

THE  
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1874.

---

ART. I.—RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO ART.

BY E. E. HIGBEE, D. D.

---

It requires but a brief survey of history to perceive the great effect which Christianity has had upon the life of the world. The old mythologies of Greece and Rome have given way before it. "The oracles are dumb." Olympus is but a vanished vision. Ægis-bearing Zeus, and Apollo with his silver bow, live only in the memories of song. The Scandavian fables of our ancestors have yielded to its power. The shield-roofed Valhalla is a forgotten dream; and the thundering Thor, and Baldur, the beautiful, live no longer in the faith of men.

"The flocking shadows pale  
Troop to th' infernal jail,  
Each fetter'd ghost slips to his several grave:  
And the yellow-skirted Fayses  
Fly after the night-steeds, leaving their moon-lov'd maze."

Not only has the *religious* life of the world been transformed by Christianity, but the whole order of civilization has come under its influence. Law and literature, philosophy and art, have been permeated by it. In fine, the whole realm of practical, theoretical, and æsthetical activity has felt its presence and power. The good, the true, and the beautiful, as well as religion, have received a new significance in the life and light

ward enabling the watchmen to see eye to eye, and through the lifting gloom to telegraph signals to each other concerning the attitude and welfare and onward movements of that great host, the Army of the Lord.

---

ART. III.—REPLY TO "AN ANGLICAN CATHOLIC."

BY PRESIDENT J. W. NEVIN.

THE respected writer of the immediately preceding paper, on the *Basis of Union*, will not take it amiss, I am sure, that I should use the article here as an occasion for what may be considered a very general, and more or less desultory, rejoinder to certain parts of its argument. The appearance of the article indeed in the *Mercersburg Review*, I take to be in itself a sort of friendly apologetic challenge to some such responsive attention. It courts discussion, and has for its object "an interchange of views." Courtesy itself requires, therefore, that it should not go without notice.

I am pleased at the same time, that the article has been allowed to appear in the *Mercersburg Review*. Some, I know, have found fault, because a *Lutheran* argument against Dr. Hodge, was admitted into the *Review* a short time since;\* en-

---

\* The Rev. Dr. Krauth's masterly article on "Infant Salvation in the Calvinistic System;" which has since been republished, in fuller form, as a neat volume of eighty pages, by the Lutheran Book-store, 117 N. Sixth St., Philadelphia. It would be hard to find within the same compass a more demolishing historical argument for its own object. It fastens on the Calvinistic system as taught by the Synod of Dort and the Westminster Assembly, beyond all question, the horrible doctrine that many infants dying in infancy, are damned eternally for Adam's sin. No Presbyterian now, of course, would dare to preach this, although it flows necessarily from the old Calvinistic doctrine of election. Yet Princeton affects to be true as ever to that metaphysical principle of salvation; and only the other day in the *Repertory*, took occasion to endorse Dr. Schneck's miserable travesty of "*Mercersburg Theology*"—garbled quotations and all—in the way of cautionary monition to our German Church of the Heidelberg Catechism. Why was no notice taken at the same time of the truly scientific, and absolutely crushing publication of the Rev. Dr. Krauth? Why is it allowed, indeed, to go without notice, anywhere, from either Presbyterian or Low Dutch brethren, who have before this always resented the reproach of "infant damnation" as a slander? The point is not a small one. It

tertaining the opinion, it would seem that it betokened, somehow, a want of proper zeal for the confessional honor of the general Reformed Church. But no such prejudice can deserve respect. It is foreign, especially, from the professed character and reigning spirit of the *Mercersburg Review*; which claims the distinction of being "an organ for Christological, Historical and Positive Theology," representing it is true a particular branch of the Reformed Church, but this at the same time in the broadest and most catholic view. No denominationalism, ecclesiastical or theological, that holds itself exclusively to its own separate limits, shunning communication with all Christian life beyond itself, can be otherwise than narrow-minded, unfree, and sectarian in the worst sense of the term. In this time especially, when by a sort of common consent, there is so much professed lamentation over the divisions of the Church, and so general a cry for union, what must be thought of any theology or church life that can join in with the cry, and yet stubbornly close itself against even the most remote advance toward the realization of such union? It is not enough here, that religious bodies hold with one another the fellowship of mere external forbearance and respect. The idea of union, even in the ethical order, and still more in the sphere of religion, calls for reciprocal inward communication of life with life in some way, and cannot be satisfied without it. Hence the need of free amicable inter-denominational conference and discourse on the subject, far beyond all that has yet been reached or attempted in any quarter. I agree with my "Anglican Catholic" critic in full, therefore, when he says, that the question of Christian Union demands a frank comparison of differing

---

strikes deep and reaches far. Neither the Presbyterian Church nor the Low Dutch Church now, we know very well, hold any such abominable doctrine. Why not then say so openly, and as openly confess a real falling away to this extent at least (and this involves a great deal more) from the Decrees of Dort, and the Westminster Confession? There is no shame in such rupture with dead confessional traditions. It is coming, and must come more and more, by historical necessity, on all sides, opening the way toward a better and more glorious future. Neither is the movement confined by any means to the Churches of the Reformed Confession. Lutheranism is not dead; and therefore Lutheranism also moves. It can never be again, and never ought to be again, just what it was in the sixteenth century.

views in regard to it, and a spirit of mutual concession on all sides; when he says, that it should be possible to discuss it without stirring up bad feeling; and also when he adds, that "certainly, if this cannot be done, no greater proof could be given, that we all need to remember from whence we are fallen, and to repent and do our first works."

### I. *The Evangelical Alliance.*

My critic, styling himself "an Anglican Catholic," has a good deal to say in regard to the Evangelical Alliance, for the purpose of justifying the attitude of the "Churchman" in regard to it, as noticed in the introductory portion of my review of Bishop Coxe's book "Apollos." Without any controversial discussion of the particular merits or demerits of that body, I may be allowed to state, in a brief general way, my own estimate of its significance in relation to the cause of Christian union.

The Alliance, in its very nature, is no permanent organization. It is a purely voluntary association of representatives from different portions of the Christian world, for the purpose of promoting common understanding, and common right disposition, with regard to the acknowledged obligation of all Christians, to be one in the Lord. The successive general conventions of the body, as it is called in this very loose sense, hold no inward necessary connection with one another. They are not joined together by any law of corporate, historical continuity. The late Conference in New York, was not bound in any way by the action of previous Conferences in the old world; and it had no power to bind in any way the action of any Conference that may be called anywhere hereafter. With progressive change in the life and spirit of the Christian world, (for which room is made more and more, continually, in the course of things throughout the world at this time), progressive change may be looked for, also in the character of this representative body. It must always reflect the reigning sense of the period, in which it is brought together, and in doing so may help that sense onward at the same time, toward something

still better than itself. The main worth of the institution perhaps, is just its power to gather in this way into some common consciousness and common utterance (however obscure), the mind of the Christian world at a given time, in regard to the great general interest to which it owes its birth. In this view alone, if in no other, it is a grand imposing phenomenon in the history of modern Protestantism, which all who love the peace and unity of the Church should regard with respect.

To say then, that with the Evangelical Alliance "the bond of union" means certain dogmas formulated in Freemasons' Hall, London, in the year of our Lord 1846, is not just correct. That scheme of supposed necessary truths was indeed formulated for the Alliance which then, for the first time, came together; and no doubt it was imagined by many, that it was to be a sort of fixed platform or confession of faith, on which the body should continue to stand in all subsequent meetings. In such view, it is easy to see, it was the poorest sort of crude theological namby-pambyism that could well be imagined. It was at best a lame contrivance, to bar off negatively such elements as were taken to be not fully up to the proper evangelical mark, by the help of a few aphoristic generalities, that had in them very little distinct, positive Christian meaning whatever. But the scheme belonged in fact only to the beginning of the Alliance movement, and cannot be considered the bond in any proper sense by which it has been held together since. Each new Convention has been its own bond for the time; and so the Convention last year in New York, was a new coming together simply of the Protestant Christian world represented by it, under circumstances widely different from those of the London meeting in 1846, in no way bound by that, and having in itself full freedom to act in the cause of church union, as to itself might seem best in the midst of the conditions of the year 1873. Hence there was no attempt with the body to establish either a doctrinal or ecclesiastical basis of any sort for its fellowship. No such attempt could possibly have resulted otherwise than in general confusion. The body had not met for any purpose of that sort, and wisely kept clear of it in all its transactions.

This may seem like reducing the Alliance meeting to a small matter. Be it so, if we choose to look at it in that light. Still it was all the meeting itself proposed to be; and we have no right to judge it by a different rule; to say, either that it imagined itself to be more than this, or that it ought to have been more than this—an agency, namely, for the direct actualization of organic unity, rather than an agency for the promotion simply of federal union—and then to condemn it for plainly coming short of any such purpose. The meeting was not blind to the difference between these ideas; for it was referred to, over and over again. Let it be judged then by the sense it had of its own constitution and mission. Thus only can we deal justly with the question of its merits.

That question becomes then two-fold; first, whether union without formal unity is worth anything for the true oneness of the Church; secondly, whether the Alliance can be regarded as being in fact a successful agency at all for its own purpose, namely, the promotion of Christian union.

## II. *Unity and Union.*

As to the second of the two points just stated, there would seem to be no room for honest doubt. The Alliance has done much already, and may be expected to do still more in time to come, for the cause of Christian union. It originated in the feeling, that the divisions of Christendom are a deplorable evil, and that they should be brought to an end; and its agency, from the beginning, has served thus far very effectually to extend and deepen this feeling. Without breaking up denominational distinctions in any way, it has worked as a silent force far and wide to undermine and weaken the hard exclusiveness of these distinctions. Other manifold influences belonging to the age, have been working providentially in the same direction; influences, negative partly (in the giving way and breaking up of old things), and partly positive (in the coming in of new things); and the Alliance has formed a sort of focus for all, without knowing it, bringing all to grand central expression, and clothing it with a voice of power for the awakened

conscience of the Christian world. This falls vastly short still, it is true, of what the full problem of Christian union requires. But let us not despise the day of small things. As far as it goes, it is in itself, nevertheless, a very great thing, worthy of being hailed by all in St. Paul's language: "What then? Notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached"—the oneness of Christ's torn body, the Church, is preached—"and I therein do rejoice, yea, and *will* rejoice."

It will not do to say that the Convention of last October, in New York, came and went without any sort of help toward the bringing in of that better day of the Church, toward which the signs of the age are pointing, and for which the heart of the world is longing more and more with earnest expectation. It was in this respect much more than any preceding Convention, in London, Paris, Berlin, Geneva, or Amsterdam. It moved the Christian world more in its inauguration; it was more of a power during its sessions; it continues to be of more historical significance since. I mean by this, no undue glorification. The Convention had its imperfections, sufficiently palpable and gross. It was in no sense properly ecumenical and catholic. The good and the solid that was in it, as a matter of course, was joined with a large mixture of what was not good, and not solid by any means. It was for the most part, with all its acknowledged wealth of learning and mind and heart, but a poor, ephemeral and superficial expression of the glorious idea of "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," which it had come together from the ends of the earth to proclaim. Even the Apostolic Creed, which we all joined in reciting on the first day, with a sort of resolute will and firm voice, led by the Very Reverend Dean of Canterbury, was not for this occasion, as one could hardly help feeling, a trumpet of *altogether* sure and certain sound.\* In spite of all this,

---

\* The Rev. Dr. S. I. Prime, one of the chief managers of the meeting, has since told us in the *N. Y. Observer*, that he at least, does not believe that Christ "descended into hell or hades," in any sense which denies that He "went directly into Paradise—heaven—the third heaven," and that therefore he never repeats that clause of the Creed. A fair example, no doubt, of what was in the mind of others also on this occasion; who had no power to see, that a *subaudition* of such sort at this point must affect necessarily the right Christological sense of the entire

however, the meeting was a religious power of the highest order, and making all due allowance for the infectious enthusiasm of the hour, we may apply to it still, without much extravagance, the following tribute of praise rendered to it at the time by the *New York Tribune* :

"This meeting together—Alliance, as it is properly called—of the representatives of so many differing sects and denominations of Christianity—representatives as well of the culture and scholarship, of the best thought, the noblest endeavor, and the purest living of the universal Christian Church—has of itself set on foot inquiry and provoked thought. Even the men with muck-rakes, whose whole life is in the market they buy and sell in—an intense devotion of a pittance of time to getting a pittance of money—have lifted up their faces wonderingly, and in a dull way asked its meaning; while the brainless crowd who grovel in sense and live in vacuity, have almost risen to a comprehension of the fact of a higher life than vegetation, and some purpose in it nobler and more exalted than the eye of sense reveals. Taken out of the realm of the spiritual and moral, and viewed simply as an incitement to intellectual processes, a spur to thought, this conference has been the most important ever held upon the Continent. The subjects it aspired to treat are of infinite moment and universal application, and to their consideration the ripest scholarship and profoundest learning have been brought. It would be strange—a phenomenon indeed—if in the large debate of these ten days covering, as it has, all the greatest problems at which mankind has wrestled and tugged always since the fall, there had not been imperfection, shallowness of reasoning, unsound logic, impatience of opposition, uncharitableness, weariness, and vanity. These things, whatever the occasion, we may expect always. But there have been, on the other hand, large contributions to the sum of human knowledge and the results of human thought; and what is more and better, a large advance in tolerance, catholicity, charity. The Christian world draws close together. Differences in uniform and armor, in watchwords and countersigns, are growing smaller and counting



for less. The larger interpretation of the need of 'eternal vigilance' dawns. It is the price not of liberty alone, but of everything. Christianity, that for nearly nineteen centuries has canopied itself in the security of a date line that recognizes 'Our Lord' in reckoning from His birth, finds the need of it, and the Christian world awakes to a sense of its besetments."

Say even that the service of the Alliance to the cause of Christian union has been mainly negative only; a protest simply against things as they are; a cry of, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord;" an attempt, however fruitless, to clear the way for His coming, to break down mountains and fill up vallies, to make crooked things straight and rough places plain, and thus to open up through the desert of a divided and scattered Christendom "a highway for our God." Who will call in question still the vast significance of its power, even in this view? The world at large has felt the challenge. It has gone home more or less to the conscience of all our Protestant Churches. It has caused "great searchings of heart for the divisions of Reuben," even among those who have not been able to show toward it any open sympathy or favor. Bishop Horatio Potter, of New York, might be impassive to the great movement. But not so all bishops. Episcopalianism in general felt it. It was felt by the "Churchman."

So much as to the worth of the Alliance for the cause of simple union. But then comes the other question; namely, the worth of all this for the cause of true church unity.

The Alliance meeting it is charged, in the first place, did not look at all to such unity; it was not the object of its coming together. Granted. Its object was professedly and openly, to promote the "association of Christians of all countries, in a cordial, visible and effective union;" nothing more. To have attempted more would have been madness. This of itself, however, was not an ignoring or rejection of the idea of organic unity. Some no doubt took it in that way. But even the language of Dr. Hodge—which displeased many—does not absolutely shut out the hope of such unity in time to come; and still less can the addresses of Bishop Bedell, the Dean of Can-

terbury and others, though seeming to look the same way, be fairly taken in any such extreme sense. The existing state of the Church—not any future state—was what these declarations looked to; and in reference to this, it was in fact as clear as day, that there was no room to talk or think of coming at once to anything like organized unity. The problem of the hour, the only problem which brought the Alliance together, was not any such unity (absolutely impracticable in the circumstances), but the bringing to pass of present practicable conjunction and co-operation among the different divisions of the Protestant Christian world, in the service of the common ends of Christianity; without waiting for farther unity; leaving the whole question of such farther unity open for future consideration and action, as the progress of the union movement itself, under the guidance of God's Spirit, might be found hereafter to necessitate and require. That was, and still is, the only acknowledged *theory* of the Alliance; and no one has a right to burden it with any other theory. If Dr. Hodge, and some others, have really looked upon a mere confederation of existing religious denominations and sects as being *all* that is needed for the actualization of full Christian unity, and have pleased themselves with the dream, that this all was in fact already reached, for the vision of angels, in the New York Conference, (which is hardly credible), I can only say that the great body of that Conference certainly entertained no such dream. The union then and there was taken to be a demonstration of substantive oneness, belonging to the diversity of confessions represented in it, and in this view a great matter for the time; but it was not viewed by any means as a finality. It was only the auspicious inception and prognostication of better things to come—a rainbow of hope made to span the departing storm-cloud of ecclesiastical jealousy and strife. That was much. But behind it lay the promise of a great deal more.

Just here, however, we reach the full gist of this Episcopalian controversy with Christian union, as not being in and of itself at once Christian unity. Even if the Alliance did not mean in New York, to make their union stand for the true unity of

the Church; did not mean, as the Churchman has charged, "that corporate union was neither possible nor desirable" in the future, "but that union in spirit, and in aim was all that in any case, ought to be attempted, and that this already existed to a satisfactory degree;" still its mere purpose, and attempt to get at union without unity, we are told, must be regarded as coming virtually to the same thing. It is schism, therefore, even in its show of union, because it has failed to go first of all, into the question of church organization, and to settle it in the so-called Anglican Catholic form. The meeting in New York, was in this respect a "mischievous, deadly error," and nothing less in truth, than a "woful travesty of Christianity," which has issued judicially only in confusion since, demonstrating the baselessness of this idea of Christian union, and making room thus for the true, better basis offered in the constitution of the Episcopal Church.

"Whatever the ideas of Christian union, in the Evangelical Alliance were, or were not," says my *Anglican Catholic* critic, "there is one thing, that they certainly were not. And that is the old idea, that the Episcopate is the bond of union, appointed by the Lord, and transmitted by succession from the Apostles." But just this, he holds to be the indispensable root of the Church, and of all faith in the Church; so that being at fault here, the Alliance, in his view, stands judged as it were out of its own mouth. For "*any Christian Union,*" that comes short of "Unity of the Church"—meaning by this Episcopally organized and accredited unity—"is no union at all, but schism."

### III. *Episcopacy as a bond of Unity.*

I have no mind to plunge at all into the dismal swamp of the controversy about bishops. There has been vast waste of words with it in past time, and no end of blind argument on all sides. "It is pleasing to observe," says my critic, "that the Rev. Dr. Nevin yields the point that St. Cyprian was a bishop, and not simply the moderator of a presbytery as the Presbyterians of Bishop Sage's time claimed. Two hundred

years have wrought this change. Perhaps in less than two hundred years more, the Presbyterian may be willing to acknowledge not only that St. Cyprian was a bishop, but that he was such by Divine right." Certainly I should be sorry to be bound slavishly by old confessional issues here or anywhere else. This freedom I owe, however, to German more than to Anglican science. I have no difficulty in owning the presence of the Episcopal system throughout the Church in the second century. The Epistles of Ignatius, take them as we may, prove it. But, as I have said in my "Apollos" article, the system is not in the New Testament, as Episcopalianism is fond still of arguing. It came in only after the destruction of Jerusalem; not without elementary preparation in the time going before; and of course then not without the counsel and sanction also of such apostolical aid as was still at hand at that time in the world. This, with the common need of that critical transition period, is sufficient to account for its general introduction. The whole state of the Church plainly underwent material change during the time in question. Let us trust, that Episcopalian prejudice here will yet at last show itself pliant also, no less than Presbyterian prejudice; and that long before two hundred years shall have rolled around, Christianity will have reached that blessed millennial reintegration, in which there shall be neither Greek nor Jew, neither Episcopalian nor Presbyterian, but Christ shall be literally all and in all.

That the introduction of the Episcopal system had for its object largely the binding together and holding together of the churches, in that ecumenical unity which lay in the conception of Christianity, but for which no settled provision had previously been made, is abundantly clear; as it is clear also, that it was a wise and more or less effectual provision for such purpose. But this falls very far short of the notion, that it was a *jure divino* constitution in the sense of "An Anglican Catholic's" argument, and that it was so joined by the Lord to His Church, by outward ordination, from the beginning, as to be essential to its very being to the end of time.

Such notion turns the "bond of unity" at once into a *prin-*

ciple of unity; and then of course easily leaps to the monstrous conclusion, that the external form in the case goes before the internal life, defining and determining of itself the unity of this life, and making all outside of its measure to be no better than unbelieving schism.

But this is just that mechanical notion of organization, which seems to me to fall short of the true idea of Christian life and Christian unity altogether. To claim for it a divine character does not mend the matter in the least, so far as the question is concerned: May Christianity be viewed rightly as growing forth anywhere principally from mere outward ordination, either human or divine? Every such view shifts the mystery of faith from its true basis, and tends to break up the inward vital order of the Christian Creed.

Take, for example, the perverse stress which the Baptists lay on their notion of Christian Baptism. The signification of the sacrament resolves itself into this, that our Lord has been pleased to ordain it as a first act for us to perform in the way of obedience to His authority. It is in this way a test of our sincerity in coming to Him and looking to Him for salvation. All depends then on our strict conformity to the outward rule itself; hence on our personal consciousness of doing what it requires, which makes the baptism of infants superstitious and profane; and hence also on the form of immersion, because this is taken to be the precise recipe or formula of the original prescription, and to depart from it in the least is necessarily to violate the ordinance as a crucial test of Christian obedience. What can be more mechanical and outward? Yet on this point, as we know, the Baptist thinking plants itself as a very principle or *principium* of the whole evangelical life, the fountain source of the universal Church; making it in this way nothing less in truth than a *jure divino* "bond of unity" for the Church; a sort of *cordon sanitaire*, beyond and outside of whose magic inclosure lies the territory of schismatical pravity, with which no Baptist Churchman should own any communion whatever.

And all this magnification of the outward form of the sacrament at the fatal expense, at the same time, of its inward es-

sence! The most ghastly killing of the spirit by the letter that can well be conceived! The old Pharisaic legalism over again, tything mint, anise and cummin, and turning the weightier matters of the law—the soul of the sacraments, the life of the Church, the whole supernatural sense of the Creed—into hypocrisy and sham.

Is there not room, I ask, for the *de te fabula narratur* here, in application to that Episcopal theory of Church unity which we are now considering? The theory which sees in the episcopate, as a mere outward ordinance of the Lord, the "bond of unity," in such sense that the organic oneness of the Church is to be regarded as in fact constituted by the bond which is thus supposed to coop it together externally (like the hooping of a cooper's vessel), and to have within itself no other deeper and more inward power of self-production and self-conservation—such as belongs to all other really organic life—coming before this bond, and making room in reality for all its subsequent worth. Organization so-called, which is brought to pass by mere outward regulation, arrangement or ordering of any sort, is not organic union at all in the proper sense of the term. It can never, as such, give us the unity we profess to believe in when we recite the Creed. It can never therefore, of itself and by itself, be that true apostolical unity, which of itself fastens on all beyond itself the condemnation of unbelief or schism.

For if that were so, who may not see that such outward bond of union must be at once the very principle or source of union, and so the very beginning of the Christian life itself; nay the very pillar and ground of the truth (as it is taken to be in the Roman scheme), and in this way the first object of all true Christian faith? For that which makes the Church one must be that which originates the very being of the Church; the unity being inseparable from this; so that the institution of the episcopate rises thus to the dignity of a primary and cardinal point of faith for the universal Christian life. And yet it has no place in any of the first Christian Creeds. More than that; it is to mistake the true nature of Christian faith altogether to suppose that it can terminate, first or last, on this or on any other

merely external ordination, externally taken, as its proper object. Faith, in its Christian view, regards universally not the outward, but the inward—not the natural, but the spiritual and supernatural—not the merely historical in the case even of our Lord Himself, but directly and first of all only the ideal, that is the invisible in the historical, without which this can have no divine meaning whatever. Not to see and own this, is to subvert (whether men mean it or not) the whole conception of faith. What must we think then of the proposition, that to accept the institution of the episcopate, *presumed* to be of outward historical appointment on the part of our Lord or His Apostles, is not only an obligation of faith, but in truth such an obligation as excludes the possibility of any right Christian faith in any other form?

The Roman Catholic scheme of Christianity, as carried out especially in its latest Vatican or Jesuitic form, is at once the most startling exemplification of this externalism—this violent tying of the inward to the outward, the spirit that quickeneth to the letter that killeth—in the broadest and most melancholy view. It ends there in the mechanism of an infallible Pope, the vicegerent of Christ by divine external historical ordination; the only logical issue of which at last is, no direct living communication with the invisible and divine whatever; no faith that reaches home at all to the objective supernatural reality of the Christian salvation behind the veil; but instead of this, blind trust only in the external machinery of a purely external Church, and a wilful perversion of the whole idea of faith into the notion of a stolid unquestioning corpse-like passivity in the hands of the sacerdotal rulers of the Church. Such is the *monstrum horrendum* now held up to the gaze of the civilized world, by the late Vatican Council.

The Episcopalian theory now under consideration, of course, means no such monstrosity as this. But I cannot help feeling that there is a certain degree of the same error at work (as is the case with the Baptistic test of evangelical obedience also), when the episcopate as a mere outward institute, supposed to be of divine right, is put forward as the "bond of Church unity,"

in such sense as to make it the principle of Church unity, and so of Church existence (like the papacy with Roman Catholics), thus placing all Christianity outside of this hierarchical order in the category at once of open and clear schism.

I must go still farther, and repeat again kindly what I have said before; namely, that in my opinion "the high-church mechanism of episcopacy by divine right can come to its full sense and right end at last only in the Roman idea of a *jure divino* infallible centre," such as Rome finds in St. Peter and the apostolical succession of the Roman see. I see no inconsistency myself between this and the other passage in which I am quoted as saying, that "many outside of the Episcopal communion," in view of the present evil condition of things, would be glad to take refuge in it, "if it could show itself truly equal to the task of the times." For there, let me say, is just the sorrowful rub. With all its attractions and merits, the Episcopal communion is *not* showing itself truly equal to the mighty Church problem of the times. To the superficial it may seem to do this; but just because they are superficial, and have not yet reached at all in fact the true depth of the problem, in their own minds. The great difficulty lies precisely here, that the Episcopalian premises, as vaunted by the high-church school, lead over logically to the Roman conclusion, and a thinking man therefore cannot easily look to them as an end of controversy on the question of the Church.

"An Anglican Catholic" repels the imputation of a Romanizing tendency in the Episcopal system (which I have not meant however to be offensive at all), and goes into an argument of some length to show, that "in making this charge men of other denominations not only mistake what is Catholic for what is papal, but also are themselves in the very error which they endeavor to fix upon Episcopalianism." I am not concerned at all to disturb the general construction of this argument. There is much in it that deserves serious consideration. Let it stand for what it is worth. I myself have long known and felt, and in one way and another have said also that there are ominous correspondences at different points between the spirit of the papacy and the



spirit of sect or schism ; each of the two orders of religion holding like opposition in fact, from apparently opposite sides, to the true idea of the one Holy Catholic Church of the Creed, and doing what in them lies to obscure the apprehension of it for the faith of men. Every one of our sects, just so far as it is possessed by the sect spirit—which is most easy of common identification wherever it reigns—is at least a quiet, if not open assumption of all the high-toned prerogatives of an infallible Church. Each in its way affects to be the sum total of true Christianity, and has in itself constitutionally all the self-will and autocratic temper, all the intolerance and persecuting despotism of popery. That the two systems, therefore, Romanism and Sectarianism, should be found thinking and working together at different points, is only what might be expected, and I have no cause or wish in the world to dispute the fact or to keep it out of sight.

But it seems to me, this is by no means sufficient to establish the reasoning of "*An Anglican Catholic,*" when he argues that the concurrence of Romanists and Non-episcopal Protestants in denying the divine right of Episcopacy, proves that this theory is the only true barrier against the Roman theory, and that all Non-episcopal bodies then, as a matter of course, are to be regarded as practically on the way to Rome. Episcopacy by divine right, he tells us is "the only idea that can make headway against the dogma of papal supremacy." And so he winds up triumphantly: "What system favors Romanism? And what system opposes it? Let any one read the history of the Council of Trent and answer. Could any denomination ever have come into existence, except upon the basis of this dogma of the Jesuits that Episcopacy does not exist by divine right? If this doctrine were rejected to-day, would not all the Christians in the world immediately be brought into subjection by the Episcopate? Certainly they would. This dogma is the one cause of Christian division in Western Christendom. And its collateral, the doctrine of the Papal supremacy, is all that maintains the schism of East and West, or Greek and Latin. Papacy is therefore the one cause of the present divided

state of Christendom. And all who are in schism are where they are, only by virtue of having adopted this papal dogma."

There is a fallacy in this reasoning not hard to discover. It is as if Old Lutheranism should argue: The Roman doctrine of the real presence in the mass contradicts the Lutheran doctrine of so-called impanation; the Calvinistic or Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper does the same thing; *therefore* Calvinism is at bottom one with Romanism, and the only power that can make headway here against Rome is Lutheranism as embodied in the Form of Concord. Only grant the divine right of the Lutheran dogma, which the Jesuits deny, and who may not see that it must end all controversy also on the opposite Calvinistic side? "Would not all the Christians in the world," in that case, "immediately be brought into subjection" to the Lutheran *jure divino* creed? Certainly they would.

It is unnecessary to say that this could not of itself prove that the Lutheran theory was divine, or that it had not in it after all a constitutional affinity with the Roman theory. And just so, in the case now before us, it does not follow because the general acknowledgment of the divine right of Episcopacy would certainly do away with Non-episcopal Christianity among Protestants, either that Episcopacy is therefore of divine right, or that it may not have in it an inward determination nevertheless toward the central power of the Papacy, as its own proper logical complement and end.

That is all I have meant in saying, that the "high-church mechanism of episcopacy by divine right can come to its full sense and right end at last only in the Roman idea of a *jure divino* infallible centre." The remark regards not the system of episcopacy as such, but that view of it by which it is made to be, by *ab extra* appointment on the part of Christ, the essential bond of unity for the Church in the sense of being at the same time, the very principle of its existence, fixing thus the stigma of schism on all Christian life outside of such mechanism. That theory or scheme, I repeat (not the mind of those who hold the theory necessarily, but the animating soul of the theory itself,) cannot consistently stop short of a like mechanical cen-

tralization at last in some such primacy as that of the see of Rome. Both logic and history, it seems to me, justify this judgment.

Logically ; no outward bond of unity can be sufficient for its purpose, that is not itself one. A multitude of bishops can no more bind the Church into one, than a multitude of presbyters. The Episcopal bond of unity must therefore, itself be bound ; and that involves somewhere the idea of a central primacy, a chair of St. Peter, a Pope.

Historically ; the view which identified the episcopate with the unity of the Church in the beginning, ran in fact from the first toward this idea of a central primacy as its proper goal, and had no power to stay itself in its course till that goal was fairly reached. As I have said before, all ecclesiastical honesty requires us to admit the fact of an early tendency in this way to centralize the unity of the general episcopate itself in the see of Rome. "We feel it in Ignatius ; it comes to full blossom in Cyprian ; it is Romanism out and out in Augustine." Particular argument on this point here would be tedious ; neither do I consider it necessary. As a mere matter of history it appears to me to admit of no doubt.

"An Anglican Catholic" thinks, indeed, that I put a new sense on Cyprian's *Episcopatus unus est cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur* ; and finds it not in harmony with certain ecclesiastical facts which he quotes. I was not aware that my interpretation was new ; and cannot well see how it is possible to be satisfied with any other construction. There is a clear historical movement in the doctrine of the Church from the beginning ; both as regards the conception of it, and as regards its empirical constitution ; these two sides of the movement conditioning each other in fact throughout, but the first in the nature of the case leading the way for the second. The conception rose out of the idea of Christ and Christianity, as we have it in the article of the Creed—*One Holy Catholic Church*. Along with this went the application of the conception to the actual outward Christian body, in which it was felt that the idea of the Church, with all its essential attributes must inhere. The

congruence between the two was assumed at first without reflection. But it became apparent gradually that the ideal and the actual in the case were not thus strictly congruent in fact; and hence arose what was felt to be the imperative need of harmonizing them, so as to find in the actual empirical Church the elements that lay with *a priori* necessity in the ideal Church. One of these elements was unity. For this satisfactory provision seemed to be found for a time in the episcopate, as it first meets us in Ignatius. It could not be long, however, till it was seen and felt that something more than the episcopal institute, abstractly considered, was required to maintain the outward oneness of the Church; since bishops were capable of forsaking the true fold of Christ no less than others. Here comes in accordingly, the Cyprianic theory, having for its object the determination of a true unity for the episcopate itself, without which it could be of no significance whatever for binding the Church together as one.

This unity, for its purpose, must be not simply ideal, but empirically real, like the required oneness of the Church itself. Hence the thought that underlies the whole tract *De unitate ecclesie*, and meets us everywhere in Cyprian, that the true episcopate is an orb meeting together from all sides in a common centre, answerably to the relation of the general apostolate to the person of St. Peter. It is everywhere one office *in solidum*—and outside of such solidarity, of course, not of any actual worth or force whatever as a bond of unity. "Deus unus est," we hear him saying, Ep. 40, "et Christus unus, et una ecclesia, et una cathedra, super Petrum Domini voce fundata." Take this any way we please, as respecting either idea or outward fact, it comes to the same thing for our present purpose. It shows that in the mind of Cyprian the solidarity of the episcopate meant its organization around a common centre, and points unquestionably to the fact that this centre even in his time was supposed to be resident in some way in the Bishop of Rome. History fell in thus with logic. The doctrine which makes the mechanism of the episcopate the absolute principle and norm of Church unity, could not rationally come to any other conclusion.

If there are things in the life and conduct of Cyprian, or any other church father, that seem to conflict with Cyprian's theory here, it cannot be helped. I should be sorry to be under the necessity of making Cyprian or any other church father agree with himself either on this or on other points. No one of them was infallible by any means.

And so of course I am not pleading the Cyprianic theory of the Church, by any means, as authority against the modern Anglo-Catholic theory, in any such sense as to imply that the Christianity of the third century, fairly represented by Cyprian, or the Christianity of the Nicene period following it, should be held of binding force for the Christian world now; so that Protestantism, for example, must be charged with error, in proportion exactly as it fails to comport with this primitive standard and rule. That is not the meaning at all of my argument. Modern Anglicanism is not the Church system of the third century or of the Nicene period. "The conditions of modern catholicity," says Bishop Coxe, "do not permit me to speak as I must have done in the days of Cyprian. This is felt so deeply that the tone of a Cyprian in these days, excites disgust. It is illogical and impertinent." The appeal then which "An Anglican Catholic" makes to the age of Cyprian is for the point here in discussion of no account in my eyes, because Anglicanism, in the first place, is not one with the Cyprianic system; and cannot therefore rightly base its theory of an outward bond of unity in a body of bishops without an outward centre, on Cyprian's theory of a solid episcopal corporation held together in some way by a central *cathedra* answering to the apostolical primacy of St. Peter. But even if that were otherwise, the appeal would still have for me no conclusive force; because, with all my acknowledged regard for Cyprian and his age, I can see no reason for making either the man or his age here a standard of absolute Christian truth and right. Christianity as it stood in the age of Cyprian, and as it stood in the Nicene age, can by no means be taken as a safe pattern of what Christianity should be in the present age, or as the true ideal of what the Christian world must reach after to solve in time

to come the problem of Catholic unity. No protest against the ecclesiastical and theological errors of modern Romanism, I am well persuaded, can be valid or truly Protestant, which is not at the same time a protest against the principal working of the same errors in the third and fourth centuries. Cyprianic Christianity is at best embryonic Romanism, as can be easily shown in many things.

#### IV. Organic and Historical.

"An Anglican Catholic" charges me with not making proper account of the great ideas of organism and history, as they have to do with the true doctrine of the Church. This is a broad subject. All I can say of it here must reduce itself to a few general and loosely connected observations.

My own objection to the Episcopal scheme, as it is put forward in the book "Apollos," has turned just on this point that it has seemed to me not to distinguish rightly between organism and mechanism, making an external episcopate the bond of Church unity in the sense of a principle of such unity, and so in the sense of a very *principium essendi* for the universal life of the Church itself. That is the mistake of Romanism. It makes its hierarchy a divine construction, a mechanical vessel, so to speak, like Noah's ark, to whose bosom then the Christian faith is intrusted, that it may so pass the waves of this troublesome world, and finally come to the land of everlasting life. The mistake abounds also in the Patristic theology. It serves necessarily to invert the true order of the Christian life. It gives us for an organism what is at best the notion only of an external fabrication.

My critic himself shows some right sense of the difference between these conceptions. An organism, he says, lives; life always manifests itself in this way; it is vain to attempt to distinguish between the inner and the outer life; they are both one. And this strangely enough, he applies as holding against my proposition, "that if either popery or episcopacy be essential to the being of the Christian Church, it must be under the view of their being in some way along with their outward ordi-

nation, a true concretion or outbirth from the inward life of the Church." That, he will have it, is "the Romish doctrine of development differently applied," according to which, as he takes it, room is made for any innovation in Church order which the inward life of the Church may wilfully originate. Therefore the absolute need, he argues, of an outward apostolical order to keep the action of this life within its proper bounds.

But here at once the critic betrays his own error. His "inner and outer life," in the case of the Church, if I understand him rightly, are after all a divine composition only, and not a true organism; just as he says of man, that "he is a compound-being made up of soul, body and spirit; when these are *combined*, man is organized and lives; when they are *separated*, he is disorganized and dies; his organism is then *taken apart*." Much, one might suppose, like the taking apart of a watch.

In its true conception, an organism (as different from an organization) is not an inward compounded in this way with an outward; but the concrescence of inward and outward together from a single principle, which is then felt through all the parts as the power of one and the same life.

That is what I mean in saying that what is *essential to the being* of the Church must be "a true concretion or outbirth from the inward life of the Church."

Such concretion is anything but what my critic stigmatizes as *accretion*, in trying to make out here a common character between Romanism and Sectarianism. Concretion is the opposite of abstraction. The very difficulty I make with the Roman, Patristic, and high-church Episcopalian theory of church unity, is that it gives us for the purpose an outward appointment abstractly taken (like the Baptist's touchstone of discipleship found in bald obedience to Christ's appointment of the outward ceremony of baptism), instead of a living power growing forth concretely from the one organic spiritual constitution of the Church. The difference between the two conceptions, to my own mind at least, is clear and very material.

I hope I do not wrong the argument of "An Anglican Catholic;" but he really seems to me to confound the idea of

an organism with the mere outward form or system by which life works; as when he seems to say, for example, that the organic nature of man comes to an end with the breaking up of his natural body, and that his spirit afterward cannot be said to live organically at all until it gets its organism again in the resurrection of the last day. That indeed would illustrate happily the notion: no Bishop, no Church; no peripheral hierarchy to begin with, and so then no inner life of the Church to end with; that is, no unity, no catholicity, no holiness, no one attribute of the Church, but at best a certain amount of disembodied Christian spirit only, waiting to be clothed upon with an organization at some future time. But perhaps I have failed to catch here exactly what the writer of the article on the *Basis of Union* really means.

Along with his criticism on my view of concrete organization, as requiring the outward life of the Church to be in some way an outbirth from its inward life, goes his criticism (no less confused and erroneous I must be allowed to say) on my view of historical Christianity; which, in his judgment, is out and out the development theory made use of by the Church of Rome to justify all her assumptions. Quoting what I say, in my review of "Apollos," of the dream of bringing all things right "by an unhistorical pilgrimage of our whole modern Christendom to the tombs of the fathers, martyrs, and confessors, who fell asleep in the Lord fifteen hundred years ago," he breaks forth into the following energetic language:

"Never before have we seen in any place by any evangelical Christian so complete an acknowledgment that history and antiquity are both against the modern sectarian idea. Nowhere have we seen so complete an abandonment of the Catholic idea of Christian union, which binds us to the past as to one another. The appeal to history is a test which neither Rome nor Geneva can abide. But it is not common to see the whole case given up in this fashion, and everything rested upon development. Christianity is either a revelation or it is not. If it is a revelation, it was all revealed in the beginning. If it is not a revelation, it is what man chooses to make it."



This might just as well come from a Romanist (who also in his way fights off the idea of development), as from an Episcopalian or a Presbyterian; and it may well provoke a good-humored smile, to hear an Anglican Churchman pleasing himself with the imagination that *his* system, in distinction from Rome and Geneva, is the "all of revelation that was revealed from the beginning," and that he has it all now as a fixed historical tradition handed down to him without change from the primitive ages.

That is not history; and that is no right view of God's revelation. It is the outward again, as before, made to be more than the inward, the letter and form exalted above essence and spirit; and it ought to be evident to all now, that the time has forever gone by for making any effectual stand in behalf of Christianity against infidelity on any such mechanical basis, whether in Papal, or Presbyterian, or Episcopalian form.

Only think what it means, to say, that revelation was all revealed in the beginning, if that is to signify that the full sense of it was at once disclosed to the Christian world in the apostolic period, or in the age of Cyprian, or in the Nicene period. Why, the Word of God in the Bible is a mighty deep, a vast abyss, a boundless ocean of truth and life, and the Church has been all along only as one gathering a few pebbles or shells on its outmost beach. Talk of the understanding of it having been complete in the first ages, or in any age since! There is a holy derision, as from the eternal world, in the very thought!

And then what shall we say of a supposed exhaustive knowledge in this way of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, on the part of the Church, from the beginning of the Christian dispensation? It gives one pain even to ask the question. Is He not the fulness of the Godhead bodily? And have the ages to come then nothing to learn from Him, nothing to know of Him, in the way of growing, deepening insight into the meaning of His person and work, far beyond all that has been handed down as an outward depositum, in fixed quantity and quality, from the first ages, or the middle ages, or the ages since the Reforma-  
 The question, put in this way, is surely its own answer.

And now, who may not see, that the idea of such a living inexhaustible fountain of measureless truth and good—in the Bible and in Christ—which is no reservoir of stagnant traditions, doctrinal or ecclesiastical, but a "well of water springing up into everlasting life," the Word of God which is ζῶν καὶ ἐνεργῆς (Heb. iv. 12), and which liveth and abideth for ever; who may not see, I ask, that the source of Christian history, apprehended and thought of in this way, must necessarily impart to the historical stream of Christianity itself, through the ages, a corresponding character of ever flowing and ever changing life?

We need not call this development For that is a treacherous amphibological term again, like baptismal regeneration or justification by faith, which may be taken in different senses, giving rise to endless contention. Let us call it simply historical movement. That is enough. Historical movement has its own universal character, just as truly as the working of natural law in the world of nature. And it is not a question at all whether the life of man shall be historical—shall be, not stationary, nor a circling recurrence of things simply to their own beginning, as in the world of nature, but an ongoing progress involving the birth of new things continually out of the bosom of old things. This is what history means; nothing less than this; and it belongs to the very idea of humanity, that it should exist in this form; and nothing which is really human can exist in any other form.

Shall we be told then that Christianity, because "if it was a revelation it was all revealed in the beginning," is not subject to this otherwise universal law of historical progress? What is that but to say, that Christianity is not human; that it is a gnostic abstraction, touching men only in an outward manner; that it has not entered as an immanent concrete power into the actual life of humanity in any way?

True Christianity has not been ever, and is not now, any such monstrous or magical unreality. It has been historical, in the full sense of the term, from the beginning. It has been so theologically; there is not a doctrine belonging to it, which

has not had its history, its rise, its movement, its progressive evolution and determination. So with the Christian life and worship. So with all ecclesiastical order. The very theory of the Church, Papal or Cyprianic or Anglo-Catholic, which now affects to exclude the historical element rightly so-called from its constitution, can easily itself be referred to a historical process of its own in the beginning. It came in with gradually unfolding growth; conception and practice working together, to bring it to pass in the fulness of its time; as all may see who have courage to read church history for themselves, instead of taking it cut and dry from ecclesiastical schools or systems.

The historical in this view, then, is *not* a breaking away from the substantive life of the past; but neither is it yet, most assuredly, a monotonous continuation of this life in its past forms; and so also never a taking up of such forms simply, from a past time, in an outwardly slavish way. It holds between these extremes, as an inward union of the new and the old, the flowing and the constant, in the power of one and the same life.

How this may be, it needs of course some effort of thought to see and understand; but I am not called upon here to go any farther into the subject.

#### V. *Theological first, and then ecclesiastical.*

In my article on Dr. Coxe's book, I speak of the dream of *The Churchman* in regard to making Episcopacy the beginning and fundament of the whole question of the unification of the Christian world at this time, as being in my opinion visionary; and then add: "The question of church unity, as the world now stands, involves immeasurably *more* than the government of the Church by bishops. It is theological first, and then ecclesiastical; not ecclesiastical first, and then theological."

Noticing the article soon after its appearance, the *Churchman* took issue with this particular position in the following plain terms:

"This, we distinctly challenge. We deny entirely that the theological basis of unity precedes the ecclesiastical. For

what is the theological basis, properly understood, but the Creed, the facts of essential belief? These facts rested in the beginning, not on any inherent probability, but on the witness of those who announced them. The authority of Apostles was the condition precedent to establishment of belief. As it was in the beginning, it is now. There are and can be ever two theories only of the way in which Divine truth comes to man. One is by revelation, the other by discovery. There are and can be but two theories only concerning the Church. One, that it is an institution, the other, that it is an invention. It is, we believe, on the vital difference between these two, which we see and trace through all variations of polity and schemes of belief, that the entire question of unity and of religion, indeed, turns. Dr. Nevin is too thoroughly a scholar to need that we should remind him that the ecclesiastical came before the theological, and that the Apostles, appearing as the ambassadors of Christ, presented to the world their credentials before they opened their mission. With a Congregationalist, who conceives of St. Paul preaching at Corinth precisely as a revivalist getting up an excitement in a Western town, it might be necessary to demonstrate; but Dr. Nevin is too familiar with the true aspect of the past, not to be aware that the early disciples took all their theological acquisitions only by and through the ecclesiastical fellowship, and that unity with the Church was the only possible test by which the correctness of theology was, or could be, tried."

Here we have at once a misapprehension of my meaning in the use of the word theological. It is taken as of one sense with doctrinal or dogmatic in systematic divinity. The latter part of my article shows abundantly, however, that I had no such thought as that in my mind; since I took the ground there that no doctrinal basis, either as at hand already with any of our denominations, or as something to be yet reached by interdenominational negotiation among them all, can ever be sufficient (any more than episcopacy itself) for the reintegration of the dismembered church into anything like true organic unity.

But the quotation is instructive, in the light it serves to

throw upon the *Churchman's* own theory of Christianity and the Church, which is found to be here again just the same scheme of mechanical supernaturalism, which it has been the object throughout of my present review of "An Anglican Catholic" in a friendly way to expose and refute.

The Creed—the living substance of the Creed—is with me indeed what I understand by theological, as different both from ecclesiastical and dogmatic. But I must utterly reject the view here broadly presented, that the Creed owes its authority in such form for faith to the outward testimony of the Church. I say—with all emphasis on the word—for *faith*; not for intelligence or rational trust, but for faith; which in its very nature has to do directly with the spiritual, with the invisible and the eternal, in their own light, and not through the medium merely of any outside foreign light.

We must distinguish between the facts of Christianity historically considered, and the ideal internal sense of these facts, which lies beyond them in the sphere of the supernatural. To see the outward Jesus, when He was on the earth, was not of itself to see the inward Christ; to perceive that great truth (the rock on which the Church is built) was no function of outward empirical knowledge in any way. Flesh and blood could not reveal it, we are told by our Lord Himself, but only the Father which is in Heaven. And just that inward revelation it is still, which alone can make the Christian Creed true for Christian faith. What falls short of that—the testimony of the Church, for example, or even the authority of apostles confirmed by miracles—may be of vast moment as a preliminary to faith; but it cannot be itself the very object of true Christian faith; for it is of itself external fact simply for knowledge and science; whereas faith, as differing from knowledge, has for its object the supernatural only and always.

The error of basing faith in this way on intermediate outward witness or authority lies at the ground of the whole Roman system; where the premise of an infallible, historical, ecclesiastical corporation (authenticated for knowledge by outside natural evidence) is supposed to be the very principle and power

of faith in every higher view. It is possible, however, and only too common in the Protestant world, to put the Bible also in the same wrong relation to faith; as is done universally where it is regarded as an outward text simply (divinely inspired), out of which the common understanding of men may draw the truths of faith for itself in a natural way!

The "Churchman" it seems to me, in the passage just quoted, falls into first this general fallacy in regard to the true nature of faith in its distinction from knowledge. The creed it will have to be simply *the facts of essential belief*; and these facts, it tells us, "rested in the beginning not on any inherent probability, but on the witness of those who announced them;" that is, on outward historical evidence, which in the nature of the case could have no power whatever to attest or verify for faith the actual divine interior life and soul of the facts.

No; the ecclesiastical is not before the theological in that way, either in order of being or in order of time; just as little as the Bible outwardly taken can be said to take precedence, in either view, of the Word of God *in the Bible* which "liveth and abideth forever."

If the opposite order were true, the Christian Creed should run: "I believe in a holy apostolical Church, authenticated to the world by rational credentials from heaven, and therefore, on the testimony of the Church, I believe in God the Father, and in His Son Jesus Christ," and so on to the close. That would be indeed ecclesiastical first, and then theological.

The only true order is the other way, theological first and then ecclesiastical, as the Creed now stands. First is the order of the Christian salvation in its own objective constitution—Christ first, and then the full-orbed world of grace and truth proceeding forth from Christ. And how should there be then possibly any right order other than this for the subjective apprehension of the Christian salvation, any true method of faith other than the method of the Creed, as it now is and has been from the beginning?

The article of the Church itself (with its attributes, one, holy and catholic), never rested for faith, and rests for it not at all

now, on historical credentials or outward empirical fact of any sort ; but altogether in the first place on its ideal spiritual and eternal constitution, flowing forth with divine necessity from the life of our blessed Lord Himself, and actualizing itself as it best may, under its adverse conditions in this world, onward to the end of time.

The principle of the Church then, the beginning of its life, the true source and only effectual bond of its unity, sanctity and catholicity, is not any Christian dogma as such, nor yet any Church constitution as such, like the papacy or the episcopate ; but only and wholly our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, the Son of the Living God, as He is set forth briefly in St. Peter's confession and proclaimed at large in the Apostles' Creed.

In saying this, I mean no polemical disparagement of episcopacy itself ; just as little, as I mean a disparagement of any particular doctrine, or scheme of doctrine, by refusing in the same way to see in it the *fons et origo* of the Christian faith. What place either the doctrinal or the ecclesiastical, under a given view, may be destined to hold hereafter in the full actualization of Church unity, is another question. All I mean is, that neither of these interests, as the Christian world now stands—in a crisis, whether men lay it to heart or not, more profoundly trying than any through which it has ever yet passed—is sufficient to open the way for this unity ; and that no handling of either of them for such purpose, therefore, can be considered as of itself adequate in any sense to the severe demands of the problem. Neither the Evangelical Alliance nor Anglo-Catholic Episcopacy has yet touched bottom here. The subject calls for deeper probing and far more fundamental help.

Such help, I am solemnly persuaded, can only come through a deeper entrance than has ever yet been gained by the Church at large into the mystery of what the Bible is (Old Testament and New) as the living Word of the Living God ; and this especially through new and profounder entrance into the mystery of the personal Christ, the Lord of life and glory, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." To say that we know and possess all these treasures already, or to say that it

is enough for us to put ourselves for the purpose under the tuition and instruction of the Church in past ages (say the sixteenth century or the time of the Nicene fathers), is such extravagance, we have already seen, as can hardly be expressed. Yet practically this would seem to be very much the reigning thought of the Christian world at this time! Many indeed, in the Church and outside of the Church, are coming to feel more and more the sphinx-like solemnity of the mighty question, *What think ye of Christ?* But it is for the most part still only in a dim and cloudy way; while but a few here and there (amid the din of surrounding theological and ecclesiastical strife) are brought to see and own in it the germinant power of a coming new spiritual creation.

It were much—O how much!—if only our denominations generally, Episcopalian and Non-Episcopalian together, could be brought to suspect the sufficiency of their several stand-points, as held at present, and to ask themselves seriously whether there might not be after all a better way than any they have yet dreamed of, for the composition of their differences (in doctrine, order, worship and life), to be found in a common acknowledgment of the great Christological truth here affirmed, and along with this then a common endeavor to surrender themselves fully to the power of it through the obedience of faith.

The mere movement of men's minds generally in this way would be such an omen and promise, nay, such a real beginning of unity, as has not yet been offered to our view anywhere in any other form. It would be a giving up of the notion of manufacturing it by any outside purpose or plan of men themselves, doctrinal or ecclesiastical. It would be the flowing of men's minds in common toward a common centre, outside of themselves, and in this way their flowing together at the same time in the felt sense of a common Christian brotherhood.

And who can question the power of this centre to organize into true inward unity and order the elements of Christian life, thus brought into right relation to it from all sides? Where else have we, or can we have, the real principle of all true Christianity, the last and deepest ground of its universal oneness? And



how then may the divisions of Christianity begin even to be harmonized, otherwise than by their being referred practically to that which is infinitely deeper than themselves in this ground, the living power and glory of the Lord? Is it not just in this sense, that He is declared by St. Paul to be our PEACE, making Jew and Gentile one, breaking down the middle wall of partition between them, and so having power to break down also all other divisions by resolving them into the sense of a deeper relationship in God?

Let it not be said, we have what is here meant already; common faith in the same Christ, and a common looking to Him as the centre of the Christian life and the one only principle of Christianity. The imagination is false; plainly and immediately so, because the sundering forces at work among us are stronger on all sides than the common power by which we complacently assume that we are all thus drawn toward the Lord. If Christ—not the notion or doctrine of Christ nor a mere theory of His kingdom in the world, but the living Christ Himself—were indeed all in all for our several evangelical denominations (as they call themselves); were indeed the first object of their common faith, the one glorious Sun of righteousness in their several ecclesiastical heavens; there would be at once a giving way and breaking down of the walls of partition that now rise up between them. The partial and separatistic would of themselves relax their deadly hold on men's souls. Self-thinking, self-willing and self-working, would give place to thinking, willing and working in the Lord. There would be at once the reign of catholicity begun upon the earth. And most certain it is that this grand spiritual ἀποκαταστάσις, or restitution of all things, can never come in any other way.

Then we would know what faith means in its proper New Testament sense; and how it is that such wonderful power is ascribed to it in the Word. For it would be seen to be nothing less in truth than real conjunction with the life of the Lord Himself. A conception almost lost under the general rubbish of our modern traditions; as is implied indeed in that startling question of the Lord Himself: When the Son of Man cometh,

*shall He find faith on the earth?* Orthodoxy enough, it may be; ecclesiasticism enough, it may be; religion of mere sentiment and feeling enough, it may be; but faith? faith in Himself as the Son of God, the Lord of heaven and earth, and one with the Father? shall He find *that* on the earth?

But I pursue the subject here no farther. This is what I mean by the "immeasurably more" that underlies the problem of Church unity, than is presented by any question of government or doctrine simply, obtruding itself upon us, in the first place, as a preliminary external condition for all farther inquiry or action. This is what I mean by "theological first, and then ecclesiastical." Not dogma, speculation, or theory first; but the actual substantive mystery itself of Christianity, as we have it in the living Word; as we have it in the Creed; and there not in the Church first by any means, but in Christ Himself, who is the principle of the Creed, the origin and root of universal Christianity (as the beginning also of the whole creation of God), and so the perennial only fountain and source of the Church to the end of time. The theological is for us properly nothing other than this—namely, the Christological, the manifestation of God in His Son Jesus Christ, "in knowledge of whom standeth our eternal life."

Sinking our souls deep then into this only principle of unity, this fountain of all charity and faith, let us pray in the language of our Trinity collect: "O God, the Creator and Saviour of the world, who hast made Thyself known in the work of man's redemption as the Mystery of the ever adorable Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, Three in One and One in Three; reveal in us, we beseech Thee, the full power of this faith, into which we have been planted by baptism; that being born of water and of the Spirit, we may by a life of holiness be formed into Thine image here, and rise to Thy blissful presence hereafter; there to join with the song of the seraphim in praising Thee, world without end. *Amen.*"