Look here, this is all Mr. Saunders's Grub-street.'

Mr. Ruskin has in his "Arrows of the Chace" a striking passage about the intolerably depressing effect experienced by his friend Turner, the painter, from the disparagement with which his efforts in art were met by the public. As for Byron, in the particular case of his "Don Juan" one might perhaps well wish that his sense of discouragement had been sufficient to prevent altogether the finishing of the poem, splendid as is the iridescence of genius that plays over the surface of that dark and miasmatic water. Still, the illustration serves all the same. Immediate appreciation is a great stimulus to production, a stimulus which only the greatest can miss and yet go on successfully producing.

Shelley, I remember, dashed, dazed, browbeaten by his ill fortune with the public, obliged to be his own publisher, or at least to defray himself the expense of his publishing, exclaimed, in a fit of despondent self-reassurance, of despairing triumph, over his "Adonais" completed, "This, let the critics say what they will, this at least, I *know*, is poetry." How much costly and exhausting effort in sustaining himself for the

quired to pay the operating expenses of this institution, and although this will be taken, at present, from the profits of the business, it is not to be left unprovided for in the event of a change in the proprietorship; for a sum of money is being set apart as a permanent fund for the endowment of the Institute, that it may go on doing its beneficent work after its proprietors have passed to their reward.

In these days, when the hearts of the compassionate are torn by so many harrowing tales of man's inhumanity to working-women, it is pleasant to be able to set forth the good deeds of these two chivalrous employers. Under the law of competition, which always pushes the weakest to the wall, women are the slaves of the labor market. They have not learned to combine; they have no power to resist the oppression of conscienceless capital; the price of their labor is therefore fixed by the most rapacious employers. Against them "the iron law of wages," in its bitterest sense, is continually being enforced. By a logic which is as inexorable as the grave, their compensation tends to starvation-point, nor does any merely "economical" force appear for their deliverance. The less they receive, the less they are able to earn; the labor-force in them is weakened by their impoverishment. The pictures that Helen Campbell has been showing us of the "Prisoners of Poverty" in New-York exhibit the natural result of unrestrained competition. If the women who work are to be rescued from their wretchedness, it must be done by the appearance on their behalf of such knightly employers as these, who decline to build their fortunes upon the woes of women, and who determine to share their gains with those who have helped to gather them. Of course all this is done in sheer despite of the economical maxims. In the thought of such employers, "business is business," and something more: it is opportunity; it is stewardship; it is the high calling of God. Not being omniscient I cannot pretend to discern all the motives of these employers, nor have they shown in my presence any disposition to make any parade of their philanthropy; but I visited their manufactory, by the side of which is planted this fair flower of their charity, and I have seen with my eyes what they are trying to do, and the thing which appears is this: that these two men are working as studiously, as resolutely, as patiently to improve the condition of their employees as they are to enlarge their fortunes. I believe that the one purpose lies as near their hearts as the other.

Are they alone in this? By no means. The number of those employers who find the vocation of the captain of industry to be a humane and a benign vocation is steadily growing. It was never growing so fast as it is to-day. The past two years, with all their strifes and turmoils, have wrought wonders in this realm. It begins to be evident enough that no organization of industry is stable and productive which does not bring in goodwill as one of the working forces. It is just as true of industry as of art, that

"He that shuts Love out, in turn shall be
Shut out from Love, and on her threshold lie
Howling in outer darkness."

The age of the soulless money-maker is passing; the new nobility is coming to its own.

It may be asked whether a higher justice, if not a true charity, would not require these employers to distribute directly in wages the money which they are

devoting to this institution. I do not think so. They are giving their employees more than the market rate of wages for such service; and this institution will be worth far more to these women than the money which it costs would be if it were divided among them. The aggregate amount of comfort, of enjoyment, of health, and of welfare which this institution will produce will be indefinitely greater than they could purchase for themselves with the same sum. This is due, in part, to economical causes; for comfort is a commodity that like most other commodities can be far more cheaply produced on the large scale. The benefits of coöperative housekeeping, after which a generation of burdened housekeepers have struggled in vain, are secured for these employees by the good providence of their employer. There are moral reasons, also, for preferring this method of distribution; for many of these beneficiaries would not, in their present state of mind, be likely to receive any real benefit from an increase of wages; a little more candy, a few more ribbons, an additional number of evenings in the skating-rink or the cheap theater would tell the story of their added income. They need, most of all, higher tastes, simpler enjoyments, and habits of frugality; and the Seaside Institute is intended to lead them gently toward these higher things. When they have found this kingdom, many things can be added unto them.

Washington Gladden.

Christian Union.

FROM THE BAPTIST POINT OF VIEW.

THE recent articles in *THE CENTURY* on the general subject of Christian union have been in a high degree interesting and instructive. He must be a very blind observer of "the signs of the times" who does not discover strong tendencies toward a closer union among all denominations of Christians. At the New York State Baptist Pastors' Conference held last fall at Poughkeepsie, a unanimous resolution was passed expressing this desire in explicit and emphatic terms. No body of Christians is more earnest than is the great Baptist denomination — numbering in the United States its millions — in offering the prayer of our Lord: "That they all may be one." By no formal appointment do I represent the denomination in this "Open Letter"; but I am quite sure that I do not misrepresent its spirit and efforts.

Three facts seem very plain to many at this time.

First. The great denominations are drawing nearer together in their forms of service. Churches which have not a liturgy, in the technical sense of that term, are adopting more elaborate forms of worship than they formerly used. On the other hand, some churches, which come into the category of liturgical churches, are omitting, in some of their services, some of their usual forms. In some of the revival or "mission" services everything which once distinguished liturgical churches is wanting. One might think in attending these services that he was at one of Mr. Moody's meetings. These "missions" are themselves an illustration of the tendency here named. They are simply "revivals," as the term has been used for generations among the more fervent Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists. The Roman church adopted them in forms adapted to

their other methods of work; and some Episcopal churches have now come into the line of work long followed by other bodies. The same unifying tendency is seen in services in connection with the reception of new members and in preparation for the observance of the Lord's Supper. This two-fold modification of services indicates progress along the line of union; it is prophetic of greater progress soon to be made. It is greatly wise in every way. The oldest forms of creed, prayer, litany, chant, and hymn are the property of no one denomination. To claim a monopoly in their use is to manifest hopeless ignorance and unpardonable bigotry. As well might one claim a monopoly of the sunshine or the evening breeze.

Second. The different denominations to-day have essential union. At present organic union is undesirable. It is possible only by making dangerous compromises. A union which is possible only to those who believe anything or nothing to secure it, is bought at too dear a price. Honest convictions must be respected. Better that men differ honestly than agree by being indifferent to all creeds. Essential union is possible and actual to-day among the great majority of our Protestant churches. There are to-day wider differences among some of the branches of the Roman church than between some of the different churches in our great Protestant host. There are churches in this city, not Roman, of the same name, which differ more widely in spirit and life than do certain other churches bearing different denominational names. Rationalism and Romanism, in many of their distinctive features, may be found under the same church name and authority. Here is organic but not essential union. When churches of different names work along the line of their honest convictions of the teachings of God's word, they have essential union; coming near to their common Lord, and coming near to lost men, they come genuinely near to one another. Such union is worth much. An organic union, secured by concessions, compromises, and concealments of honest convictions, is a positive damage to all concerned.

Third. Christian union, both essential and organic, is greatly retarded because many Christians refuse to accept the plain teaching of God's word, and the conclusions of the highest scholarship regarding the subjects and the act of baptism. Baptists hold that Christ alone can make laws for his church; and that the Bible is the only rule of faith and practice. They believe that this word teaches with unmistakable clearness that believers are the only subjects of baptism, and that baptism is the immersion of believers into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. If the Bible does not clearly teach these truths, what truths does it clearly teach? More explicit are its utterances on these subjects than regarding the divinity of Christ, or any article in the orthodox creeds. As a matter of fact, there are in this country to-day millions who cannot accept sprinkling or pouring as baptism. But all men, always and in all places, accept immersion as baptism; not to accept it, is not to accept baptism. If ever there is organic union it will be at the baptistery. *Baptists care little for the mode of baptism.* The person to be baptized may kneel in the water, and be baptized forward; or he may stoop until the water flows over his head; or he may be baptized backward. But Baptists insist upon baptism. They cannot accept a substitute for the

act honored by the audible or visible presence of each Person in the Trinity when Jesus was baptized; honored in this respect as was no other act of obedience in our Lord's life. The so-called "Teaching of the Apostles" does not call anything baptism but immersion. It gives directions for baptism, and then, when the conditions of baptism are wanting, although we find them always possible, it gives permission for something else, not called baptism. This "teaching" Baptists alone live up to; it is especially their document. Their views the highest scholarship indorses. Lexicographers such as Donnegan, Schleusner, Greenfield, Stourdza, Liddell and Scott, Robinson, Wahl, Grimm, Wilke, and many more distinctly and emphatically affirm that baptize, which is properly a Greek word, means to dip, to immerse, to plunge. Such religious teachers as Calvin, Luther, Melancthon, Archbishop Leighton, Wesley, Conybeare, and Dean Stanley say that immersion was the original mode. Such commentators as Chalmers, Zwingle, Ewald, De Wette, Meyer, Godot, Alford, Plumtre, Bishop Elliott, and many more, representing various churches and countries, say in substance that same thing. Such historians of our Lord's ministry and of the apostolic church as Mosheim, Neander, G. A. Jacobs, Geikie, Pressensé, Conybeare and Howson, Lewin, Dean Stanley, Edersheim, Farrar, Weiss, Hagenbach, and Dollinger, and such recent learned theologians as Luthardt, Van Oosterzee, Schmidt, Dorner, and Rothe, agree substantially with the learned Dr. Schaff when he says, "Immersion, and not sprinkling, was unquestionably the original form." Luther, Dr. Wall, Neander, Olshausen, and Professor Lange agree with Dr. Hanna when he says, "Scripture knows nothing of the baptism of infants." If scholarship can prove anything, it has established the Baptist position regarding the subjects and the act of baptism.

The point I make is this: All are agreed on immersion as baptism; all cannot agree on anything else. All can be baptized without doing violence either to conviction or to conscience. High Roman, Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Methodist and other authorities can be cited — and their exact words given — to prove all these statements regarding the teaching of the highest scholarship; and the plain teaching of the Bible to the unlearned is in harmony with the conclusions of the highest scholarship. Baptists have no option but to be separate so long as others refuse to follow Christ in baptism. If a pastor in any of the churches not Baptist were to teach and practice our views, he would be driven out. What then could he do but be separate from his former brethren? If others than Baptists will not do what conviction and conscience permit them to do, it is certain that they do not much desire union. Surely in such a case the charge of bigotry and schism does not lie at the door of Baptists. We shall continue to pray, "that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, . . ." that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

R. S. MacArthur.

CALVARY BAPTIST CHURCH, New York.

American Students in Germany.

Now that multitudes of American college graduates annually migrate to Berlin, Leipzig, Göttingen, and Strasburg, it may not be out of place to call attention

not as an intending American citizen, but as a reënforcement to a hierarchy which the United States Government has proclaimed to be its enemy; to him who is the known and irreconcilable enemy of society itself,—to all such, the law may easily be so framed as to make the necessity of a consular certificate, under the instructions given to consuls, a very serious impediment to immigration. It would be impossible, no doubt, for such a filter to catch all the objectionable elements which might assail it; but the result would be at least somewhat clearer water than we have been receiving from the old continent for years past.

The desire for such a purification of immigration is no mere product of a sentimental admiration of cleanliness. Our "dangerous classes" have been increased, of late years, by the addition of a still more dangerous class, one which is amenable to none of the influences by which society has hitherto dealt with the others. Its numbers are no larger than those of our bears or panthers or other wild beasts. But it has human intelligence, superimposed upon the instincts of the wild beast; its members have the power and will to work destruction to which the mere brute is incompetent; and yet their human lineaments prevent society from dealing with them in their proper capacity until after they have wrought their evil work. They are in, though not of, the country; and their presence has only added to the responsibility of those men to whom the preservation of the public peace is intrusted. But why should their base of operations be left unattacked?

Why should they be left to draw reënforcements from abroad *ad libitum*? Such a restriction on immigration as has been suggested would cut off at least a percentage of their reënforcements; and every chief of police in the United States would feel that, difficult as his task in dealing with this class might still be, it would no longer be an absolutely hopeless one: daylight might be indefinitely in advance, but it would be daylight at least.

The hardships of the proposition lie mainly in the visions, which the imagination unconsciously conjures up, of United States marshals lining the shores of the great republic, ready to treat as criminal the desire of any immigrant to enter her jurisdiction. But the reality would be far from correspondent with any such spectacle. There would be a few cases of stowaways, whom the steamships or sailing-vessels which brought them would be compelled to carry back at their own expense; and then the mere fact of the known restriction would obtain all the good that can ever be hoped from it. Nor is there any constitutional objection to the power of Congress to enact such a restriction. The section of the Constitution, forbidding Congress to interfere with the "migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit" until the year 1808, carries with it a complete power to interfere in later years. The importation of negro slaves, of Chinese, and of contract labor has already been forbidden; are there not other classes of immigration which yearn for restriction?

OPEN LETTERS.

Christian Union and Baptism.

IN the July number of THE CENTURY, an "Open Letter" writer says: "Christian Union, both essential and organic, is greatly retarded because many Christians refuse to accept the plain teaching of God's word, and the conclusions of the highest scholarship regarding the subjects and act of baptism. Baptists hold that Christ alone can make laws for his church; and that the Bible is the only rule of faith and practice. They believe that this word teaches with unmistakable clearness that believers are the only subjects of baptism; and that baptism is the immersion of believers," etc.

Now, all the world knows that, in these matters, other Christians hold, and Presbyterians, among others, plainly declare, just what this Baptist represents as the great faith of his denomination,—namely, "That Christ alone can make laws for his church; and that the Bible is the only rule of faith and practice." Therefore, if they differ from Baptists, *why*? This writer says: They "refuse to accept the plain teaching of God's word," etc. To "refuse to accept the plain teaching of God's word," they must know that teaching. And if, as this writer charges, they believe that God's word does not teach what they practice, as to the mode and subjects of baptism, then they are all hypocrites, acting in opposition to "conviction and conscience." To brand them all the more deeply and darkly, as living in the impen-

itent practice of known sin, he says of God's word: "More explicit are its utterances on these subjects than regarding the divinity of Christ, or any article in the orthodox creeds." That is, as he means: "*Believer's baptism*" and *immersion* — to the exclusion of all other modes and subjects — are more explicitly taught in God's word, than is the divinity of Christ, or any other doctrine! Is this true or not? All other Evangelical denominations accept the divinity of Christ as a teaching of God's word, and hold that it is heresy not to accept it. So clear is the teaching of the Bible on this subject. Now, as this writer says, the baptism of believers only, and immersion as the mode, are more explicitly taught in God's word, than this essential doctrine of the common acceptance and faith, we do utterly and emphatically deny the statement. We affirm that there is not *one verse* in the Bible proving immersion as the only mode of baptism or the only baptism, and not one verse in the Bible proving that only believers are to be baptized, and not one verse in the Bible proving beyond doubt or controversy — that is, in *express words* — that any one was ever immersed in being baptized.

But this writer claims that "all men, always and in all places, accept immersion as baptism; not to accept it, is not to accept baptism."

And we ask: Why is it *recognized* as baptism? (We do not say it is *accepted*,—for that would not be true.) Simply because, thereby we wish to recognize Baptists as an *Evangelical denomination*, and be-

cause we wish to *respect every brother's conscience in all things doubtful, or not essential*. This, God's word commands.

Good and wise men differ as to the Bible-teachings touching the mode and subjects of baptism. Since these differences are not about "things essential," ought we not to show Christian charity? If it be said that we are disobedient to a plain command of Christ's own giving, we must deny it. We believe that baptism is commanded; and we *believe we obey the command in our mode and subjects*. We believe this more firmly than we believe that the "Baptists" are right! And, certainly, in the Presbyterian Church (South, at least, if not North also) we do not accept nor practice immersion. Some cases of immersion there were, formerly; but, because of our great doubt as to the Scripturalness of this mode, it is now disapproved among us, in practice. Notwithstanding all that this Baptist writer says, we do not "agree on immersion as baptism" for ourselves; and we cannot be immersed "without doing violence either to conviction or conscience."

As to the "highest scholarship," etc., we have good reason to know and say that when writers and others are *fairly and fully represented or quoted*, their "Concessions" to Baptists are worthless, and in many cases merely imaginary. But were it otherwise, we cannot depart from our law, "that Christ alone can make laws for his church; and that the Bible is the only rule of faith and practice." The baptism given in the example of Christ is found in Acts ii. *It is the only case in the Bible where mode cannot be argued at all. It came from above, was "poured" (v. 18) upon the heads of those receiving it.* Not one case of immersion is mentioned in all the Book! This is not the place to argue the meaning of the original word, as used before Christ adopted it. Suffice it to say that neither classic Greek, nor any other, justifies immersion as the one mode; and *the Bible does not justify it at all, in our view!*

We must not conclude without remarking upon the very strange assertion that "the so-called 'Teaching of the Apostles' does not call anything baptism but immersion"; that "it gives directions for baptism, and then, when the conditions for baptism are wanting, . . . it gives permission for something else, not called baptism." In the directions about baptism in that document, *immersion is not once mentioned, nor even hinted at!* Two kinds of water are mentioned; "Living," that is, fresh, or running water, is preferred. "But if thou hast not both (kinds), pour water (the kind thou hast) upon the head," etc. *And this is called baptism, afterwards!* "προὐδὲ τοῦ βαπτισματος." No one can read that document, then say truly, "Baptists alone live up to it."

His further claim that "all are agreed on immersion as baptism . . . All can be baptized (immersed) without doing violence either to conviction or conscience," we object to, most emphatically. We have explained why we *recognize* immersion. But for ourselves we cannot conscientiously accept it, nor administer it to others.

Herbert H. Hawes,

Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Staunton, Va.

Christian Union and Pending Public Questions.

THE discussion which has been maintained of late, in THE CENTURY and elsewhere, on the subject of Christian Union, has thus far established at least these three propositions:

First. That there is a strong and a growing desire for such union—a desire discovering itself among some of the leading ministers of several distinct denominations.

Second. That the Christian union so desired is not only nearer and more harmonious relations between different and still separate churches, but, certainly by some, *an effective organic unity*; not the general absorption of all others by any one, but reunion based on reconciliation of differences or on the discovery of mutually satisfactory terms upon which those distinctive differences can be coördinated.

But, *Third*, that in none of the churches is there felt, as yet, any great motive power pressing them on with sufficient force to overcome either the general inertia or the many and serious practical difficulties and obstacles which arrest actual progress in that direction.

In other words, while many Christian thinkers greatly *desire*, the churches clearly do not, as yet, feel the *necessity* of Christian unity.

Meanwhile, however, it is evident that a question is beginning to present itself, as perhaps worthy of serious consideration, which is nearly allied to this, and which must practically involve this very issue of Christian unity.

From no principle of English social and political life did the revolution separate our fathers more effectively and more thoroughly than from that which recognized an established religion of the State. That the new nation should have, as such, no religion, was assumed to be one of the corner-stone principles on which rested the guaranty of our liberties. So far has this assumption been carried, so widely and continuously has it entered, ever since, into all our writing, speaking, and thinking upon matters of public interest, that it has come to be accepted as a virtual axiom of American social and political philosophy, that religion is concerned only with a personal and private life of the individual; and that it has no natural, much less necessary, relation with social problems and political issues.

This experiment of relegating Christianity to the individual and to private life,—the attempt to conduct business, to develop social interests, to work out an American economic science, and, above all, to administer the affairs of the nation without reference to Christian laws or to Christian principles,—on the ground, that is, that these laws and principles do not apply to the affairs of this life, has, in consequence been tried thoroughly; and there are not a few who are now beginning to look around them, to consider the utter disorganization of our accepted economic system; to analyze and search for the causes of the labor troubles and of the inchoate anarchy of the last few years, of the confessed moral failure of our boasted public-school system, and of the corruption of our politics,—and to ask how far these are the outcome of that experiment.

Without attempting to anticipate the results of such inquiries, it may, at least, be said that they open up before us some of the most serious questions ever pro-

posed to American thinkers and students. They remind us of the plain, direct language of Isaiah: "The nation and kingdom which will not serve thee shall perish," and they constrain us to consider whether those words be not deserving of a larger and a more modern application than we have been wont to give them.

But this inquiry also brings us face to face with another grave question. If we should be led, eventually, to admit that Christianity is a necessary factor in the settlement of our labor troubles, in the solution of the most perplexing problems which now present themselves in sociology and even in public politics, how is it possible to bring this factor into effective action, so long as Christianity presents itself to the public embodied only in a number of wholly distinct and at least supposedly antagonistic sects and churches? Even were the community to be persuaded of the necessity of taking counsel, in its extremity, of the church of Christ,—who shall or who can decide for the community, from which one of all these several Christian bodies, each claiming to be at least the nearest approximation to the ideal of that church and most faithfully to teach Christian doctrine?—society is to ask and receive instruction in the oracles of God. Even were the business community ready to accept a new Christian social economy or the nation to conform its public policy to Christian principles, is not Christian reunion a condition precedent of the power of the Church to give such guidance or to teach such principles?

National Christianity, where it still exists, has come down from a period which antedates these divisions among Christians. In a pure monarchy, so long as the ruling family—in an aristocracy, so long as the ruling class, continues to be identified with one organic form of Christianity, so long can that national Christianity be maintained, even after Christian unity, among the people, had been broken up. But, in proportion, as the actual power of government passes into the hands of those who are themselves divided on organic religious issues, in that proportion must such divisions prove fatal to anything like a national Christianity. The exclusion of Christianity from all but purely personal and private interests is, therefore, the inevitable corollary of Christian divisions in a democracy.

Conversely, then, among us, must the restoration of such a lost Christian unity precede all hope of anything like a real social or economic or national recognition of Christianity; and any one who honestly believes that a non-Christian social economy and a non-Christian political philosophy have been failures; every one who is convinced that the great issues which have been raised by the conflicting interests of labor and capital can only be adjusted stably on Christian principles; every one who is now ready to confess that a public-school system, in accordance with which the intellect only is educated, while the conscience is left undisciplined, is worse than a failure; every one who believes that the attempt to ignore the laws of Christ in national politics is fatal to all national prosperity and stability;—all these must, of necessity, therefore, whatever their personal or private religious convictions or character, sooner or later seek the restoration of some effective Christian unity.

That the social disturbances of these times and the present state of party politics have brought many to

consider these questions as never before, is not to be denied. That they will awaken and stimulate discussion, in the drawing-room and at the table, in the religious press, the magazine and the review, on the platform and in the pulpit, is equally beyond a doubt.

In the presence of such considerations and questions the wide distinction, heretofore so generally accepted and so steadily maintained on both sides,—between the domain of public interests and duties and that of private and personal Christianity,—fades away and utterly disappears. The Christian finds himself called upon to consider his relations, as such, to every social question and to every political issue of his times. The economist, the publicist, and the statesman find themselves equally called upon to ask what Christianity has to say upon the question in hand, and what modifications are introduced into the problems of the hour, by that which, at all events potentially, if not in actuality, is the overruling factor—the law of Christ.

Wm. Chauncy Langdon.

ST. JAMES' RECTORY, BEDFORD, PA.

Secret Societies in College.

THE time has arrived again when the classes are gathering in our various institutions of learning over the land, and many young men are just beginning the new and strange life embraced within those eventful four years which mold and in a great measure fix their after career among scholars and professional associates in the real world outside.

I should like to say a few words about one matter concerning the societies which have place, rightly or wrongly, in most colleges. The process of what used to be called "electioneering" commences almost at once when the freshmen come on. The secret and the anti-secret associations alike select their members; and so most of the new students are compelled to take sides on a question which grows more and more intricate as they advance in years, and are able to mark the workings of an experience thoroughly unique and prodigiously influential, upon themselves and upon others. The least that can be said at the beginning, and the least that can be urged to the end, is that men should be conscientious at the beginning and consistent to the end of their course.

Let me tell an old true story: When I was in college, it was an admitted custom for the secret-society students to attend at pleasure the regular meetings of the anti-secret association, then called there the Social Fraternity. On one occasion the news went around that the delegates of a number of affiliated institutions had assembled in some central city during the vacation, and formed a *quasi* national consociation, embracing all the local ones, which hereafter were to be understood to have become auxiliaries. Curiosity was at its height, and the assembly convened to accept the report was visited by a large number of outsiders also, and the small chapel was nearly full. Even the "neutrals" doffed their dignity in order to witness the novelty.

The committee proceeded to read their preamble and constitution for a formal adoption. It was in the regular form. It began by saying that the name of the new organization should be the "Anti-Secret Society

followed by the sage remark that "after all, the stimulating of these is of far more value than any number of facts or theories crammed into his brain by patent processes." Why should not this hold as true for the "clumsy methods" of the schools in question? Why should the writer take into consideration, at all, the methods of instruction if, as he further says of the pupil, "it is what he is, and not what he is taught, that makes him a success or a failure"? A casual reader would be led to infer that a school for the blind assumes to take in hand any "individual under thirty" and turn him out a "finished specimen of its educational excellence." As, however, the school age is usually placed at from six to twenty years, it will be seen that this does not fall within its "scope."

In short, Mr. Perry, notwithstanding his characterization of the methods pursued in the schools as "clumsy," recommends, especially in the home, the use of the Braille-board for writing, maps in relief, and the type-board for arithmetical calculations.

These constitute in effect nearly all the apparatus, designed specially for the blind used in the schools, with the exception that here their use is directed by experienced teachers.

J. T. Morey.

PERKINS INSTITUTION FOR THE BLIND, SO. BOSTON, MASS.

The American of the Future.

IT has been observed that the bulk of American citizens now engaged in the attempt to free labor from the tyranny of capital were not born in this country; and this fact has been mentioned as if, in some way, it cast a reflection upon the expediency or wisdom of the attempt in question. Native-born Americans, it is urged, trained from birth and by inheritance in the traditions of American independence and in the principles of the Constitution of the United States, would never lend themselves to such "foreign" and aggressive measures as the boycott, the strike, and the bomb. This position, however, will be found upon examination to be both logically and morally indefensible. In the first place, it is much to be doubted whether one native-born American in ten could repeat from memory a single clause of the Constitution of his country; and this ignorance bears practical point in the uncomplaining submission with which most native-born Americans endure insolence, imposition, and robbery that would stimulate to rebellion the least warlike denizens of the effete monarchies of Europe. Our foreign-born population, on the other hand, especially those of recent importation, are still instinct with something of the same enthusiasm for liberty and for having their own way which distinguished the Pilgrims of 1620 and the patriots of 1776; they have not yet succumbed to the apathy and timidity which seem inseparable from a prolonged residence in the land of the free. It is not the descendants of the "Mayflower," in short, who are the representative Americans of the present day; it is the Micks and the Pats, the Hanses and the Wilhelms, redolent still of the dudgeon and the sauerkraut barrel; and it is to them that a prudent public sentiment will intrust the reins of power and the destinies of the republic. Nor should we stop here. There is a further step to be taken; one which the increasing enlighten-

ment of this age will be certain, sooner or later, to force upon us. America, unlike all other countries of the world, is an idea rather than a place; a moral rather than a geographical expression. It is not so much the land, as the principle, of Freedom. To be an American, therefore, it is by no means necessary to be an inhabitant of the United States. In a higher and truer sense, an American is a man of European birth, who renders himself obnoxious to the land or social proprieties of his birthplace. And since, as has been shown, the genuine American spirit deteriorates in direct ratio with the length of the individual's residence in America, it follows that the most genuine Americanism must be that which has been free from this enervating influence altogether. If this reasoning be valid, an amendment to the Constitution should be introduced without delay, providing that no person of American birth or descent should be allowed to hold any political or public office in the United States; that the most recent immigrants should be intrusted with the most controlling offices of government; and that no man shall be eligible for the Presidency unless he can prove that he is an outlaw in his own country, and that he has never set foot in this.

Julian Hawthorne.

Christian Union.

IN reading the profoundly interesting second paper on the "United Churches of the United States," in the December CENTURY, I was struck by the omission of all reference to an episcopal church (probably on account of its numerical weakness) which, owing to its peculiar history, would have been deserving of mention in Professor Shields's scholarly essay. I refer to the Moravian Episcopal Church, with its historical name of *Unitas Fratrum*. Taking its rise in the forces set in motion by the Bohemian-Moravian Reformation of Huss in the fifteenth century, and experiencing a renewal under German influences in the eighteenth century, it possesses the oldest Protestant historic episcopate, antedating the Anglican, continuing in an unbroken succession to the present day from 1467, at which time the episcopate was obtained from the Romish Church through the medium of two Waldensian bishops, regularly consecrated by Roman prelates. After a searching examination, the church was legally acknowledged as an "Ancient Episcopal Church" by an act of the English Parliament in 1749, and thus, so far as I know, is the only church whose clergy is officially acknowledged by the Anglican church.

So early as 1840 the late Right Rev. B. B. Smith, the then Presiding (Anglican) Bishop of Kentucky, proposed an organic union between the Methodist Episcopal and Protestant Episcopal churches through the medium of Moravian ordination, *i. e.*, that the Methodist clergy were to be ordained by Moravian bishops, as "this was an episcopate which both churches acknowledged." The two Wesleys, John and Charles, were converted through the instrumentality of the Moravian bishop Peter Boehler.

The Moravian Church, while admitting of the greatest freedom of worship, has a rich scriptural liturgy, which, with its pure historic episcopate, it prizes as its richest treasure.

Although historically an episcopal church, its government is largely synodical and confederal, and thus presents an example of a church combining these two forms of government.

It has from its origin always been of strong union tendencies, and of a truly catholic spirit, ever recognizing, even in times of prevalent bigotry, all sister churches, and standing in friendly relations with them where they would let it. It possesses this same spirit to day, and hails with delight all signs of union in the great denominations of our country, for its churchly watch-word has ever been the high-priestly prayer of Christ, "that they may be one."

Paul de Schweinitz.

MEDFIELD, MINN.

To the Deaf.

THE conditions and troubles of defective hearing may not interest the general reader, for none but the sufferers themselves have any idea of the burden of sorrow imposed by the impairment or deprivation of the sense of hearing. Nothing save blindness is so hard to bear, especially for those full of ambition, and otherwise capable of the full enjoyment of life.

But there are comforts even in deafness. We can see the faces of our loved ones, we can enjoy all beautiful sights,—the lovely flowers, the rich landscapes, the glorious sunsets, and all the beauties of nature,—while all arts save music lay their treasures and achievements at our feet. The pleasures of travel, too, are not less to us,—perhaps in many respects they are rather enhanced.

We can make the pen available by correspondence, and so benefit ourselves and our friends. We can use the brush, and enjoy our labor at the easel; and we can employ our hands for our own and others' comfort and happiness in a thousand ways.

Deafness is far more common than is generally supposed, and is especially prevalent among the middle-aged. Medical works assert that fully one-third of our population between the ages of twenty-five and fifty are partly deaf, the trouble having come on so gradually that fully one-half of those afflicted are unaware of it until sufficiently advanced to become troublesome.

We believe the best aurists agree that there is no help for hereditary and congenital deafness, or those cases where the nerves are paralyzed. A very common cause of temporary deafness is hardening of the wax of the ear; and the trouble may become serious if not relieved by prompt and proper treatment at the hands of a good aurist. Where such aid is not available, it is safe and possible to remove the wax by putting into the ear two or three drops of pure glycerine three times a day for three days, and then syringing with warm water (as warm as can be comfortably borne) in which a little carbonate of soda has been dissolved. Use a teaspoonful to one quart of water.

The ear being a very intricate, delicate, and sensitive organ, no patent nostrum should ever be introduced into it nor any quack ever allowed to tamper with it. Only the very best aurists should treat it. Many disorders and conditions of the inner parts of the organ are beyond the reach of medical skill. Such cases are disheartening. Obstruction of the Eustachian tube (the tube that connects the tympanum, or ear-drum, with the back upper part of the throat) is a frequent cause

of deafness. Inflammation of the throat, affecting this tube, also causes it. In either case, a good aurist can afford speedy relief by removing the obstruction or allaying the inflammation.

Catarrhal deafness usually disappears when the cause is removed, if the trouble has not become too deeply seated. Early manifestations of deafness should not be overlooked or neglected. Elderly people are often deaf because vitality is declining generally; the hearing, in common with the other powers, shows the approaching weakness and decay of age. Some persons whose hearing is ordinarily very acute are quite deaf when extremely weary.

Rupture of the drum membrane by an accidental puncture, by whooping-cough, or by a blow on the head, is among the causes of deafness. The sudden concussion of air against the delicate tympanum, caused by the discharge of heavy artillery, has often more or less impaired the sense of hearing, and, strangely enough, in some reported cases where the hearing was already weakened, has restored it. Many soldiers were made deaf during the war. The ears sometimes seem entirely stopped up by a severe cold; but let them alone, treat and remove the cause, and the effect will probably disappear.

Climatic causes produce deafness. We have visited a county in central Pennsylvania where deaf people are the rule and those with good hearing the exception. In districts in Alpine Switzerland the same peculiarity has been observed. Another cause of deafness is thickening of the lining membranes of the ear, and for this there is no known remedy. It may be constitutional, or caused by ulceration after scarlet fever, or by other diseases; but it sometimes comes on without any known or apparent cause. All that can be done in this case is to palliate the trouble by using an ear-trumpet, or, better still, an audiphone. The latter is now oftenest made in the form of a fan of vulcanite, and being black, and a seeming accessory to the toilet, is in no respect objectionable, as was the large ear-trumpet of former days. There is a very small ear-trumpet made that is helpful. These instruments are of great assistance in hearing lectures and the like, as well as in lending distinctness to conversation.

It has been said that "Deaf people are always proud." Call it pride, if you will; but why needlessly proclaim a misfortune (which, unlike blindness, is not often evident) by using a conspicuous and forbidding instrument? One does not care to emphasize his own personal afflictions for the observation and comment of others.

If people only knew how to talk to the deaf, a great many heart-aches would be saved. First, have a little consideration, and by a very trifling motion, which they readily see and understand, call their attention to you; then articulate clearly and distinctly—not too fast, and not too loud. It is this shouting into the ear of a deaf person that fills him with confusion and sends all the blood to his face; by his wavering and equivocal responses he sometimes hardly gets credit for due intelligence, although he may really be very well informed on the subject under discussion. He had hoped you would speak low and distinctly; he could then have heard you, acted like himself, and been himself; but now all within hearing know he is deaf, think he is very deaf, and look upon him with com-

Christian Union.

It is now very generally believed that there is a tendency towards some organic union of the churches of Christ in the United States. The leading men of the different denominations are, for the most part, declaring themselves in favor of an attempt at some form of union. They clearly perceive that the missionary interests, home and foreign, demand it. The strange thing is that such convictions do not lead to practical results. When one enters the mission field and makes observation of what is going on there, he finds that the rivalry of the societies for the possession of the field, not in the name of Christ, but in the name of sect, is as great as ever it was. For example, there is in the new West a field containing a population of three thousand souls. Nine years ago this became a home missionary field. An effort was first made to establish a Presbyterian church. This having failed, a Congregational church was organized, composed of the Presbyterian and Congregational people in the community, and largely supported by the missionary society of the Congregational church. In the mean time the Methodist, Baptist, Christian, and United Presbyterian societies established successful missions in the same field, and two other societies organized small churches. Recently the Congregational church came to self-support, and seemed in shape to do good work and to make some return by its benevolences to the general work in other fields. But at this point the Presbyterian society came in. It organized its church; called a pastor; made an attempt, which succeeded in part, to build itself up from the membership and congregation of the Congregational church, before that time in a harmonious and prosperous condition; asked for and received from its society a grant of a considerable sum of money; and offered its pastor a salary of one thousand dollars. The result of the movement was to give to a town, already having five very good Christian churches and two weak organizations, an additional church at the expense of the missionary society of the Presbyterian denomination, and also to weaken and discourage the Congregational church, and make its struggle for self-support, for some time to come, a severe one.

In the example cited, it happened that the Presbyterians were the ones to come into the field. In other fields some other denomination might be the one. The writer of this article does not here criticise the Presbyterian denomination, but aims to show that in the mission field the rivalry of sects is the same as formerly. It is not to be expected that a great conviction will work its way into practice in a day, but would it not be a simple and easy matter for the denominations to come to an agreement on union in the mission fields of the country? How foolish to cry about a want of money and ministers for Christ's work when both are wasted in sectarian warfare. Instead of theorizing in papers and magazines about union, let us try some scheme for union regarding the expenditure of our forces in fighting infidelity, worldliness, and vice in the land. The Christian minister who, wherever he works or wherever he makes observations, feels that his work assumes, to a considerable degree, a struggle to keep up the courage and faith of a weak church, in a field which has too many churches, may well ques-

tion whether he might not more profitably to the Lord and himself engage in some other kind of work than the ministry, for he must labor under great discouragement, his efforts only partly succeed, and his church remain in a measure weak and helpless.

C. A. Wight.

The "Ach!" School of Literature.

ONE of the most deplorable tendencies in our modern literature is that tone of melancholy resignation which finds its way into much of our prose fiction and criticism, and still more of our poetry. "Ach!" exclaims Goethe; and "Ach!" repeats Carlyle monotonously after him, with remorseful variations. It seems a pity that when a great writer is dyspeptic, or happens to have seated himself at his desk on a dreary, drizzly day, or has been reviewing his past life with unpleasant results to his self-complacency, he must inflict his blues upon his hundred or thousands of readers, according as he is famous. If Schiller misses the dryads and fauns in his morning stroll, is it kind of him to immortalize his disappointment? How helpless Heine and his brethren would be without their favorite guttural sigh, which not only serves to give the line a vigorous start (Schiller begins five distinct verses thus in the "Götter Griechenlands"), but, quite as expressive in its way as the Frenchman's shrug, embodies a host of dismal reflections, and puts the reader into a proper state of gloom for what is to follow.

It is alarming to observe that the same influence is felt in some of our cheeriest as well as strongest poets on this side the water; while many of the secondary authors are always holding up their little umbrellas, and piteously entreating us to come under them.

"But it does n't rain!"

"Ach! but it's going to."

"And just now the sky seems very bright."

"Then let us keep the sunshine from your weary brows."

Blessed be those who feel it their duty and privilege to bring brightness into the world, rather than clouds. Let us swing our hats for cheery faces and glowing hearts that diffuse gladness and courage wherever they go; that substitute light for gloom, smiles for tears, hope for despair, glad energy of action for stolid resignation. Who can estimate the good accomplished by that masterpiece of Christmas stories, Dickens's "Carol," pervaded as it is by the very spirit of peace on earth and good-will to men?

There are those, to be sure, to whom the minor chords are most grateful. I do not mean by "minor," or by the use of the words "sad," "gloomy," and the like, a mere allusion to some pathetic incident or phase of life; a deep, uncontrollable cry of anguish, such as often breaks from a sensitive heart, and finds echoes in only too many others,—but a morbid tone of despair, over the irretrievable past, the unmitigated unpleasantness of the future, the worthlessness of life in general, and the writer's prospects in particular. Even these desperate sentiments, I was about to say, are eagerly seized upon by a certain honest but unhappy class

Although the North has been taken at a disadvantage, has been by the wily plans and prearrangements of the Secessionists stripped of arms, of which they are now in great want for their volunteers, there cannot be a question that they will, nevertheless, effectually suppress the rebellion. They have, after long and patient forbearance, entered upon the struggle forced upon them with a determination never to bring it to a close until they shall have effectually prevented the possibility, for a long time to come, of the recurrence of any similar attempt to subvert the Constitution of the Republic.

For my own part, in this view of the case, I believe that the most merciful course and, in the end, the most salutary results will depend on the Federal Government placing itself as speedily as possible in such a commanding attitude of power as to render further resistance to its authority utterly hopeless. I believe that the escape of the white population of the South from the horrors of servile insurrections (of the commencement of which there are already rumours) renders it necessary that the Federal Government should put out its whole strength, as it is preparing to do, at the earliest moment, and thus anticipate the useless wasting by the Southern States of the strength and means which they will now, more than ever, require to keep their slave population in subjection.

The national honour vindicated, the Constitution upheld, and the Government established in its supremacy, I have no fears that the Southern States will be unfairly dealt with. Motives of interest, no less than magnanimity, under such circumstances, will secure to the Southern States, whether they continue in the Union or a separation be agreed on, everything to which they have a just right or claim.

A prolongation of the contest, I need hardly say, will be attended with most disastrous consequences to other nations, and especially to our own commercial interests. In view of this certainty, and under the consciousness of the vast importance of the crisis, pardon my presumption, My Lord, if I venture to suggest the consideration of the expediency of a prompt interposition by Her Majesty's Government by way, if not of a mediator (which perhaps would hardly now be accepted), then by affording to the lawful Government of the United States such a consistent and effective demonstration of sympathy and aid as will have the merciful effect of shortening this most unnatural and horrid strife. It is unnecessary to waste a word on the many considerations which I believe would influence Her Majesty's Government to adopt such a line of policy in so far as it consistently may; but of this I feel assured, knowing what I do of the American people of the North and West, that, whether countenanced by England or not, they will never lay down arms until they have entirely subdued and extinguished this rebellion. The issue raised, in fact, is one which leaves them no alternative; while, on the other hand, I need not say how adverse and revolting to the spirit and feelings of the age and of our own nation would be the triumph of the principles on which the founders of the new Confederacy have based their government.

Praying Your Lordship's pardon for these observations, which have run to greater length than I intended, I have, etc.,
E. M. ARCHIBALD.

A Brotherhood of Christian Unity.

ON the evening of April 20 a meeting was held in Orange, New Jersey, to consider the subject of Christian Unity. I had become so impressed, or, I may say, oppressed, by the lack of united feeling and united effort among the churches that I asked some friends to join me in issuing a call for such a meeting. It was not largely attended, but an earnest spirit was evident in those who were present. In the essay which I had prepared for the occasion I suggested as a possible solution of the difficulty, or as an effort at least to attempt to translate sentiment into some form of action, the formation of a Brotherhood of Christian Unity. Dr. Lyman Abbott, hearing of my plan, asked me to present it in the columns of "The Christian Union." In the editorial department of the issue of June 11, containing the article, Dr. Abbott wrote as follows:

Mr. Seward's article on another page affords another and a somewhat striking indication of that growing tendency towards the unity of faith which is characteristic of the present age. It is peculiar in that it distinctly recognizes and proposes to leave wholly undisturbed the difference in creed, ritual, and government which separates the denominations, and simply furnish a testimony to the unity of faith which is deeper than any creed. It is also peculiar in that it is based upon the principle that loyalty to Christ, not adherence to a series of intellectual propositions, is the true and adequate basis of Christian Union. To what Mr. Seward's plan may grow it is not possible to foretell. It may be born before its time, and be only a precursor of a movement on similar principles, but possibly different in form, to follow hereafter. In any case the suggestion cannot be in vain, for it is never in vain for a prophet to familiarize the public mind with new ideas which it is not yet ready to receive. We commend Mr. Seward's simple pledge to the consideration of our readers as one step towards a realization of a fellowship which now has no symbol. Let them read his plan and then answer to themselves the question, Why not?

The response of the public to the suggestion is truly remarkable. Letters of inquiry pour in from all directions and from people of every Christian sect and of no sect. It indicates that the feeling of dissatisfaction with the present bondage to creeds is widespread and deep. Those who write usually express the opinion that the plan of a Brotherhood of Christian Unity is a practical movement in the right direction without undertaking too much. As its title implies, it is a fraternization rather than an organization. It is not proposed, at least for the present, to have any constitution, officers, or funds. Its purpose is merely to enable individuals to place themselves more definitely under the law of love. It goes back of the ecclesiasticism of the past eighteen centuries and accepts the creed of Christ and of the first century—love to God and love to man. It gives an opportunity for members of the Christian Church in all its various branches to acknowledge one another as brethren of one family, and not as belonging to distinct factions. It also gives an opportunity for those who are out of the churches and out of sympathy with the church creeds to step upon a Christian platform. The only qualification of membership of the Brotherhood of Christian Unity is signing the following pledge:

I hereby agree to accept the creed promulgated by the Founder of Christianity—love to God and love to man—as the rule of my life. I also agree to recognize as fellow Christians and members of the Brotherhood of Christian Unity all who accept this creed and Jesus Christ as their leader.

I join the Brotherhood with the hope that such a voluntary association and fellowship with Christians of every faith will deepen my spiritual life and bring me into more helpful relations with my fellow men.

Promising to accept Jesus Christ as my leader means that I intend to study his character with a desire to be imbued with his spirit, to imitate his example, and to be guided by his precepts.

I have prepared a pamphlet treating the subject more fully, which will be sent with two copies of the pledge for ten cents (to cover expenses). One pledge is in certificate form, illuminated and printed on bond paper. The other is note-size, to be signed and returned as a means of recording the membership.

EAST ORANGE, N. J.

Theodore F. Seward.

W. L. Dodge.

WILLIAM LEFTWICH DODGE, the painter of "David and Goliath," reproduced on page 665, is in his twen-

The Unity of the Sects.

BY THE PRESIDENT OF BOWDOIN COLLEGE.

At first sight the Christian sects seem as unlike as the colors of the solar spectrum, and as different from the simplicity and purity of Christian love as red and blue and violet are different from the white light of the sun. One seeks justification by sound doctrine, and sanctification by long creeds. Another tries to lift itself to the heaven of emotional ecstasy by tugging at the boot-straps of free will. Another finds saving efficacy in cadences and candles, music and millinery. Another insures an entrance to heaven by exclusiveness on earth. Another seeks to take the kingdom by the violence of denial and the boldness of free thought. And, among the illiterate, numerous sects seem to believe in salvation by reflex action; *i. e.*, the transference of sensuous stimulus from the sensory to the motor nerves without the intervention of the brain. Such is the view which the multitudes outside of the Church, who have no sympathy with its life and no insight into its thought, take of the differences which separate its members.

Then there is a large class within the Church having the Christian spirit, but lacking the breadth of view which ought to accompany it, who would explain away these differences. One man signs his name in bold John Hancock style, using plenty of ink. Another writes his with a fine Spencerian pen. Common-sense business men accept either signature as valid; but Baptist and Pedobaptist must split into sects because they differ as to the quantity of material used in an act as purely symbolical as the signing of one's name.

One man goes to a concert because he makes up his mind to go, and expects to have a good time. Another goes because he loves music, and music draws him. They do not require separate musicians, instruments, and concert-halls on that account. Yet on this very question of the relative importance of the two blades of the scissors which cut the threads of our fate,—freedom and determinism, free will and determination,—Calvinist and Arminian, Presbyterian and Methodist, must needs divide.

In a political campaign one class of voters are influenced chiefly by dry, hard presentation of facts and arguments. Another class are roused to political enthusiasm by brass bands, transparencies, uniforms, and kerosene-torches. Separate tickets, however, are not placed in the field to represent these issues. Yet ritualistic and non-ritualistic worshippers resist union as obstinately as oil and water.

This tendency to belittle and explain away the sects is as fashionable within the Church to-day as is the disposition to ridicule them in the outside world. And the one attitude is about as shallow and superficial as the other.

Sectarianism, or the disposition to spend everything in keeping up the fences while the fields go to weeds and briars, is indeed a serious evil; and we may congratulate ourselves on whatever inroads ridicule or reason can make upon it. Yet sectarianism is fast dying out, except in new and rural communities. If I, as an orthodox Congregationalist, prefer to have each stage of the spiritual journey precisely described in the doctrinal guide-book, and choose to verify by chart and compass each step as I proceed, I can rejoice that my more far-sighted companion is able to see and follow some shining banner far ahead, and that another has

within his own breast as reliable a home instinct in religious matters as beasts and birds have in their temporal concerns. And, to speak of differences in substance rather than in method, the more profoundly I believe that Jesus Christ is very God of very God, the giver of divine life, and the incarnation of divine love, the more confidently shall I trust that he is able and willing to impart that life and love to those who with humble hearts reverence his character, and with obedient wills walk in his footsteps, even though with honest intellects they call him merely man.

Our present danger is not that we shall make too much of sects, but that we shall make too little of them. Sects are not the result of either perversity or folly. The fact is, God and his truth are very great; and man and the average mind of man are very small. To grasp the full revelation God has made of himself in Christ and in his Church is beyond the power of average humanity. The best of us get but partial glimpses of his glory. One sees one aspect of the divine; another, another. Yet amid all the diversity of individual view, there are certain great classes into which the individual differences may be grouped. The grouping together of individuals whose points of view most nearly coincide is the foundation of the sects. And the fact that the sect represents to the individuals who compose it that aspect of the divine truth and love which presents the line of least resistance to the communion of their souls with God is its sufficient justification.

Sects are to the Church what parties are to the State. The abstract idea of the State is too vast and vague for the average citizen to grasp. He is not able to deduce from the first principles of government the proper policy on every issue that comes up. Hence arise at least two opposite parties: one, which we call Republican, emphasizes the grandeur of the nation, vindicates its honor before the nations of the earth, and makes its power felt for the education of the ignorant, the relief of the suffering, and the protection of the wronged throughout the length and breadth of the land; the other, which we call Democratic, has for its mission to vindicate the largest liberty of the individual, to guarantee his freedom from all avoidable interference and unnecessary taxation, and to maintain local self-government. The danger of excessive Republicanism is corruption and tyranny; the danger of too much Democracy is rebellion and anarchy.

Now, the average citizen can grasp with clearness and force the merits of one of these parties, and the defects of the opposite one. In doing so, he is able to render to the State an important service as a partizan which he could not render as a mere citizen. Hence all good citizens must be partizans. The so-called independent differs from the regular partizan, not that he cares less for party, but that he cares more for party. He sees the merits and defects of both parties, and endeavors to ally himself with the one whose merits are most needed and whose defects are least dangerous at any given time.

In like manner the sects apprehend various sides of the one great fact of the love of God manifested in Jesus Christ, and imparted to humanity as the spirit of a new life of human love. One apprehends clearly how lost and loveless a creature man is without this love of God; traces minutely the process by which the grace of Christ gains entrance to the soul; marks off precisely the successive stages of the Spirit's conquest; and so

by orthodoxy, or right thinking and right teaching, whether it be Presbyterian or Congregationalist, makes the love of Christ a reality and a power in the world. Its body of doctrine is lacking in grace and warmth, no doubt; but it gives to its adherents strength for patient endurance, noble self-sacrifice, and far-reaching practical endeavor beyond any religious force the world has ever known.

To see the beauty of holiness, and to express worship in worthy and appropriate symbols, to organize human life into an enduring instituted embodiment of the sweetness of charity, is the special mission of the Episcopalian. To protect from change and cheapening the divinely ordained sacraments which signify the reception and communion of this same love of Christ, is the chosen work of the Baptist. To keep live coals upon the altar of Christian gratitude and joy, and to keep the way of repentance and forgiveness ever open to the wandering and the lost, is the glorious service in which the Methodist is an example to us all. To think out freshly and work out practically in relation to present problems this same love of God, is the perilous and arduous path on which the Unitarian ventures.

Evolution, in the words of its prophet, is "a change from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity through continuous differentiations and integrations." The sects are differentiations of the great Christian principle, and are essential to its evolution as a practical power among men. They are the special organs the Church has developed for the performance of special functions. To reduce them to uniformity would be seriously to impair the vigor and vitality of the Church as a whole.

Not uniformity, not union by ignoring differences, but oneness in the midst of differences,—the organic unity of members having features and functions entirely unlike,—is the goal of evolution for the Christian church.

It is the mark of a weak administrator to seek to compel his colleagues and subordinates to share his own views and plans. A strong man will seek to associate with himself the strongest men whom he can find, regardless of whether they agree with him in matters of detail or not, and then let the final policy of his institution or enterprise be the resultant of the wills of all these strong contending forces. The divine ruler of the Church has chosen the collision of sects with their several ideals, in preference to the stagnation of one-man power, and the deadness of uniformity. Sects are evil only when they become sectarian—that is, when differences of apprehension count for more than the object apprehended; when the private preferences of men are of more consequence than the love of God. The sect principle must in many cases be sacrificed even by those who appreciate its worth. In small country villages it is the duty of the members of the various sects to form a union church, since a union church in such villages is the only strong and efficient church possible. This does not imply that a union church is in itself better than a Methodist or an Episcopal church. It is simply the best they can afford; just as the district school where all grades are crowded into one, and the country store where everything from a toothpick to a horse-rake is huddled together, are the best school and store the country village can afford.

In the cities and large towns greater concert of action,

and better division of territory, guided perhaps by a common council composed of representatives of each sect, are needed to coordinate the missionary efforts of the various members of the one church in the place. Greater comity between boards of home and foreign missions is also a crying need.

These sacrifices, concessions, and agreements, however, are by no means inconsistent with a full appreciation of the worth of sects. And it is not by obliterating the lines that separate them, but by deepening our consciousness of the bond that holds them all together as differing members of one organic body, that we must expect to avoid the evils of sectarianism without destroying the life and vigor, the liberty and originality, the independence and enthusiasm, of the Church.

As the State needs citizens who serve party well for country's sake, so the Church needs members whose fidelity to their particular sects is animated and sustained by devotion to that modern Catholic Church of which all sects in whose veins flows the blood of Christian love are useful and honorable members.

BRUNSWICK, ME.

William DeWitt Hyde.

American Artist Series.

JOHN DONOGHUE. (See page 837.)

ON a Brooklyn dock, in the case in which it came from Rome, and perhaps one day to be sold for freight and custom charges, lies a colossal piece of sculpture, the greatest effort of an art life of over twenty years, a life spent in hard study in America, France, Italy, and England by a man whose artistic intuition can hardly be said to be second to that of any of our sculptors. This statue, "The Spirit," modeled by John Donoghue in Rome, was intended for exhibition at the World's Fair, but such a work calls for large outlay in material, models, casting, etc., and with the shipping of the statue Donoghue's resources were exhausted. As no one was found to do what, it would seem, the directors of the Fair might well have done,—pay for its transportation to Chicago, and for its setting up there,—the chances are that it will never be seen. But I cannot believe that Mr. Donoghue's great work will have this abortive ending. There is no lack of interest in art on the part of our people, and doubtless some one will be found who, for the honor of art, and the credit of the country, will resurrect this statue from its packing-case grave. Its worthiness may surely be inferred from the example of Mr. Donoghue's work reproduced on page 837 of this magazine—"Young Sophocles Leading the Chorus of Victory After the Battle of Salamis"—and from other works by the same artist shown in the United States in former years.

Mr. Donoghue's statues and reliefs are distinguished, dignified, and sculptural. They are builded, doubtless, on a Greek foundation, but are modern, and his own. There is in all good contemporary sculpture (whether from the standpoint of the purist this be a good quality or not) a tendency to the picturesque, in the form of warmth, of fleshiness, and of color. This tendency is felt in Donoghue's work, but is well restrained, for with him the sculptor is above the painter, the artist above the decorator.

John Donoghue was born in Chicago, Illinois. Soon after his twenty-first year he took up seriously the study of art, entering the Chicago Academy of

the public credit. The Government should be given power by Congress to issue bonds on the most favorable possible terms, and to pledge payment of them in gold. This is the only policy which is safe for all the people, and which insures the lightest burden of taxation upon them. Nothing worse could happen to the people of moderate means and the poor than to have the country pass to the silver standard. Capitalists, and all men who have money, can take care of themselves in such a change. It is upon the wage-earners that the calamity would fall with most crushing weight. Prices of all kinds, including rents, would double at once, but wages would be slow to advance. A dollar would buy only half as much as now. Farmers and all other borrowers of money on mortgages would find that their contracts, in ninety-nine cases in a hundred, call for interest and principal in gold. They would find also that uncertainty about the money standard would make it impossible to make fresh loans save at greatly advanced rates of interest.

There is one point that is too often overlooked by those who assail the gold standard. All the great nations of the world have adopted that standard, and insist upon conducting all business transactions upon it. It will not do for us as a people to say that we will take

silver because we like it better. We must use the money which the rest of the world likes best, or we cannot trade with the rest of the world. Our merchants and traders act on this principle constantly. So do all capitalists and money-lenders. It matters not what standard the Government may adopt, the gold standard will still be the basis of all business transactions. For many years past all contracts for future delivery of goods, all loans, mortgages—in fact, all transactions involving considerable sums of money, have contained a gold clause. It is not Congress or the Government which fixes the standard, but capitalists and business men. They fix it in gold, not because they dislike silver, but because on gold alone can they depend for stability. In doing this they are making it possible for widows, orphans, and all other holders of savings to get an income from them. Without a sure standard of value there can be no loaning of money, no safe and profitable investments, and hence no interest. Without invested capital, domestic and foreign industries must languish, and workingmen be left without employment. It is not merely a high patriotic duty, therefore, for all the people to help the Government in maintaining the national credit, but it is also the first essential to national well-being.

OPEN LETTERS.

"The Social Problem of Church Unity."

I READ with interest the article by the Rev. Dr. Shields on "The Social Problem of Church Unity," published in your magazine. It occurs to me to inquire what the author meant by the expression, "The Church includes, while it transcends, the State in its scope." Also, the precise significance of the word "even" in the sentence, "Nor are we ready in this country to have any class dominant: not the wealthy class; not the learned class; not *even* the clerical class." Again, what historical or philosophic ground is there for his declaration, that "organized Christianity is the only perfect remedy for social ills"? Am I right in supposing that he alludes with disapproval to the claim that the State has the right to render the government which it administers "as humane and even Christian as the churches can make it," and that he favors the reservation to the churches of "all higher education and humane effort"? Does he correctly characterize the "secularized charities for the poor, the blind, the deaf, the maimed, the fallen, and the outcast" as "social bodies without a Christian name or even a Christian spirit," who have "intrenched upon" the natural domain of the churches?

It must appear to very many of your readers that the premises on which the writer rests the argument require first to be established; and that, if this can be done, the conclusion to which the argument itself points is very different from that which he appears to have in mind. Is there not a palpable contradiction between his picture of Christian sects as "a great cluster of churches and denominations, differing endlessly in doctrine, polity, and worship, held apart by hereditary feuds, and in-

flamed with sectarian jealousy and pride," and his assertion that these very denominations, "as transferred to the New World, and brought under democratic influences, have been sifted together for a hundred years, and assimilated, until now they differ less in things than in names"? How is "an ecclesiastical unity which shall embrace dogmatic differences and allow them due scope and action" to put a stop to the diversity of teaching which, he tells us, has proved a hindrance and a failure in missionary work at home and in foreign lands? Is this diversity of teaching likely to be less when tolerated within one ecclesiastical organization than when it finds its natural and logical expression in many?

The ecclesiasticism of Dr. Shields's article is so apparent as to discredit many of the excellent and true things contained in it. If anarchy, revolution, or civil war shall ever make it apparent that "the problems of American society, if solved at all, can only be solved by one united church of the United States," it is safe to predict that this united church will be not Dr. Shields's "American Catholic Church," which seems to be as utopian a vision as the dream of Edward Bellamy, but the Roman Catholic Church, which now claims to be the moral teacher, the conservator, and the regenerator of society, and which, if "organized Christianity is the only perfect remedy for social ills," is itself that remedy. But Dr. Shields wants "an ecclesiastical unity which shall embrace dogmatic differences." Within what defined limits? The Roman Church does not fulfil his ideal conception of the great social need of the age, because it does *not* embrace the dogmatic differences which he has in mind. It does not because it cannot; if it could, it would; and what it cannot do, no other ecclesiastical organization can accomplish.

But neither the Roman, nor the Anglican, nor the American, nor any other Catholic Church, in this sense of the words "Church" and "Catholic," will ever, in a democratic State, be permitted to "transcend the State" in the State's proper sphere. If, by his assertion that "the very seat of our citizenship is in a *Christian* citizenship," he designs to limit citizenship to Christians in any possible sense of the term, and to establish a religious test as a condition of citizenship—especially if he means to put the application of this test in the hands of "bishops conjoined in the same historic succession," who shall exercise the episcopal functions committed to them by "free presbyteries," composed of "congregations," he should be warned that he is treading on perilous ground, and that the tendency of his teaching is to hasten the fulfilment of his own prediction that "the time may not be far off when church unity shall have become a question belonging to the domain of practical politics."

Frederick H. Wines.

COMMENT.

THE inquiries of the Rev. Mr. Wines concerning "The Social Problem of Church Unity" seem adapted to render that problem a puzzle in pure logic rather than a question of any practical interest. I might solve the puzzle simply by restoring his mosaic of fragmentary quotations to their original places and connections in the argument. My replies, however, must be limited to any new points which have been raised.

The remedial power of the Christian church has been shown "historically" during nineteen centuries in the social advancement of Europe, as contrasted with Asia or Africa. The same may be argued "philosophically" from the tendency of its teaching and training to diminish pauperism and crime, and to promote private and public virtue, especially in a free commonwealth. As a social institution it is itself charged with the ideal and the duty of social regeneration, and is fitted to exert a regenerative influence upon society, which cannot be claimed for unorganized Christianity as a mere individual belief or opinion.

The differences between the sects of the Christian church, though endless and embittered, are nevertheless quite trivial as compared with their substantial agreements. For this reason, under the favoring influences of our age and country, the differences have long been disappearing from public view, while the agreements are coming to the front, and thus rendering the idea of church unity as feasible as it is desirable.

Such differences, "when expressed in diverse ecclesiastical organizations," easily become exaggerated, tend to obscure and mar the essential truths of Christianity, and lead to mere sectarian wrangling in missionary and humanitarian movements; whereas the same differences, "tolerated in one ecclesiastical organization," soon sink to their relative insignificance, are made to check and modify one another, and do not interfere with the charities and missions of the body as a whole. Accordingly, different schools of doctrine were once embraced within the undivided apostolic church. To some extent they have ever since prevailed within the Roman Catholic Church. All of them may now be found within the Protestant Episcopal Church. No more utopian would it be to comprehend them within an American Catholic Church; not a whit

more utopian, in fact, than is the actual comprehension of the most diverse political schools and parties within that compact organization known as the United States.

The suggested resemblance of such an American Catholic Church to the Roman Catholic Church only strengthens the reasoning. Could that great ecclesiastical organization, under the influence of our democratic institutions, exchange its Romanism for Americanism, it would much better fulfil the duties of a moral teacher, conservator, and regenerator of American society. It would also take an immense stride toward organic oneness with Protestant Christianity on the basis of the Holy Scriptures, the Ecumenical Creeds, and the Historic Episcopate. Already the consensus of the two bodies in Christian ethics is of the greatest social value; and the more they can combine their attacks upon social evils, the better will it be for our common country.

I scarcely know how to reply seriously to Mr. Wines in his closing remarks. If the "ecclesiasticism" which he suspects is some imagined coalition of sects against civil government in this nation, or any conceivable domination of a United Church over the United States, he must be aware that we are no more in danger of such ecclesiasticism than of the Grand Lama of Thibet. The dread of a Church-State may once have had some force in the political mind of Europe. In our civilization it survives only as an inherited prejudice.

Charles W. Shields.

Should Higher Education be Provided for the Negro?

MANY friends of the negro North and South seem to have taken it for granted that means should not be provided for him to push his studies beyond the grammar-school. I wish to examine four reasons for this opinion which many think conclusive, and to suggest some answers.

I. Means are lacking for giving the great masses of the negroes even those elements of learning which should be provided for the many before more advanced training is given to the few.

ANSWER.

(1) Most negroes are less amenable than before the war to good, and especially religious, influences coming from the whites; while to those addressed to their prejudices, fears, self-interest, and appetites, it is to be feared that the lower strata of them are as open as ever.

(2) They must, then, have leaders of their own race.

(3) These leaders must have intelligence enough to side with statesmen rather than with demagogues upon such questions as tariff, currency, civil-service reform, and the relations of the General and State governments. They should be able to understand the discussion of such matters in the higher class of books and periodicals. The ablest men of the South are not now to so great an extent as before the war engaged in public life or upon the press. They are largely in various kinds of business.