OUTLINES OF SOCIAL THEOLOGY

OUTLINES

OF

SOCIAL THEOLOGY

BY

WILLIAM DEWITT HYDE, D.D.
PRESIDENT OF BOWDOIN COLLEGE

New York
MACMILLAN AND CO.
AND LONDON
1895

Norwood Press:
J. S. Cushing & Co. — Berwick & Smith.
Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.

PREFACE

IDEALISM and theology, originally joined together in "the Gospel according to St. John," were put asunder through the estrangement of the Greek and Latin churches. The Greek church put a metaphysic in the place of religion, and paid the penalty in spiritual sterility. The Latin church put authority in the place of reason, and paid the penalty in intellectual barrenness. Protestantism has inherited the Greek formulas without the philosophy which gave them meaning, and the Latin distrust of reason without the authority which made dogmatism effective. The remedy lies in a reunion of vital religion with rational theology.

The time has not come for writing this new theology. The returns from psychology and sociology, on which it will depend, are not yet in. A man however may blaze a path, even though he lacks the materials and the capacity to build a road. This little book aims to point out the logical relations in which the doctrines of theology will stand to each other when the time shall come

again for seeing Christian truth in the light of reason and Christian life as the embodiment of love.

I have called it Social Theology, because the Christianity of Christ and his disciples was pre-eminently a social movement, and because we are looking at everything to-day from the social rather than the individualistic point of view. In ethics, in economics, in sociology, in politics, we no longer treat man as capable of isolation. *Unus homo, nullus homo.* Man is what he is by virtue of his relations to that which he is not. In these special sciences we try to solve the problem of the individual by putting him into right relations with the forces and persons about him. Christ came to place man in right relations with God, with nature, and with his fellow-men. The modern man translates the Greek ψυχή by life rather than soul. The preservation and enrichment of life, not the mere insuring and saving of the soul, is the function of religion which appeals to men to-day. And at this period of transition the adjective "social" serves to call attention to the shifting of emphasis from the abstract and formal relation of the isolated individual to an external Ruler, over to man's concrete and essential relations to the Divine Life manifested in nature, history, and human society.

A few paragraphs of this book, amounting to twenty or thirty pages, have appeared in published sermons and addresses, and in articles in the *Andover Review*, the *Outlook*, the *Century*, and the *Forum*. The greater part, the relation of parts to each other, and the interpretation of each part in the light of the whole, is entirely new.

For valuable suggestions and criticisms upon the proofs, my thanks are due to Professor Egbert C. Smyth, of Andover Seminary; Professor George H. Palmer, of Harvard University; and Professor D. Collin Wells, of Dartmouth College.

With the exception of the first and last chapters I have avoided the technical philosophical discussion which theology always invites. In dealing with the grounds of belief in God, in the first chapter, I have found it impossible to treat the subject at all without assuming some familiarity with the results of metaphysical inquiry. And yet the presentation there made is the merest summary of the idealistic position. In the last chapter also I have introduced a summary of the idealistic objections to asceticism, hedonism, socialism, and promiscuous charity. The general reader is advised to skip both these chapters. Yet it was impossible to omit them from the book

without leaving it logically very incomplete. For after all metaphysics must be the Alpha, and ethics the Omega, of any theology which is rooted in reason and fruitful in life.

WILLIAM DEWITT HYDE.

BOWDOIN COLLEGE, BRUNSWICK, ME.,
January 21, 1895.

CONTENTS.

Part I. Theological.

Part II. Anthropological.

Part III. Sociological.

Part I

THEOLOGICAL

SOCIAL THEOLOGY

CHAPTER I

THE WORLD AND THE SELF — THE FATHER

THERE are three stages in the spiritual development of man. The first stage is world-consciousness; in which he is engrossed by the stream of sensations which come pouring in from the great world without. The second stage is self-consciousness; in which he goes forth with eager ambition to subject this outward world of men and things to the forms of his understanding and the service of his will. The third stage is God-consciousness; in which, unsatisfied with self and the world, he devotes the matured powers of reflection and self-determination to the unselfish service of objective and universal ends. The first stage is the state of nature. The second is the plane of science, art, business, politics, and culture. The third is the sphere of religion.

These stages are not mutually exclusive. They

are rather distinguishable aspects, different degrees of maturity, of the one indivisible life of man. The higher include the lower. The later take up into themselves the significance of all that has gone before. Science and art fare ill if they ignore the solid ground of sensuous fact. Religion degenerates into an empty form, a useless and mischievous superstition, if it fails to make close connection with the science and art and business and culture of the age.

The first of these stages need not detain us long. Psychology tells us there is no pure sensation in adult life. Sensations are mere signs which we at once work up into perceptions. Sensations are only the raw material of the world our thought constructs. The world pure and simple, apart from the unity and coherence which it receives from the mind which thinks it, is no world at all. It is a chaos, not a cosmos. It is, as Professor James says of the object of the baby's consciousness, "one big, blooming, buzzing Confusion."

The notion that there is a world unrelated to our intelligence, which yet makes impressions on the blank white paper of a passive intellect and drops ready-made ideas into the previously empty cabinet of a merely receptive mind, is a relic of phil-

osophical superstition which Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* has demolished; and the last vestiges of which modern psychology has swept away. The world we know and talk about, the only world we can conceive and think, is a world which the mind creates for itself out of the materials which sensation brings. One might as well say that the cloth which comes out of a factory is the exclusive product of the bales of cotton that are dumped into the picker-room, as to claim that the world as we know it is the exclusive product of sensation. What the card and the jenny and the loom do to the raw cotton, that the forms and categories of the understanding do to the raw material of sensation. As the cloth is the joint product of the material and the machinery, so knowledge is the joint product of sensation and the mind which reacts on it and works it over. The world of mere sensation, therefore, is not the ultimate reality.

No less disastrous than the effort of the mind to treat the world as ultimate reality is the practical attempt to make it the object of our devotion. At some time or other, we all try the experiment. We go out into the world expecting to find there, ready-made and fitted to our forms, the happiness we crave. But, like the

prodigal, we soon discover that perpetual feasting ends in feeding swine. The world was not made to order to gratify our wants Of itself, it will not even supply our physical necessities. Nor do our fellowmen stand waiting to receive and execute our orders. "And he began to be in want; and no man gave unto him," is the pitiful plight in which Nature leaves those who cast themselves blindly upon her bounty. We cannot be satisfied with the husks, which give such perfect satisfaction to the swine. The reason is that we are more than they. It was "when he came to himself," that the prodigal determined to return from the far country. As Carlyle has explained it, "Man's unhappiness, as I construe, comes of his greatness; it is because there is an infinite in him, which, with all his cunning, he cannot quite bury under the finite. Will the whole finance ministers and upholsterers and confectioners of modern Europe undertake in joint-stock company to make one shoeblack happy? They cannot accomplish it above an hour or two; for the shoeblack also has a soul quite other than his stomach; and would require, if you consider it, for his permanent satisfaction and saturation, simply this allotment, no more, no less; God's infinite universe altogether to himself, therein to enjoy infinitely, and fill every

wish as fast as it rose. Always there is a black spot in our sunshine; it is even, as I said, the shadow of ourselves." Carlyle's shoeblack and Jesus's prodigal are brought up at the same point; the unsatisfied, infinite self.

This incapacity of the finite and fleeting world without to satisfy the spirit within, is the half-truth of pessimism and the secret of its charm.

> "We demand
> Of all the thousand nothings of the hour
> Their stupefying power;
> Ah, yes; and they benumb us at our call!
> Yet still from time to time, vague and forlorn,
> From the soul's subterranean depth upborne
> As from an infinitely distant land,
> Come airs and floating echoes, and convey
> A melancholy into all our day."

The quest of pleasure in outward things defeats itself. Cyrenaicism teaches suicide. If man's ultimate relation is to blind and unconscious nature, then Schopenhauer is right when he exclaims: "Desires are limitless, claims inexhaustible, and every satisfied desire gives rise to a new one. No possible satisfaction in the world could suffice to still its longings, set a goal to its infinite cravings, and fill the bottomless abyss of the heart. Happiness always lies in the future, or else in the past,

and the present may be compared to a small dark cloud which the wind drives over the sunny plain; before and behind it all is bright, only it itself always casts a shadow. The present is therefore always insufficient; but the future is uncertain, and the past irrevocable. Nothing at all is worth our striving, our efforts and struggles, all good things are vanity, the world is bankrupt at all ends, and life is a business which does not pay expenses."

Neither intellectually nor practically can we rest in mere world-consciousness, and accept the world as the ultimate reality. We must turn next to ourselves. *Intra te quære deum.*

The world within the mind of man, the world as thought makes it, the world of human science and art and history and politics, is throughout an ordered world. All things are firmly bound together by indissoluble laws; so that a change at one point involves a compensating change in everything even remotely connected with it. Every act that takes place here implies corresponding reaction everywhere. What I do now is at once the product of all my past, and a determining element, however slight, in all my future. This oak tree now before me, owes its size and shape to thousands of oaks and acorns that have gone before; to the soil that feeds its roots; to the

upheaval, denudation, vegetation, and decay, which formed that soil; to sunshine and storm; to measureless cycles of clashing meteors and diffused fire mist and glowing earth and cooling crust out of which sunshine and storm were born. This man upon the street derives his present being from countless generations of men and women who bridged for him the gulf between the savage and the civilized estate; to numberless animal forms which in the struggle for existence won the right of his superior structure to survive; to liberties secured on ancient battlefields and institutions inherited from unremembered days; to parents, friends, teachers, books, influences, ideals, inextricably blended in the seamless robe which we all wear and call environment.

This world of our thought is one. All things in it stand to each other in reciprocal relations. Each thing must take its definite place by the side of other things in space; each event must take its precise position before and after other events in time; each quality must be bound up with and dependent upon other qualities under the conception of substance which we put upon groups of qualities in order to hold them together in our minds; each change must be the correlate

of other changes according to the law of cause and effect, whereby we maintain for our thought the identity of the world in the midst of its unceasing transformation.

Thus the world of our own thought, which in fact is the only world we know and can talk about, proves to be a world built up by the activity of our own minds, which reduce the uncoördinated data of sensation to unity and order by imposing upon them forms of perception and laws of relation which are inherent, not as formulated propositions, but as modes of operation, in the rational nature of the mind itself. That the world of our thought is one; that it is an ordered world; that it is a coherent system of rational and reciprocal relations; and that this unity and rationality of the world we think is due, not to the raw material of sensation dumped into a passive and receptive mind, but to the reaction of an active intelligence which contributes out of its own nature the forms and categories by which it reduces the manifold of sensation to the unity of reason, — this, in briefest possible form, is the positive outcome of the *Critique* of Kant.

The order and rationality we find in nature, then, is not material, but mental: it is not im-

printed on our senses from without, but is imposed upon sensation from within. And, we must recognize, even at this preliminary stage in the discussion, that, as Herbert Spencer has said, "This necessity we are under to think of the external energy in terms of the internal energy, gives rather a spiritualistic than a materialistic aspect to the Universe." The world is the great mirror in which our reason sees itself reflected. Of so much Kant makes us sure. Is that all? Can we stop here? Is the intelligence by which we interpret the world simply our intelligence? Can we rest satisfied in a merely subjective idealism?

The raw material, the sensations themselves, we certainly did not create. Kant had to admit an external source from which these sensations come. He, however, placed this source of sensation in "things in themselves," out of all possible relation to the mind of man, which can merely receive sensations, but is unable to go behind the immediate returns sensations give. Kant thus prepared the way for the agnosticism of Herbert Spencer. And when Mr. Spencer tells us that "amid the mysteries which become the more mysterious the more they are thought about, there will remain the one absolute certainty,

that man is ever in presence of an Infinite and Eternal Energy, from which all things proceed"; and then adds that, "The power manifested throughout the Universe distinguished as material, is the same power which in ourselves wells up under the form of consciousness"; and then, having gone so far, stops short with the declaration that we can know absolutely nothing of this Power of whose existence we are sure, he is simply translating Kant's inaccessible source of phenomena into his own Unknowable Background of the universe.

Kant and Spencer leave us with a world which is essentially mental; a world which our own minds alone cannot explain; and the certainty that there is something beyond which does explain this world with its "spiritualistic rather than materialistic aspect."

If the source of phenomena merely gave us sensations and nothing more; if one mind could interpret these sensations in one way, and another could interpret them in another; if there were no reason in the world except that which the individual minds of men impose upon it; if there were no such thing as verification of the opinion of man by the objective witness of nature; if there were no objective standard to which all finite minds are compelled to

conform; if there were no valid and immutable distinction between truth and falsehood, between science and fancy, between proved theory and probable hypothesis, — then indeed the position in which Kant and Spencer leave us would be final and ultimate.

These very things, however, it is the peculiar achievement of modern science to have established. We can verify our subjective notions by appealing to the test of objective experiment. We make predictions; and nature fulfils our expectations to the minute. We recognize an established body of scientific truth which we have discovered, not created; and which no man may deny without thereby banishing himself from the society of the intelligent. We accept a standard of objective truth; we acknowledge that there is one system of thought-relations, common to all thinking minds; and we judge a given proposition to be true or false according as it falls within or falls without this one system of rational relations.

In the crises of development, when new truths are declared and new standards of duty are proclaimed, this divine background of truth comes to the front. When Copernicus declares in opposition to the unanimous opinion of mankind that the earth moves around the sun, what gives him

confidence in the truth of his assertion? If it is merely his opinion, it cannot maintain itself against the opinion of mankind. If the opinions of finite minds are the ultimate source of truth, then neither the opinion of Copernicus nor that of his opponents is certainly true. Both are merely probable. And of the two theirs is more probable than his. The ground of the astronomer's confidence is that there is a rational relation of things, as infinite reason, in which the revolution of the earth around the sun always was, is now, and always will be, an inseparable and undeniable element. Into that thought Copernicus has entered. He is prepared to show that with his doctrine of the revolution of the earth, all other astronomical facts fall into harmony; without this doctrine, all other facts remain in confusion and contradiction. As Copernicus said: "By a close and long observation I have at length found that, if the motions of the rest of the planets be compared with the circulation of the earth, and be computed for the revolution of each, not only their phenomena will follow, but it will so connect the orders and magnitudes of the planets and all the orbs, and even heaven itself, that nothing in any part of it could be transposed without the confusion of

the rest of the parts, and of the whole universe." This thought, which is common to him and to his opponents; this thought, which is common both to the minds of all thinking men and to the forms of the external order; this rational and universal relation of things, which is the basis of the ultimate agreement of all candid minds with each other, and the guarantee that their united judgment is in agreement with the facts, — this is the only rational ground of the confidence which the scientific discoverer has in the new truth which he declares. If there were two natural orders, he might be talking of one, and his opponents of the other. If there were no objective rational order, both he and they might be amusing themselves with fancies equally true because equally subjective; but equally false because nothing could be found to which either could be proved to correspond.

The facts which we have been considering demand some explanation. The fixed relations in which all objects of our thought stand to each other are not of our own making. This coherence of all the forces in the world, in such a way that we cannot think of a change in one element or member without thinking corresponding and compensating changes in the whole, is no device

of the subjective mind of the individual beholder. This unity of all the forces and facts of the world in an organic whole of reason we discover, but do not create. The universality of law, the verification of hypothesis, the fulfilment of prediction, the established body of science, the objective validity of truth and its distinction from error, the necessity of all finite minds to think alike on all subjects which, like mathematics and demonstrated science, admit of perfect clearness and distinctness, — these facts require for their explanation a common ground of unity between nature and the mind of man; a bond and basis of intelligibility between different minds; a supreme source and standard of truth authoritative over all finite minds. Such a ground of unity, and bond of intelligibility, and source and standard of truth can be found in nothing short of the Absolute Thought, the Infinite Spirit, or God.

As the uniform order of physical events, and science which is its mental equivalent and correlate, reveals the Absolute Mind; so the developing order of human society, and morality which is its subjective counterpart, reveals the Universal Will.

When Socrates preaches moral doctrine contrary to the conventional Athenian tradition, why.

should he die rather than renounce his vocation? If it is a mere question of individual preference, all Athens is more likely to be right than a single individual. Socrates affirms that it is not his private opinion which he is setting forth, but an absolute and eternal right of which he is the mouthpiece. How does he know this? Because with his doctrine he can see the facts of the moral life, as one harmonious whole. Without it he sees that these facts contradict each other; and he is prepared to manifest these contradictions to any one who will consent to answer his questions on these points. It was because of his confidence in a right not of his own making or choosing, that he refused to abandon his teaching. Hence his boldness. "If you say to me, Socrates, this time we will let you off, but upon one condition, that you are not to inquire and speculate in this way any more, and that if you are caught doing this again you shall die, — if this was the condition on which you let me go, I should reply: 'Men of Athens, I honour and love you; but I shall obey God rather than you, and while I have life and breath I shall never cease from the practice and teaching of philosophy.' For I do believe that there are gods, and in a far

higher sense than that in which any of my accusers believe in them."

At first sight the customs and institutions of different ages, races, and nations seem as conflicting and chaotic as the forces of nature seem to the unscientific mind. Yet while the specific customs and institutions of society are undergoing perpetual change, the great purpose at which these seemingly inconsistent and actually conflicting principles and practices are aiming is constant and unvarying. That purpose is such an adjustment of the several members of society to each other that out of their united action there may result a harmonious social order in which each individual shall be at once the servant and the lord of all. In the beginnings of society this purpose is indeed hidden underneath intolerable burdens of usurpation and tyranny; and the course of social evolution is marked by oppression, corruption, and the betrayal of the common interest by those whom inheritance, or power, or wealth, or popular election have constituted its guardians and defenders. And yet the fact that we recognize these things as wrong, and the fact that by revolution and rebellion, by agitation and reform, society has succeeded in correcting these abuses and dethroning these usurpers, shows that underneath all the injustices

and wrongs it has endured there has been ever present, as the silent judge and the omnipotent avenger, the social ideal of a society in which each individual is at once end and means to every other.

And if we turn from the outward social ideal to the inner moral standard, or conscience, we find even clearer evidence of the presence of a Will higher than our own. Morality is something far deeper than the prudential regulation of personal conduct for private advantage, although such prudence is an important and essential element of morality. In the deeper moral experience we come face to face with a "categorical imperative." We recognize that the doing of duty is what makes us men. We feel that to be false to duty is to violate our inmost nature, and to be unworthy of a place in the world in which we live. This sense of responsibility for conduct is the fundamental instinct of the race.

Now the contents of this moral ideal are drawn from and correspond to the requirements of the social order of which we form a part. To be a good member of society, and to have a clear conscience, are the outer and inner aspects of one and the selfsame thing. You can distinguish these two aspects in thought, but you can no more

separate them in fact than you can separate the convexity of the outside from the concavity of the inside of a circle. And yet, while drawn from and dependent upon the outer social order, the moral ideal is always transcending this order. The good individual owes all his goodness to the society in which he has been reared; and yet he feels called upon to give back to that social order services and standards which tend to make it better. In a word, while the ideal of human life is embodied and preserved in society, it is developed in the consciences and advanced by the efforts of individuals.

This constant correlation of the outer order of society and the inner ideal of conduct requires some common ground as its explanation. As the correlation of physical facts with human science involves an Absolute Mind expressed in nature and progressively unfolding himself to the advancing science of man; so this correlation of the social order and the moral ideal involves a Universal Will embodied in the progressive evolution of the social order, and revealed in the ever-expanding ideal of the moral life. And as the impulse toward scientific discovery rests on the belief that the science which we know is only a fragment of the infinite science as it exists in the Absolute Mind;

so the impulse to moral reform springs from an implicit faith that the social institutions and moral standards prevalent at a given time are but arcs of the infinite circle, stages in the eternal process by which the Universal Will is realizing his purpose in society, and reproducing his likeness in the hearts of men.

Again, just as the possibility of error is proof positive of the reality of truth, and of an absolute basis of truth in the Infinite Mind; so the consciousness of wrong is the infallible witness of the reality of right, and of its eternal ground in the Universal Will that makes for righteousness. If I were the only being in the universe, then my private caprice and fancy would be supreme. To be sure, one impulse of mine even then might come into conflict with another, and I should discover that this isolated self is more than the sum of its particular states. But whatever should give me permanent satisfaction would therefore justify itself as right; because by hypothesis there would be no other interests with which it could conflict. Why is it then that I am dissatisfied, ashamed, conscious of guilt, when I have done something which seems to perfectly promote my interests as an individual? Because I am more than an individual, and am conscious of the claims of other

beings upon me. But how comes it to pass that these other beings, and society which is the organization of the interests of these other beings, have a claim upon me? To be sure, they, and society as their agent, may punish me if I offend them. But this guilt and shame and sense of ill-desert, though historically originating in experience of actual punishment, has come to be a far deeper sentiment than mere fear of external penalty accounts for; and there are many wrongs I can commit against society of which neither the law nor public sentiment will ever take the slightest notice. And yet I feel condemned. I feel that these other beings and their interests belong to me and are part of my own proper interest. This consciousness of wrong, this sense of guilt, is the persistent witness to the fact that in our inmost being we are one with those whose rights we have disregarded, and a member of that social order whose laws we have disobeyed. The consciousness of a limit is the knowledge of that which transcends the limit. The confession of guilt is the acknowledgment of obligation. The insufficiency of the private self is the revelation of the identification of self with society.

Here, through the attempt to break the bond which binds us to our fellows, we discover how

strong it is, and how impossible it is for us to cast it off. This bond which binds all men together, making authoritative for each the rights of all, can be nothing less than the Universal Will which holds all beings as the objects of an impartial interest and an equal devotion. The progressive and purposeful order of society; the correlation of the social order and the moral ideal; and the impossibility of escaping even by wrongdoing from the bond that binds the individual to society constitute the evidence from the social order and the moral ideal of the existence of the Universal Will.

These lines of thought preserve what is valuable in the substance, while they avoid what is inadequate in the form of the traditional proofs of the existence of God. As demonstrations of the existence of a Being anterior to creation and external to the world, these proofs are fallacious in method and illusory in result. As expositions of immanent causality and immanent teleology and immanent rationality in nature and in man, they all contain elements of truth.

The cosmological argument for a first cause is unsatisfactory; for it rests on an unwarranted projection of an analogy which, just because it is true of interdependent finite phenomena, is by no means sure to hold true of the relation of phe-

nomena as a whole to an external source. And even if we could prove such an external first cause, it would be of little use to us; for such an extraneous source of phenomena either is manifested in the effect, in which case he is more than the mere cause; or else he is not manifested in the effect; in which case he at once vanishes into the thin air of Mr. Spencer's Unknowable; or at best remains "the Great First Cause, least understood."

The argument from design is nearer the truth; but at best can give but half the truth. The designer is limited by the materials he works with; and we can never be sure that the plan which we discover is precisely the plan he had in mind. That there is an "immanent purposiveness" in the world, all our æsthetic and moral experience indeed attests. But that an external will impressed this or that stamp upon it at this or that moment in time, we cannot assume. The moral argument, in so far as it bases belief in God on the hope of righteous retribution, whereby the evils of this world shall be righted in the next, is an inference from the absence of justice here to its existence elsewhere; and carries no conviction. Still less, according to the general interpretation of the ontological argument, are we justified in leaping from

the requirements of our accidental notions to the necessities of things.

The cosmological argument is right in its recognition that interdependent finite phenomena must have a Ground; but it is wrong in placing that Ground back somewhere in time. The physico-teleological argument is right in its recognition of purpose; but is wrong in thrusting that purpose outside of the world. The moral argument is right in affirming retribution; but it is wrong in postponing that retribution to a remote future. The ontological argument is right in affirming that the Infinite and Absolute is a necessity of thought; but is wrong in assuming that there is a world of reality other than the world of thought, to which the conditions of thought may or may not apply. These arguments are all stages of a single process by which man has sought to confess the dependence of all things upon an Absolute Ground; the participation of all beings in an Infinite Purpose; the obligation of all men to an Eternal Will; the presupposition in all thinking of a Universal Reason.

What then is the logical character of our belief in such a Being? We cannot prove it by deduction; for there is nothing greater from which such a Being might be deduced. No major premise

can be found which will warrant so vast a conclusion. Neither by induction of an indefinite number of particulars can we arrive at an infinite being which includes them all. No mere aggregate of particulars can constitute the universal.

Is the belief in God then merely a working hypothesis, as President Schurman is content to call it? No. An hypothesis, as its etymology signifies, is something which we *put under* facts, in order to explain them. The Absolute Mind, however, is not something which we put behind nature and the mind of man to explain their agreement. It is there of itself. It is presupposed in the facts. It is the source of science and the foundation of morals. Were there no Absolute Mind, there could be no science; were there no Universal Will, there could be no firm basis for morality. Science and morality, however, are real, patent, indisputable facts. Therefore, that without which these facts could not be, must exist. If you have two mountains, you must have the valley between them, which by their very nature the mountains require as the condition of their own existence. If you have two bones which fit into each other, you have absolute proof of the prior existence of the whole animal body, with its other bones, its flesh and blood, its heart and lungs, its

nerves and muscles, without which these two bones, related to each other as they are, could not have come into being. Given the fact of these bones, and the organic relations between them, and the existence of the organism is not merely a hypothesis. It is a certainty. If the bones are facts, the body of which they were members must have been a fact as well.

The world and the self, and their correlation in science, are related members which fit into each other perfectly, and yet which are incomplete in themselves, and require One Infinite Reason for their explanation. The social order and the moral ideal again are likewise two mutually conditioned members, which presuppose for their rational interpretation an Absolute Will. The partial science of a given age is the witness and prophecy of an absolute standard of truth, a complete circle of knowledge, by which its propositions are judged to be true, of which its fragmentary discoveries are arcs and elements. The progressive moral order is likewise the gradual unfolding of a righteous purpose from which its institutions derive their stability and its precepts their authority. Since the truths of science are not subjective fancies, but are stubborn facts; since the laws and institutions of morality are not the products of

individual caprice, but eternal realities; therefore, the Absolute Reason and Eternal Righteousness which they reveal and presuppose must also be real, actual, objective; must exist.

God is not a mere hypothesis which we *put under* the facts; as subjective idealism claims. He is the hypostasis, in the literal meaning of the term, who *stands under* the facts, and gives them the reality they have. What the skeleton is to the constituent bones; what the solar system is to the included planets; what the family is to its members; what the nation is to the citizens; all that and more God is to every truth that man thinks after him and every law his universe contains. He is in all and through all and over all. He is immanent in each individual mind and each particular atom. Yet as an organism is more than the sum of its parts, God is transcendent in the sense that all particulars are but incomplete and fragmentary revelations of his mind and will.

This fundamental intuition that the mutually related, interdependent, finite facts of the world and the self involve as their necessary presupposition and only possible explanation the Absolute and Infinite, which cannot be cast in syllogistic form simply because it bears witness to the universal major premise on which all formal

reasoning rests, assures us that God exists. Does it tell us anything about him? Have we any right to identify the Absolute of philosophy with the God of religion? Does this line of thought justify us in calling him a person?

The whole cannot be less than its parts. The organism cannot be inferior to its constituent members. The infinite cannot exclude anything the finite contains. Now self-consciousness, personality, is the crowning glory of man, the highest of finite beings. Hence the Infinite Being whom all finite things and finite thoughts and finite beings presuppose cannot be less than self-conscious and personal. He includes all the thoughts and acts of finite persons in the unity of his larger thought and will; either approving or condemning them. He is as personal as we are; for in him we live and move and have our being. He is more of a person than we are; for the progressive thought of man is ever taking up into its science more and more of that body of truth which constitutes his eternal thought; and advancing civilization is steadily enlarging and improving the social structure which is the embodiment of his unfolding will.

There are limits to human personality, as there are limits to human stature and human strength.

But as God's omnipresence includes the space occupied by our bodies, without being limited to the outlines of our forms ; as God's omnipotence includes the strength of horses and oxen, without being confined to those modes of manifestation ; so the divine personality includes all that is positive in human personality, without being confined within the narrow limits of human finitude. As Lotze says, "Perfect personality is reconcilable only with the conception of an Infinite Being ; for finite beings only an approximation to this is attainable." Paulsen and Pfleiderer express the same thought when they say that God cannot by any possibility be infra-personal. If we take the personality of finite beings as the standard, it would be more correct to say that He is supra-personal. God is all that we know of personality ; and vastly more which we cannot comprehend. But since the unknown is to us the unmeaning, the most appropriate and the perfectly justifiable representation of his nature, is personality as we know it in ourselves. This is, to be sure, not the whole truth : but it is a genuine part of the truth ; the most valuable aspect of the truth ; and the one which best serves our practical spiritual needs. The thought of God as Infinite Spirit is thus warranted by philosophy and justified by religion.

Such a conception leaves indeed much that is unknown in the nature and the ways of God. That any reverent view must do. It, however, expressly excludes agnosticism. Any view of God which puts him before the universe in time, or behind it as a cause or force, or outside of it as mere creator and governor, leads ultimately to agnosticism. For knowledge draws its materials from the actual, the present, the immanent. And God must be found and known here or nowhere. The idea of God as Infinite Spirit; as Absolute Ground of all finite phenomena; as the Indwelling Self within all finite selves, is preëminently the idea of a known and infinitely knowable God. All our knowledge of nature is so far forth knowledge of God. All natural and moral laws are expressions of the Divine Thought and Will. All our consciousness of ourselves; all the expression of their deeper selves that men have wrought in history and uttered in literature are revelations of God. The source and standard of all accepted science and established institutions, the promise of ever-increasing discovery and the ideal and goal of ever-progressing morality, is God. He is partially known, progressively revealing himself, absolutely knowable. Not toward him as some "far-off divine event," but in him as the present and pervasive

life, including "all objects of all thought," the whole creation lives and moves. As we know just as much about a curve as we know about its constituent arcs; as we can construct, symbolically at least, the total curve from a very few given points; so we know as much about God as we know about ourselves and the world. From the facts and implications which the world and the self contain we can construct a representative conception, true as far as it goes, of the Absolute Being in whom self and the world are related elements, and of whom they are so far forth the authentic revelation and expression. The most important and significant of the data from which this representative conception must be constructed is the self-conscious personality of man. And any representation of God which excludes this element is not merely inadequate, as all symbolical representations must be, but it is needlessly inadequate, inasmuch as it deliberately omits from the formula of the infinite curve the most important datum given in the finite arc. The fact that we are persons; that we are incomplete and finite persons; that we know and recognize our incompleteness; that we are ever enlarging the sphere of our thought and will; that such enlargement is possible only in case there is an infinite sphere of

thought and will into which our own thought and will enters and which it progressively appropriates in the advancing science and civilization of the world; — this fact is all the evidence we need, the only evidence which the nature of the problem makes possible, of the personality of the Absolute. That in which our personality lives and moves and has its being; that which is the presupposition of personality in us, cannot be less than personal. That by which we think cannot be unthinking and unthought.

The conclusion which we have thus reached by reflection upon the dependent, relative, and finite character of phenomena, and especially of our own intellectual and moral experience, has been reached in the history of the race by a very long and gradual process. And yet at the heart of the whole process from first to last we find the recognition of the incompleteness of the finite, the dependence of the relative, and the endeavour to transcend that finitude and lay hold of the ground of that dependence.

First this ground of dependence is represented to the mind by the promiscuous personification of all sorts of natural objects. With deepening reflection, the spirit is separated from the object, and thus arises fetichism, or the attempt to control

the spirits which are supposed to dwell in natural objects. From this the transition to the worship of the spirits of departed ancestors is a natural advance. Increasing knowledge of the larger aspects and mightier forces of nature led to the worship of great nature-spirits, mythological divinities, in which were united the power of nature and the caprice of man. With the progress of civilization, man comes to be less and less dependent on the crude forces of external nature, and more and more dependent on moral, industrial, social, and political customs and institutions. And accordingly at this stage of development he reveres Gods of war, of wisdom, of craft, of love, protectors of homes, guardians of cities, rulers of nations. Next, if we may neglect the side currents of Oriental quietism, comes the recognition of a single World-Ruler who rules in righteousness all the nations of the earth; who is the upholder and vindicator of the one moral order which is common to all mankind. This consciousness of the One God was dimly apprehended by a few of the philosophers of Greece; but in clearest outline and most popular and effective form it was revealed to the Jews. Here was elaborated a ceremonial, which, if it shared the bloody and barbarous features of surrounding nations, still

was free from the two greatest defects of the contemporary religious cults, idolatry and licentiousness. Here was gradually developed the most just, humane, and merciful moral code the world had thus far known; and here to a degree far surpassing any other nation the duties of morality were identified with the service of God and enforced by the sanctions of religion. Here too were first heard the clear tones of prophet and psalmist, appealing from the letter of the law and the performance of the rite to the attitude of the heart and the spirit of the life; and declaring that the true service of God is the just administration of national and social affairs and the merciful treatment of one's fellowmen. Ethical monotheism, the doctrine that we depend upon and owe allegiance to One God who is the author and vindicator of the moral order and the social institutions of the world; this is the contribution of Israel to the religious life of man. And this doctrine is so true, so final, so beneficent, that, while its ritual is superseded, its code transcended, and all its local and peculiar setting outgrown; yet by virtue of this eternal truth which the history of the Hebrew race reveals with inimitable freshness and incomparable clearness, the history and literature of Israel is rightly regarded as *the* revelation of God.

This conception of a World-Governor, however, is not adequate to express the intimate identification of God with nature and humanity. Even government, especially when conceived after the analogy of the ancient monarchies, has an element of externality about it, which fails to express that union of the organism with its members which is the true figure under which we conceive God's relation to the world of men and things. Is there then any relation in which the distinction of personality is combined with the unity of sympathy and purpose? Is there any sphere in which, without destroying individuality, the life of the whole organism is distributed through each of the members, and gives that unity in the midst of differences which is the essence of social and spiritual life?

Yes; there is one such relation. It is found in the family. The family is the type of a spiritual or social life in which one body is composed of many members. The head and representative of the family is the father. The rule of the father over his family is not the imposition of a law from without; but is the assertion of the common interest of all as obligatory upon the will of each. The father is simply the head and representative of the total interest of the family in which each

member shares alike. He seeks not his individual will; but rather the good of all the members. The authority of the father is not an arbitrary law or a legal abstraction. It is simply the assertion of the common well-being.

Now this is precisely the relation in which the Absolute stands to the relative. This is the mode of union between the Infinite and the finite. It is in just this way that the Universal includes the particular. If then we are to express the relation of God to man by the symbol which is least inadequate and most suggestive of the truth, we shall call him, not Cause, nor Substance, nor Creator, nor Governor, but Father; as Jesus teaches us to do.

Still even here we must be on our guard against the material side of this symbol, which would lead us to regard the Father as one individual among or over others. The spiritual essence of fatherhood is the comprehensive thought, the sympathetic feeling, the devoted will, which makes the welfare of each member of the family the object of constant consideration, and unchanging affection, and unwearied devotion. God is our Father, because he is the all-embracing thought which includes each thought and action of every human mind; because he is the holy will which presents

the ideal of conduct and the demand of duty to every finite will; because he is the loving heart which finds no human soul alien to itself; because he is the bond which binds things and thoughts together; because he is the unity in which society and individuals find their common ground and from which they derive their mutual obligation; because he is the Spirit in whom we live and move and have our being; who is never far from any one of us, for we are his offspring.

CHAPTER II

THE REAL AND THE IDEAL — THE SON

In the first chapter we saw that all the phenomena of nature and all the interests of men are present to an Absolute Mind who includes them in the unity of one thought, and makes them the objects of one love. To this "personal Absolute whom faith calls God" we gave the name "Our Father," because the family life, and the father as its head and representative, is the best example we have of many individual members held together in the unity of a single spirit.

Belief in God most people take for granted. And yet the intuitive belief in God is apt to be a half-pictorial representation of a mighty individual, outside of the world, arbitrary in his decrees, remote from the daily life and foreign to the habitual thought of men. And while it is possible to develop an individualistic theology out of such a figurative conception of an external and arbitrary Being, it is impossible out of such a conception to develop a social theology, which will show the laws

of moral life and the forms of social institutions as essential expressions of the life of God in men. This belief in an Absolute Mind, even though we ascribe the name Father and attribute to him a kindly disposition, is only the foundation of theology. It answers well enough as an interpretation of nature, but the pantheistic optimism to which it gives rise is a poor defence against the wrongs and miseries, the struggle and competition, of actual life.

Life presents problems of its own, and brings out the deeper antithesis of the real and the ideal. The plant and animal have within themselves a principle which is different and distinct from that of the inanimate world. Being produced in connection with a definite environment, they are given a fair start; since unless the environment had been fitted to sustain them they could not have been produced. But nature's nursing period is brief. A new environment quickly follows upon the old; and to this new environment the original form is not fitted. It must become fit or perish. The chance of becoming fit is offered in the fact of variation and enormous fecundity. In the lower forms of life each individual or pair leaves a multitude of offspring; of which no two are exactly alike. Of this multitude those only which by

merit or fortune best fit the changed environment survive. And while what we may call accident plays a large part in determining which individuals of any given generation shall survive; in the course of many generations the survivals due to mere outward fortune are sifted out, and only those which are inherently fitted to the new conditions survive and reproduce. Heredity helps on the process of adjustment; though in what manner and to what extent is now a matter of dispute. The survival of the fittest is secured by a process of natural selection which is automatic as gravitation or chemical affinity.

Is natural selection a beneficent process? It certainly involves much suffering, and frightful slaughter. And yet it is difficult to see how any other process could be more merciful. To permit forms to outlive the state of things to which they were originally adapted would be not kindness but protracted cruelty. To give the ground to the less fit in preference to the more fit, would be unjust as well as unkind. Fitness is doubtless purchased at a high price. But unfitness would cost more and be worth less. Given the fact of evolution, and the purpose to develop independent organisms, capable of becoming centres of individual life, it is impossible to conceive how this pur-

pose could be accomplished better. Short of miraculous creation to begin with, and constant arbitrary interference from without, there is no way by which the price of the perfection of species could be lowered. And although special creation and external interference are phrases which seem to carry meaning; yet, when put to the test as an explanation of any world-process whatsoever, they would certainly break down under the weight of detail they would have to bear.

That the less perfect shall perish and the more perfect shall survive, that the real shall be in constant subjection to the ideal, is the inexorable law of nature in dealing with plant and animal, and savage man, and primitive races of men. Though severe, it cannot be called unjust or cruel; because the ends which evolution is accomplishing could not be had on easier terms. As Mr. Wallace says, "This struggle for existence really brings about the maximum of life and the enjoyment of life with the minimum of suffering and pain."

As we pass from the conscious animal up to self-conscious man the tragic struggle deepens. Under civilized conditions it becomes not so much a struggle between individuals as between ideals. Yet the essential features of the process are the same. Good conduct at any given time is conduct

which adjusts man to his social environment. But the social like the natural environment is in a slow but constant process of change.

> "New occasions teach new duties:
> Time makes ancient good uncouth."

The moment you secure a perfect adjustment, it becomes imperfect; because the social order to which the original adjustment was made has changed, and what perfectly fitted the old order for that very reason imperfectly fits the new. Hence every moral and social advance has to fight its way not merely against the bad who oppose all order, but against the traditionally good, who believe that the social order is constant, and that what has been the ideal adjustment in the past must remain the ideal of conduct for all time. These conscientious but short-sighted conservatives are always more bitter and powerful opponents of the new ideal than the unprincipled rabble. The worst enemy of the better is the good. It was the constituted authorities, the conservative aristocracy of Athens, not the lawless and irreligious masses, who condemned Socrates to drink the hemlock. It was the scribes and Pharisees and the chief priests and the principal men of Jerusalem who crucified Jesus.

Out of this perpetual change, which is the very essence of that process of evolution through which the world is passing, is born the struggle between the imperfect reality and the perfect ideal.

This conflict always manifests itself in a lower and a higher form. In the lower form it is the conflict between individuals who represent the uneliminated appetites and passions which were essential to an earlier stage of development, but which have been relatively outgrown by the present stage of civilization, on the one hand, and the law, which affirms the demand of the existing society, on the other. This is the simple conflict between good and bad as we ordinarily see it. A man wants to be as lustful and brutal as he was permitted and perhaps even encouraged to be in primitive savage conditions; but the law declares that such conduct is inconsistent with the welfare of the more advanced society of which he is a member; and punishes him if he violates the higher requirements of this more advanced social order. Here we see the imperfect standards of an outgrown past in collision with the more perfect standards of the actual present. The individual is behind society; and society is trying to drag him ahead.

The higher form of this struggle comes between

the law as the representative of the existing order; or rather of the order which existed when the law was framed; and the individuals who see the vision of the better order that is about to be, and demand institutions, customs, standards, duties, liberties large enough to meet the requirements of the social order that has come into being since the law was made, or stands ready to come as soon as the hard crust of the old order can be broken so as to give the new life room. Here society is behind the individual, and is trying to hold him back. Thus the average good man is equally at war with the bad man who is below him and the progressively good man who is above him. The reformer and the criminal are about equally obnoxious to the man of average goodness and intelligence. The prophets and the betrayers of their country are equally odious and promiscuously stoned. The Saviour is crucified between two thieves.

The case of the bad man, the problem of sin, will be considered later. The progressively good man requires interpretation.

Mr. Benjamin Kidd, in his *Social Evolution*, has brought out with great clearness and force the antagonism between the interests of the social organism and the interests of its individual mem-

bers; and has gone so far as to assert that we never can find "any universal rational sanction for individual conduct in a progressive society." He recognizes indeed that such sacrifice of individual to social interests is the most persistent fact of history; but he explains such conduct by the "ultra-rational sanction" of religion.

The question all turns on what we conceive to be the essential nature of man. Is he essentially a bundle of animal appetites and passions, supported for a little while by a framework of bone; wrapped up for a season in a blanket of flesh; lighted by a flickering candle of intelligence, just sufficient to show him the objects by which he may gratify these animal appetites and passions? If the appetites are the man and intelligence is his adjunct and instrument; then indeed the antagonism between such an individual and society is, as Mr. Kidd tells us, hopeless and irreconcilable; and the only hope of getting social conduct out of him is some "ultra-rational sanction" which shall startle him into a wholesome fear of penalties, or shock him into a prudent concern for his fate in the hereafter.

Such an abstract individual; such an animal in human form, however, nowhere exists. It is a fiction of the imagination, to which no real

being corresponds. *Unus homo, nullus homo.* One man alone is no man at all. The very essence of man is determined by his relations to other men and things, and ultimately to the Absolute Ground of all relationships. And reason is the consciousness of these relations; and involves in latent form at least the reverent recognition of that ultimate relation. Reason is the man; and the physical nature, with its appetites and passions, is indeed the essential instrument and support of the man, but not his essential nature. If reason and appetite come into conflict, as to some extent they perpetually do, the man who will realize his essential self must sacrifice, not his reason to his appetite, but his appetite to his reason. For this is the better part. Reason is not, as Mr. Kidd represents it, "the most profoundly individualistic, anti-social, anti-evolutionary, and disintegrating of all human qualities." Reason is the common bond that binds mankind together. The service of society is not, as Mr. Kidd assumes, the sacrifice of the individual: it is his gratification and realization. Though labour leaders and socialistic agitators usually appeal to selfishness, yet it is not the selfishness of the working men; it is their nobleness, their fidelity to what they believe to be a principle, their loyalty

to their order or union or class, which responds to these appeals, and gives to strikes and labour movements whatever strength they have. It is not individualism but a new manifestation of the social spirit that is blindly struggling for expression in the labour movements of our day.

Now the good man, whether he is the man of average virtue who sacrifices his private gratification in obedience to the law; or whether he is the leader and reformer who sacrifices the good esteem of his fellows and the commendation of the existing society to promote that better adjustment of men and society to each other which is the condition of progress; — the good man in either case is simply the man who sees a larger sphere of reason than the bad man; who recognizes that this larger reason is the expression of his own true nature and his better self; and who faithfully identifies himself with the cause of that larger reason wherein he sees revealed the fuller possibilities of his own rational nature.

If he sees merely a little fragment of the larger truth, and takes that for the whole, and regards it as ultimate, as, for example, was the case with some of the anti-slavery agitators, and is the case with a good many temperance reformers to-day; then he is merely a moral reformer: and probably

as he grows older he will grow narrower and harder, and ultimately become one of the most hide-bound of obstructionists. He has merely set one finite bit of truth over against another finite bit of truth; the fact that his bit is a little bigger than the bit which he opposes makes him a useful man as long as the fight is along that particular line; but invariably leaves him a conceited, soured, impracticable, and useless man after that particular issue is settled.

If the good man, whether of one type or the other, for both are essentially the same, sees the social interest for which he sacrifices his private gratification, as part of an infinite whole; if he sees the society of which he is a member, or the social order he is trying to introduce, as a stage in the one continuous process by which men are becoming at the same time more perfect in themselves and more perfectly adjusted to each other; then he is a religious man, and the victory over one private appetite, or the triumph over one public wrong, will make him the more eager and strenuous to attack a new abuse and respond to a new duty. Not until we get beyond this or that particular application of moral and spiritual law to the universal principle of love which is the foundation and fulfilment of the law, not until we reach the

standpoint of Jesus, do we reach the ultimate religious relation of perfect sonship to God. Morality makes a whole of a small part. Religion makes the part a member of the great whole. Religion is essentially social; and sonship to God and social service are related to each other as the emotional and the practical aspects of the same thing. Unselfish service of the social order by the individual member is a filial act. It is a revelation of the sonship of man to God.

What then is sonship? Who is the Son of God? The Son of God is he who, in the cramping limitations of space, under the evanescent form of time, with the finite instrument of flesh, and with the partial knowledge which is conditioned by a particular human brain, still sees nature as the expression of an omniscient Mind; beholds human society as the unfolding of one universal Will; recognizes every man as the potential reproduction of the thought and will of the Father; accepts every duty and relationship of life as an opportunity to do the will of the Father, and to bring men to the consciousness of their sonship to God and their brotherhood with each other. Sonship consists in the perception of the Divine Ideal in every concrete situation; and the striving to realize that ideal even in the most unideal condi-

tions. It means the healing of the sick; the comforting of those in sorrow; the relief of the poor; the instruction of the ignorant; the reproof of the wayward; the exposure of the hypocrite; the overthrow of the extortioner; the forgiveness of the penitent; the encouragement of the weak; the succour of the tempted; the emancipation of the prisoner; the solace of mourners at the funeral; the blessing of little children; the provision for the necessities of old age; the imparting of courage to do the work of life and serenity to meet the hour of death; the utterance of truth even when it is most unwelcome; and the doing of duty even at the cost of life itself. It is the filling of the finite with its infinite significance; it is the fulfilment of relations in the light of their absolute ground; it is the treatment of men in the light of their common sonship to the Father; it is the doing of duty as the reasonable requirement of God.

Such is our *a priori* conception of what the Son of God would be, were he to come into the world. Revelation of this sonship has been progressive. The lawgiver and the prophet have stood a little in advance of their times, and in the name of the eternal reason and righteousness have beckoned their followers step by step toward juster institu-

tions and more humane ideals. Sons of God they all have been to whom the word of God has come, in so far as they have been conscious that the institutions and standards they have set up have been grounded in an eternal process of development through which the universal will of God is being unfolded in time and expressed in humanity. Yet even the prophet, though he recognizes the larger reason of which his message is a partial declaration, in so far as he fails to catch the spirit and grasp the principle of the deeper reason and the larger life, remains only half emancipated; a servant rather than a fully conscious son. The prophet is great; but not the greatest. As Jesus said of John the Baptist, the burning prophet who at the cost of his life proclaimed certain fundamental duties in the face of oppressive power and in the hearing of guilty ears, "Among them that are born of women there is none greater than John: yet he that is but little in the kingdom of God is greater than he." Is this conception realized? Is there a historic person who corresponds to this definition? After all the ages of imperfection and laborious progress, has the Perfect come? Has the Son of God appeared?

The consensus of the competent in spiritual

things has been almost unanimous in ascribing this title to Jesus of Nazareth. Not always on the wisest grounds; not always with the deepest insight; not always with the clearest conceptions of the consequences which ought to follow such a confession; the world has accepted him as the Son of God, the incarnation of the Divine Truth and the revelation of the Father's love.

The *a priori* conception of what a Son of God should be and the Gospel account of Jesus of Nazareth exactly coincide. Even if it is urged that the Gospel narrative is itself an idealized portrayal, that does not destroy its force. Every account of a historical character, by the elimination of irrelevant detail, by the emphasis upon leading traits, by the sacrifice of the insignificant and trivial to the essential and the significant, is and must be an idealization. But the fundamental outlines, even of an ideal representation, must be real. No other character ever lived of whose teaching and life we know so much, who could stand such an idealization without making the incongruity of the real and the ideal manifest. And if it is urged that the Gospel of John is drawn from a contemplation of the ideal Son rather than from acquaintance with the historic Jesus, still the fact that the plain story of the Synoptics and the ideal

representation of the Fourth Gospel fit so well together is the strongest possible proof that in Christ we have the union of the ideal and the real, the eternal and the historic, God and man.

Jesus was tested at all the vital points. The lust of the flesh, the fascination of power, the pride of life, all presented themselves to his youthful ambition. And he met them all, not with the greater pride of self-sufficient virtue, but with the filial humility of one conscious of the Father whose commandment he was to obey and whose will he was to do. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

The appeal of innocent childhood, the claim of sickness, the necessities of the poor, the misery of the social outcast, the sadder tale of guilt and shame, all were presented to him; and he met them all with that tenderness and helpfulness and sympathy and forgiveness which a human father bestows upon his child, and which he declared the Heavenly Father bestows on all his children.

On the other hand, he met hypocrisy with exposure, crafty questions with more crafty refutations. He pricked the bubble of conceit and laid bare the hideous features of pride wherever he found them.

He held fast to the nothingness of all that is not rooted and grounded in God. "Every plant which my heavenly Father planted not shall be rooted up." He refused to act from motives of personal prudence; rejecting such counsel with the words, "Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou art a stumblingblock unto me: for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men." He based all greatness on humility and service, and taught that the standard of forgiveness is not finite endurance but infinite love. "Whosoever shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven." "I say not unto thee, Until seven times; but, Until seventy times seven."

He scorned flattery; had none of that self-conscious goodness to which flattery appeals, and which we all despise. A young man once tried it. He came and kneeled to him and called him good. Jesus promptly asked him, "Why do you call me 'good'? There is only one who is good, that is God." This passage has puzzled the commentators, intent on making out for Jesus an artificial and ready-made divinity. But rightly understood, it reveals the simplicity and modesty and genuineness of Jesus' character as no other text in Scripture does; and lifts him clear up out of the

level of ordinary human virtue with its pride and conceit and self-consciousness onto the divine level of a love that is so devoted to its object and its work that it does not stop to think of self at all.

The way to become conscious of one's own personal goodness, and to impress the sense of it upon others, had been reduced to a very elaborate system in Jesus' day. The Pharisees were masters of this precious and proper and precise goodness, which knows just how good it is and how it came to be so: and Jesus treated the whole miserable business with contempt; telling his disciples that if they could not develop a better type of piety than that, he had no use for them.

Jesus took for his task nothing less than the gigantic work of stripping religion of all its counterfeits and superfluities; of teaching each individual to revere and love the Author of his being as his Father and his Friend; of training each individual to regard every other person as his brother, with rights to be respected and interests to be served as generously and faithfully as if they were one's own. Thus he made the service of God so simple and so real that a child might be sure of the heavenly Father's favour as often as he tried to do right and was sorry for having done wrong, and the life of man so noble and so

sweet that even the humblest might share its highest privileges and holiest joys. He believed in a living God, now working in the world; and he accepted it as his mission to work with him. "My Father worketh even until now, and I work. We must work the work of him that sent me, while it is day; the night cometh when no man can work."

He was the friend of publicans and sinners; measuring his service not by the deserts but by the needs of his fellows; following the example of the Father who maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust. He met opposition with determination, endured indignities with serenity, and faced death with courage. When told that Herod desired to kill him and advised to "get out and go hence," he replied, "Go and say to that fox, Behold I cast out devils and perform cures to-day and to-morrow; and the third day I am perfected. Howbeit I must go on my way to-day and to-morrow and the day following."

He would have no compromise with fraud and wrong. He found the temple service formal, mercenary, extortionate. It was in the hands of a pontifical clique, an ecclesiastical ring, that had elaborated an expensive ritual, and

then formed a monopoly in the means for its observance. Out of the charges, commissions, and brokerage incidental to this worship they were making a luxurious living for themselves. By this manipulation of public worship for private profit the chief-priests and their confederates had acquired wealth, and the power and influence wealth knows how to buy.

This whole system was the exact opposite of that immediate trust in a loving Father which Jesus felt in his own heart, and was striving to impart to men. Conflict was inevitable; and Jesus saw clearly what would be the outcome. On the one side was venerated custom, sacred precedent, established authority, and all the machinery to make authority effective, intrenched in the temple at the nation's capital. On the other hand he stood alone, with his little band of half-trained pupils from an obscure and despised province. And yet, knowing perfectly well that attack on the party in power meant death to himself, what did he do? "And he found in the temple those that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the changers of money, sitting; and he made a scourge of cords, and cast all out of the temple, both the sheep and the oxen; and he poured out the changers'

money, and overthrew their tables; and to them that sold doves he said, Take these things hence; make not my Father's house a house of merchandise."

We know the consequence. We know how he refused to demean himself before the Roman Procurator, to save his life; how almost with his last breath he made thoughtful provision for his mother in the home of his best friend; and died pitying the ignorance and praying for the forgiveness of his murderers.

Make your conception of what the Son of God should be as high as you please. Put into it all you have known or can conceive of righteousness, and love, and truth, and tenderness, and constancy, and courage; and you cannot put into it a single trait of moral character, a single quality of spiritual grace, a single principle of social service which has not its counterpart and its embodiment in the Gospel story of Jesus' life and death.

He did the grandest work ever conceived by man; he did it in the spirit of gentleness and tenderness to all whom he could help and bless; he did it in defiance of all that corrupt influence and unscrupulous power could bring against him; he did it in the serene certainty that it would cost his life.

If the doing of beneficent work with constancy and courage, in kindness and in love; if the strenuous resistance of unrighteous power, even unto blood; if the faithful witness to the truth in the face of hypocrisy, and fidelity to duty in the hour of death; — if these are our conceptions of how God would manifest himself in human history if he were to manifest himself at all; then Jesus has the obvious right to be accepted and worshipped as the Son of God; the authentic revelation and perfect incarnation of the divine in human history and human form.

This title, Son of God, was not the one which Jesus gave himself. In the Synoptic Gospels he does not use it once, although he speaks of himself as the Son of Man sixty-nine times. It is a title which his life and character drew forth from those who witnessed it and undertook to interpret it. "Truly," says the centurion, "this was the Son of God." So says the Fourth Gospel, in its attempt to give the historic person his ideal and eternal setting. So has replied the faith of eighteen centuries.

The perfection of humanity is the revelation of divinity. Christ is the fulness of the Godhead bodily: all of the divine nature and spirit that can be manifested in human form. Christ is the God-

man. He reveals at the same time how human is the heart of God, and how divine may be the life of man. His divinity is not a remote inference from the fulfilment of prediction and the exhibition of signs and wonders. It is the manifestation of those moral virtues and spiritual graces; it is the exemplification of those social principles and ethical laws which we all recognize as the principles on which the world is founded and the laws on which society must rest. In revealing the ideal or end toward which humanity is progressing, and in which society will find its ultimate realization, he at the same time reveals the divine purpose which was in the beginning, by which and for which the world was created. What is last in the order of time is first in the order of thought. That the Son realizes the purpose of the Father in the process of time, shows that he was with the Father in the beginning.

As the whole life and activity of the Son would be inexplicable without the Father, whose will the Son does, and whose messenger he is, so the Father would not be a social and spiritual being, that is he would not be a person, without the eternal Son, or Logos, in whom to take delight, through whom to express his purpose, and in whom to find that relationship of self to not

self, without which personality is but an empty shadow.

When we spoke of the Absolute as our Father in the last chapter, it was hardly warranted by the stage of development our thought had there reached. It was an anticipation; though an anticipation which the ancient world had made before Christ came. That God is our Father we might discover by reflecting on our own dependence and relativity. What God is, what fatherhood means, we can only know through the perfect embodiment of his loving will in the person of his well-beloved Son. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

By virtue of his perfect obedience Christ is God in humanity. He is the Mediator between God and man. He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father. He that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me. No man cometh unto the Father but by me. My Father and I are one. Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other. Lines parallel to the same straight line are parallel to each other. Contact with a good conductor of the electric current is equivalent to contact with the battery which generates the current. Learning from the perfectly intelli-

gent and sympathetic and competent pupil is equivalent to learning from the original teacher. All we know of the spiritual nature of God comes to us in its complete form and in its ultimate principle in the person of Jesus Christ.

The attempt to approach God apart from Christ, to conceive God otherwise than through the expression he has made of himself in Christ, involves either an impoverishment and indefiniteness in the conception of God; or else it involves the ascription to him of attributes which Christ revealed, without acknowledging the medium through which the revelation came. The former course is intellectually more consistent; but it is spiritually fatal. After a generation or two this tendency fades out into mysticism, evaporates into pantheism, or shrivels up into hard, dry rationalism. The latter tendency is intellectually inconsistent; but it explains the fact that some of the most devout and earnest Christians of the present day are to be found among those who have dropped from their formal creed the doctrine of the divinity of Christ.

The Unitarian objection to the doctrine of the divinity of Christ is forcibly stated in the following passage from a sermon by the Rev. J. T. Sunderland, on the subject, "Was Jesus God?"

"A God pinched and compressed into the limit of our finite humanity, becomes thereby of necessity a very meagre and small God. Jesus, born as a babe, and in a few years dying; during his boyhood growing in knowledge as you and I do; after he was a man sometimes disappointed; trying to accomplish ends, and again and again failing because of opposition; declaring that there were some things that he did not know;—furnishes a picture of a God so meagre, so inadequate, so like the little gods that the heathen believe in, that we instinctively push it aside, and demand for our worship something infinitely higher and larger—lifted wholly out of the category of this finiteness."

At first sight this line of objection seems irrefutable. It seems to reduce the belief in the divinity of Christ to the most absurd product of childish credulity. Apparently, the believers in the divinity of Christ are guilty of imposing on God the most cramping and confining of limitations.

In reality, the objector himself is subjecting the conception of God to the most serious and fatal of all limitations. He is denying to God the power of appearing in finite form; of revealing himself in terms of humanity. A God thus incapable of self-revelation would be the most impotent and useless being conceivable. He would be no God

at all. He would be merely the unknowable abstraction of agnosticism. We have no predicates, save such as we draw from our finite experience. God must be known in terms of nature and humanity, or else he cannot be known at all. As Professor Andrew Seth has said, "We speak most truly, and most in accordance with the real nature of things, when we characterize the Absolute in terms of the best we know." Jesus Christ is the best we know or can conceive of moral and spiritual excellence. Therefore, either Christ must be the revelation and incarnation of God to us, or else God will be to our thinking a mere name; and his attributes will all resolve themselves into sesquipedalian negations.

The true Infinite does not dwell remote and inaccessible, in some immaterial realm of pure ideas, like that with which Plato endeavoured to solve the problem of the rationality of the universe. Goethe is right when he says, "Wer grosses will muss sich beschränken können." Greatness depends on definiteness and limitation. As Goethe says again:

> "Willst du ins Unendliche schreiten,
> Geh nur im Endlichen nach allen Seiten."

The only Infinite we can conceive is to be found in

the symmetrical fulfilment of finite relationships. We seem to be paying the highest compliments to God when we try to "lift him wholly out of the category of this finiteness." The difficulty is that when we have gone through the list of these doubtful and negative compliments, there remains nothing definite, or conceivable, or knowable, or lovable, or worshipful, to which our thought and devotion and worship can direct itself. In our excessive politeness we have bowed our God out of the universe. In denying him the possibility of manifestation in the limitations and finitude of humanity, we have reduced our conception of him to that abstract being which is the same thing as nothing.

Unitarianism has been of immense service as a critic of the extravagances and excrescences of orthodox tradition. In performing this service it has, in great measure, made the fatal mistake of accepting the deistic conception of God. Unitarianism has helped to save others: itself it cannot save. Between acceptance of the incarnation and agnosticism there are several way-stations where the practical worker may tarry and the devout spirit may rest. But between these two positions there is no permanent and enduring philosophical foundation on which one can rear a consistent and positive conception of a personal

God. One might as well try to see the sun by closing his eyes to the rays of light which proceed from it; one might as well try to get at the thought of an author by refusing to read the book he has written; as try to think of God's spiritual nature in other terms than those which are expressed in the personality of Christ.

Belief in the divinity of Christ does not rest on such narratives as the accounts of the "Gospel of the Infancy," introduced into the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke; and is entirely independent of the question whether we interpret these narratives as fact or fancy, poetry or prose. Any attempt to base the belief in the divinity of Christ on the miraculous is sure to alienate multitudes of honest minds; who will thus be led to regard it as simply one among the many deifications of saints and heroes with which the legends of antiquity abound.

The greater portion of the signs and wonders which the Gospel narrative attributes to Jesus, are much more credible now than they were twenty or thirty years ago. We see that they involve of necessity no violation of law; but simply the introduction of higher forms of force. The law of gravitation is not violated when chemical affinity lifts up what gravitation tends to pull down. The law of chemical affinity is not violated

when the vital force in the root-hair of a plant breaks apart what chemical affinity tends to hold together. Physiological law is not violated when mental influences produce results the exact opposite of what physiological conditions alone tend to produce. The phenomena of hypnotism; the various forms of mental therapeutics; and many other phenomena which psychical research is bringing to light, render it impossible to deny that a unique personality might heal physical, mental, and moral disease, and even appear after death to the sight of those who had intensely loved him. Yet just in proportion as the credibility of signs and wonders is increased, their evidential value is diminished. The argument for the divinity of Christ from prophecy and miracles is absolutely destitute of cogency for the representative modern mind. Miracles are at best merely the scaffolding or decoration, not the foundation and substance of Christian faith. Ten times the miracles ascribed to Jesus, supported by ten times the evidence, would not be sufficient to convince us that Nero was the Son of God.

The divinity of Christ is merely a question of the agreement of two conceptions: the conception of the spiritual character and will of God; and

the historic narrative of the life and work of Jesus Christ. That the Father is greater than the Son is evident. But that in the moral and spiritual points in which the two can coincide they agree; this is all that the believers in Christ's divinity affirm. If there is an essential spiritual attribute known to us of God which Jesus did not embody in his life and express in his teaching; if on the other hand there is a single authentic trait or practice in the character and life of Jesus which falls below our ideal of divineness of character and conduct; then, indeed, we shall have to agree that Jesus is merely a man like other men, not only in natural endowments but in spiritual attainments.

If, however, these two conceptions coincide; if Father and Son are correlative terms; then to ignore or to deny the divinity and Sonship of Christ is to deny God; or at best to substitute for the concrete and personal revelation he has made of himself in history some vague abstraction of the philosophic mind. It is to go back to Paganism without the charm of its mythology; or to embrace positivism with the most precious fact in history eliminated, and the most attractive person in the race dethroned. It is to return to the vagueness and generality in which our first chapter left us.

The supra-personal God of philosophic speculation will never win the heart and mould the will of the masses of mankind to the finer issues of the spiritual life. He who is to rule the human heart must be himself human; touched with the feeling of our infirmities; tempted in all points like as we are. Such a Lord and Master, such a Son of God, the world has found in Jesus Christ. Shall we not, as Robert Browning says:

"Call Christ, then, the illimitable God?"

"The very God! think, Abib; dost thou think?
So, the All-Great, were the All-Loving too—
So through the thunder comes a human voice
Saying, 'O heart I made, a heart beats here!
Face, my hands fashioned, see it in myself!
Thou hast no power nor may'st conceive of mine,
But love I gave thee, with myself to love,
And thou must love me who hast died for thee.'"

CHAPTER III

THE NATURAL AND THE SPIRITUAL — THE HOLY SPIRIT

By nature man is the descendant of unnumbered animal ancestors, who have been slowly transformed through successive eons of geological time. Physically he is but a slight relative modification of the highest apes. Mentally he depends upon an essentially similar, though much more complex brain and nervous system. All his physical appetites and passions are common to him with the lower animals.

One power, however, which they lack he has. As Locke puts it, "Brutes abstract not." To single out the essential principle from its accidental embodiment; to deal with general ideas; to see things in their relations to each other as distinct from their relations to the individual percipient; to become identified with a wide range of objective interests; to transcend one's own petty individuality, and live as a conscious member of a social whole; this, as Romanes has

conclusively shown, beyond its faintest instinctive anticipations is impossible to the animal and is the exclusive prerogative of man.

Yet, while possible for man, this larger life is not natural; in the sense that it is the course toward which his impulses urge him. It is not the line of least resistance. For reason in its highest form is a late acquisition of the race; while the animal appetites and passions have tens of thousands of years of heredity behind them; and many of them were the conditions of survival by which the race was saved from extinction in earlier stages of the struggle for existence.

To be sure there is a second principle, which Professor Drummond calls the struggle for the life of others, developing side by side with the struggle for individual life. Yet the altruistic or reproductive principle in the animal is as blind and instinctive, as little ethical and consciously rational, as is the egoistic principle. It is ultimately grounded in the physical necessity which compels a growing cell to divide in order to secure wall-surface sufficient for its bulk. And though this reproductive principle is the soil in which the social virtues have been nourished, yet it is so far from being sufficient of itself to support them that in man the most selfish and cruel and loath-

some of his vices spring from the abuse and perversion of this very function.

Making all due allowance for instinctive altruism, and the altruistic anticipations wrapped up in reproduction and maternity, the fact remains that it is natural for each individual to look out for number one. Looking out for the interest of number one may, indeed, involve gratifications of appetite, indulgences of passion, which benefit number two and number three; but such incidental benefits are to be credited to the beneficent tendency of things rather than to the social virtue of the individual. Call it with Darwin the survival of tendencies once necessary in the struggle for existence, but no longer so; call it with Kant the bad principle in human nature; call it with Calvin total depravity and original sin; call it with the refined selfishness, or with the vulgar meanness; call it with the Bible sin; the fact remains that the principle of life with which we all start out and which we find it easiest to follow is a tendency to assert the interest of the individual as against the interest of others and of society, whenever the two interests conflict.

As we saw in our last chapter, Mr. Kidd is right in his assertion that there is no rational

sanction for social conduct, provided you assume that the individual is complete in himself. And that is precisely the assumption which nature is constantly prompting each one of us to make.

Our interminable line of animal ancestry, and the fact that each child reproduces in himself the main features of historic evolution, give to the selfish, individualistic principle the start to begin with, and the inside track throughout the entire course of the moral race. "That is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; then that which is spiritual." The raw material of life comes to us in the form of sensuous impulses; which in themselves are neither good or bad; but may become either, according to the uses that we make of them.

Now the outcome of such a state of nature in which each man should do what unrestrained nature prompts, would be intolerable. We should have a state of internecine strife. As Hobbes, who has most clearly depicted the consequences of unrestrained nature, declares, possession would be precarious, life insecure, and the whole life of man would be "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, short." Some other principle must come into life than the raw material of selfish impulse, if life is to be tolerable, and society is to endure.

Over against the natural stands the spiritual. By virtue of his reason man can transcend the immediate impulses of his animal nature; he can represent to himself the interests of others as equal to his own in reality and worth; he can merge his private self in the larger life of society, and compel his natural impulses to obey the dictates of reason and serve the wider interests which reason represents. The spiritual life, therefore, is the realization of reason; while the natural life is the gratification of appetite. In the eye of reason selfishness is an illusion. Selfishness says these keen appetites and hot passions of mine are the things of supreme moment in the world. They alone are urgent, vital, peremptory. Reason says there are thousands of beings whose appetites and passions are of just as much consequence to them as mine are to me. Furthermore, reason points out that the promiscuous gratification of appetite and passion would bring but a short-lived and precarious pleasure, while it would inflict permanent and irretrievable pain. All this even the hedonist admits. Reason, however, goes a step further, and declares that it has pleasures of its own. Reason demands that its own ideal of a harmonious and mutually helpful social organism shall be made real; and it declares that the consciousness of

being a worthy member of the social organism is of itself a nobler and higher satisfaction than the poor, petty, sensuous indulgences which it bids us sacrifice. Spirit is reason realized in personality. The spiritual life is the universal life; the life determined by reason.

The spiritual first presents itself as the merely prudential. Natural impulse aims only at the immediate present. Reason soon discovers that the gratification of separate impulses in successive moments conflict. A happy to-day may be bought too dearly if it brings a wretched to-morrow. A frivolous and rollicking youth may not be worth the premature and disconsolate old age it invariably brings. Reason demands that to-day and to-morrow, youth and old age, shall be so related to each other that the outcome shall be a consistent and satisfactory whole. Reason presents the ideal of the whole of life as the standard by which to test the worth of each constituent part. This substitution of the happiness of a lifetime for the pleasure of the moment, this rise from the Cyrenaic to the Epicurean view, is the first stage in the spiritualizing of life.

The maxims of Theognis, the proverbs of Solomon, the counsels of Benjamin Franklin in *Poor Richard's Almanac*, are literary expressions of this

spiritual stage. It will repay us to examine carefully what is involved in this first effort of reason to regulate life. My immediate present appetite is all that nature or sense presents to me at this particular moment. To-morrow is not real to-day. Old age is not an actual fact present to the sensuous experience of the youth. To-morrow and old age are not facts of sense, but ideal representations of reason. They do not exist in the actual world which sense now presses upon me. They are parts of the larger world in which reason tells me this sensuous present is but a single and relatively unimportant fragment. Reason, therefore, bids me subordinate this fleeting and fragmentary present to the total and abiding life. Reason bids us treat the moment, not as an isolated self-sufficient thing, but as an element in a larger whole. It bids us rise from the temporal to the eternal point of view. It bids us treat the ideal future as of equal worth with existing present fact.

Now we have only to carry this same process one step farther to get the ultimate spiritual life. Add the absent in space to the absent in time; make what is actual in the experience of people outside of us in space as real and regulative a consideration in our conduct as what is inwardly present in our own personal experience; and we have

the insight which shows our individual lives as members of the great life of the world. Then from the point of view of reason we shall behold our little selves as they really are; members of the one great life of society. To recognize that my neighbour is as real as myself is the second stage of the spiritual life. Professor Royce has put this matter very clearly. "Thy neighbour is as actual, as concrete, as thou art. Just as thy future is real, though not now thine, so thy neighbour is real, though his thoughts never are thy thoughts. If he is real like thee, then is his life as bright a light, as warm a fire, to him, as thine to thee; his will is as full of struggling desires, of hard problems, of fateful decisions; his pains are as hateful, his joys as dear. Take whatever thou knowest of desire and of striving, of burning love and fierce hatred, realize as fully as thou canst what that means, and then with clear certainty add: Such as that is for me, so it is for him, nothing less. In all the songs of the forest birds; in all the cries of the wounded and dying, struggling in the captor's power; in the boundless sea, where the myriads of water-creatures strive and die; amid all the countless hordes of savage men; in the hearts of all the good and loving; in the dull, throbbing hearts of all prisoners and captives; in

all sickness and sorrow; in all exultation and hope; in all our devotion; in all our knowledge, — everywhere from the lowest to the noblest creatures and experiences of our earth, the same conscious, burning wilful life is found, endlessly manifold as the forms of living creatures, unquenchable as the fires of the sun, real as these impulses that even now throb in thy own little selfish heart. Lift up thy eyes, behold that life, and then turn away and forget it as thou canst; but if thou hast known that, thou hast begun to know thy duty."

The third stage of the spiritual life is the necessary complement of the second. For these other wills of whose reality reason and reflection make us aware, are in competition and conflict. Just as the isolated appetites of the individual conflict with each other, and can be solved only as they are subordinated to a permanent ideal of life as a whole; and as this individual ideal could be found only in relation to the other wills with whom we stand in social relations; so the individual wills of men are in strife and antagonism; and that strife can be harmonized only as we rise to the point where we can see them in the light of the one universal will. To give everybody just what they want is neither possible nor desirable; even after you have come to appreciate what their wants are.

To give them what is best as distinct from what is most desired, is the spiritual problem. And this involves having an ideal of their social relations and social condition. The ideal is social. It is universal. It carries us back to the universal thought and will; and shows us that what we found to be a necessity of thought is an equally imperative necessity for conduct.

The spirit of social service is the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father; for if there were no absolute and eternal thought and will binding all men together in the unity of one conception and one purpose; then it would be "ultra-rational," absurd, to live a life in which the social good should be the aim of individual endeavour. The Holy Spirit is the realization of the will of God in the life of humanity. The Holy Spirit also "proceeds from the Son," as the later creed rightly affirms; for without the example and inspiration of one to whom the Spirit was given without measure, and who embodies the perfection of the Father's will and manifests the completeness of the principle of social service, the reproduction of the divine life among frail, finite men would have been feeble, fickle, and fragmentary. The Holy Spirit is Christ multiplied into individuals, and reproduced in institutions. The

Holy Spirit is the fellowship of the many brethren among whom Christ is the first-born.

The Holy Spirit is equally divine with the Father and the Son; and with them is to be worshipped and glorified. The same reasoning which makes the Son equal to the Father in all spiritual things, makes the Holy Spirit equal to both. Jesus said not only, "He that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me"; but also, "He that receiveth you receiveth me." If the purpose to establish in humanity a kingdom of love and mutual good-will is the essential thought and will of the Father; then he who came to make that purpose actual in history by his teaching, his example, and his inspiration — in other words, the Christ — is also divine, for he is the embodiment in outward fact of what God is in inmost thought. And if the revelation of this thought and the doing of this will makes Christ divine; then the life of every individual man who receives this thought into his mind and makes this purpose the object of his will becomes therein a recipient of the life and spirit of God; a temple in whom the Holy Spirit dwells. And the Spirit of God dwelling in the hearts and lives of men is no less divine than the thought and will which this Spirit embodies; no less divine than the historic person through whom in its fulness

and completeness this same thought and will first became manifest.

The Holy Spirit is the thought of God, the life of Christ, reproduced in those who obey God and follow Christ. As Jesus promised his disciples, "He shall be in you." And God in man is in no wise inferior to God in nature; God unfolding his thought and working out his purpose through individuals in time is not inferior to God abiding in his perfect thought throughout eternity.

Yes: the Holy Spirit is of the same essence as the Father, as the old creeds profoundly teach. If this is meaningless jargon to modern ears, it is because we have missed the intimate relation in which God stands to man and man to God. As Dr. Bushnell said a generation ago: "We think of the Holy Spirit as of some impersonal force, some hidden fire, some holy gale, not such a Spirit as, living in us, keeps the sensibilities even of Gethsemane and the passion in immediate contact with our inmost life." The Holy Spirit is the meeting-point between the actuality of God and the possibility of man. Just in so far as we rise above the crude, selfish impulses of our immediate animal nature, to that precise extent does God come down into us, and make his abode with us. And the indwelling God, the self-transcend-

ing life of social service, is the presence of the Holy Spirit in our hearts and lives. To deny the divinity of the Son and the Spirit, is to reduce the conception of God to that of a blank, self-identical nonentity; to banish him from the whole course of history and the entire sphere of reality; and to leave man without reliable guidance or personal inspiration in the spiritual life. In place of a living, growing consciousness of a personal Father, a personal Master, a personal Companion; such a denial drives man into a blind acceptance of unverified tradition; a perfunctory observance of unintelligible rites; or a rationalistic reliance upon cold hard crumbs of finite fact, to give to life its lost semblance of an infinite significance.

In succeeding chapters we have considered the Father, the Son, and the Spirit as distinct objects of thought, reached by distinct lines of reflection. The Father is the Absolute Ground of the phenomena of nature and the progressive movement of history. The Son is the incarnation of the divine in humanity and the champion of the ideal in its conquest of reality. The Holy Spirit is the Helper and Comforter without whose presence our aspiration to overcome the appetites of our nature would be irrational and our efforts vain.

These three are one. Unless there be a Father whose thought and will include the right relations of all beings to each other, there can be no Son, who finds it his meat and drink to do the Father's will. Unless, on the other hand, there be a true and real and eternal Son, through whom this will is done, the will of the Father remains nothing but a pale, unsubstantial shadow, hovering in the background of speculative thought. The Father manifests himself through the Son; and the Son exists in the Father.

Unless there be an eternal Son, who embodies the perfect ideal of human life, no Divine Spirit, conscious of oneness with the Father, can dwell with men; but all our moral aspiration and social endeavour would remain a blind striving after the unknown and the unattainable. And on the other hand, unless such an indwelling of the Spirit be possible to us, then Christ becomes an unintelligible projection into history of an alien being.

Each is interpreted through the other. The evidence presented in the first chapter for the being of God must have seemed to the thoughtful reader inadequate, inconclusive. So it is. Only through the Son do we know the Father. The Spirit in ourselves is the only infallible witness of his existence. And all our subsequent study of

the working of the Spirit in the hearts of men and in the institutions of society will be the confirmation of the evidence which in the first chapter could be presented only in its abstract, metaphysical form. Theology is a circle. Each part of it tells something about all the rest. We might begin almost anywhere: but in any case we should find the first steps difficult; for until we have seen the whole circle we cannot rightly appreciate the necessity and significance of any part. The divinity of Christ, taken as an isolated proposition, is incapable of proof. Unless we bring to our interpretation of the person of Christ the conception of the Father's loving will for all his children on the one hand, and the conception of the Holy Spirit prompting us to social service on the other hand, we cannot form a worthy conception of Christ as the Son of God. And in like manner, the Holy Spirit will never be to us anything more than a name signifying something mysterious, a mere "Ghost," as the English revisers insisted that he shall continue to be called, until we recognize the life of social service in ourselves as an embodiment of the eternal love of the Father, and as a reproduction in us of the life of his well beloved Son.

Part II

ANTHROPOLOGICAL

CHAPTER IV

SIN AND LAW — JUDGMENT

It is impossible to separate God from man, or man from God. They are correlative terms. Hitherto we have been considering God as his relation to man discloses him. Henceforth we shall consider man as he is determined by his relation to God. Already we have seen that man is a relative, finite, dependent being. In that fact as such no evil is involved. But a finite being endowed with self-consciousness and freedom, is capable of attempting to assert his independence; and to set up his own finite being as self-sufficient. Again we saw that in the progress toward the perfect it is possible for man to carry forward survivals of lower stages of development into higher stages; and so to transform a primitive virtue into a present vice. Again we saw that impulses, appetites, and passions which are harmless and even beneficial from the natural standpoint of the individual, are inconsistent with the social well-being, which it is the essence of the spiritual life to recognize and further.

These are all aspects of the fall to which a finite individual, placed in the midst of a social order which is constantly changing, is liable. This assertion of the finite against the Infinite, of past permissions against present ideals, of the individual interest against social well-being, is sin. Its specific forms are as numerous as the relations in which man stands; as various as the lines on which society is advancing; as multitudinous as the points at which individual and social interests touch. It is the province of ethics to trace out in detail the special forms of virtue and vice which result from the fulfilment or the violation of these relations. Religion is concerned with the single principle which is common to all the particular cases.

All self-assertion of the individual against the social order, and against God as the author and perfecter of the social order, is sin. Sin is the attempt of the individual to set himself up as the lord of his little world; when it manifests itself as pride and vanity. Sin is the clinging to antiquated customs and inherited rights, and traditional views, after they have ceased to represent existing facts and promote social well-being; when it takes the form of bigotry and hypocrisy. Sin is the attempt of the individual to take advantage of the imperfect

institutions, or the imperfect knowledge, or the unequal opportunities of his fellows in order to make private gain out of their loss ; when it takes the form of meanness and dishonesty. Sin is the willingness to secure something for myself without rendering society an equivalent. Sin is the disposition to make in my own favour exceptions to the just and impartial law of God. Sin is the disposition to treat other people as means to our own ends ; instead of recognizing both others and ourselves as alike means and ends in one common social order.

Sin is an original principle in human nature. By virtue of our finitude we must be conscious of our own private desires, before we can be equally alive to the desires and claims of others. The "good" child who always minds when he is spoken to ; who always observes the proprieties ; who never gets angry ; who never makes too much noise ; who never fights, will not make the strongest type of man. Real goodness is good for something. Real regard for others implies intense likes and dislikes of one's own. And the boy who does not assert his own rights and fight his own battles when a boy, will be unable to protect the rights and fight the battles of others when he is a man.

The servant of others must first have served himself. The development of the child is a reproduction of the evolution of the race. Had there been no tiger in our ancestors, we should not be civilized men to-day. Our mild virtues would have stood us in poor stead in the fierce struggle for existence which our savage ancestors fought out for us in the primeval forests. Our altruism rests on the deep and obscure foundation of their fierce egoism. Had our ancestors been of gentler temper, we should not have been at all.

The doctrine of original sin does not find favour with that sentimental mood which just now happens to be dominant in religious thought; but the modern historical conception of human evolution brings it out tenfold more clear than when it was proclaimed by lonely seers like Kant and Calvin and Augustine and Paul. Sin is the most universal, the most stubborn, the most cruel, the most ineradicable element in human nature.

The correlate and corrective of sin is law. Law is the formulation of rights. Law is the declaration of the conditions of social well-being. As sin is the destruction of the interests of society and of other individuals, in order to secure the immediate gratification of the sinner at the social expense;

so law is the assertion that the social interests of the community must be conserved at the cost of reasonable and necessary sacrifice on the part of individuals. The law, therefore, "is holy, just, and good," because it is simply the affirmation of the common good as against the private encroachments of individuals. When once the law is declared, sin takes the form of disobedience. "Sin is lawlessness." "Sin is the transgression of the law."

Law assumes two forms: the ceremonial and the moral. In early times these two are blended in one system. Later they are separated. At first both are supported by civil authority. Later the ceremonial is greatly reduced in scope; and is compelled to rest on social sentiment and personal conscience for its sanction and support. And even the moral law, in its higher requirements and subtler applications, ultimately appeals to the same sources for its sanction. The moral law lays down the particular things which must be done, or must not be done, in the interest of the social order. The ceremonial law, on the contrary, confines itself to prescribing or prohibiting those things which promote or retard the cultivation of the social spirit in general; and reverence for God as the upholder of the social fabric.

The ceremonial law is peculiarly liable to corruption; as the requirements of this law are artificial and arbitrary. They are valuable so long as they are recognized as symbolical of the attitude of reverence to God and service to man: but they are worse than worthless; they are mischievous and perverse, as soon as this, their symbolical significance, is lost, and they are regarded as having virtue and value in themselves. Every religious system in the process of time accumulates in its attic a heap of this worn-out ceremonial rubbish; and a reformation is needed every few generations to sweep it out, and take a fresh start with new and vital symbols. Protestantism accumulates this stock of faded millinery and worn-out garments as fast as Catholicism. The only difference is that Catholicism has been accumulating longer; and has a more intense aversion to the necessary periodical house-cleaning than the Protestant sects: and that Protestantism is prone to treasure up antiquated conceptions of truth rather than obsolete expressions of worship.

Hence it often happens that the deeper and truer service of God and the social good demands the destruction and overthrow of the ceremonial requirements. Isaiah and Jesus, Luther and Knox, were compelled to tear down ceremonial observ-

ances which had degenerated from original helps to actual obstructions to the religious spirit they were meant to foster and the social service they were intended to promote.

As we have already seen, even the moral law, though to a much less extent, is subject to a corresponding degeneration. Acts which are permissible and even praiseworthy in one stage of development are prohibited and condemned in another. As long as the worth of the human individual as such remained relatively unrecognized, slavery was relatively permissible; and the wisest philosophers and the justest lawgivers of the ancient world accepted slavery as a necessary human and therefore a warranted divine institution. But the advancing recognition of the dignity of human personality made the indignity of slavery increasingly manifest; and thus what had been permitted as relatively right became prohibited as absolutely wrong. Where protection and support was as much as women could expect, and where the perpetuation of the family was as much as men thought of, polygamy and concubinage were not inconsistent elements of social arrangements, and not incompatible precepts of a genuinely beneficent law. But when the personal affections were deepened, and intellectual affinities began to be

appreciated, and spiritual union came to be desired, and the infinite worth of the human soul came to be recognized; then what had been permitted to the hardness of primitive hearts was prohibited by the tenderer requirements of softened and civilized souls. Hence a Socrates and a Jesus may find their higher duty in opposition to the imperfect morality, as well as in disregard of the ceremonial observances of their times.

And yet in so doing they do not destroy but rather fulfil the spirit of the law whose letter they abolish. For as the law has its sole justification in a form of social good which it upholds, so they are justified in overthrowing it, provided they can show a greater good, more adapted to the requirements of their times, which they establish in its place.

Law is not ultimate; but is the imperfect and temporary means to a permanent and ever-enlarging social good. Below the law no man may fall without sin. Above it the prophet and reformer are often compelled to rise, in order to reach higher forms of good than the law has recognized; and to lift the law, by their example and precept, to the level of the new and larger good. In the sight of the law such persons are sinners, equally with the criminals who break the law in their own

private interest. The difference, however, is world-wide. The culpable sinner hates the law and breaks it because it affirms the social and denies his private good. The prophet and reformer breaks down the letter of the ancient law because he finds it has become the excuse for selfish practices and private indulgences, and he desires to put in its place a law which will lift life to humaner levels, and bring man nearer to his God.

Law originates in opposition to sin ; and in its early form is confined to the prohibition of irreverent and unsocial conduct. The Ten Commandments are the nucleus of such a code. The form in which this code was delivered was doubtless much more natural than the literal interpretation of the Old Testament narrative has led men to suppose. The date of the completion of this legislation was doubtless centuries later than tradition has assumed. The process of formation was doubtless far more gradual than orthodox commentators have been willing to admit.

Yet if God be a Spirit; if the moral progress of the race be an object of his thought and a purpose of his will; then this legislation, by whomsoever it may have been promulgated, howsoever it may have been developed, whensoever it may have been completed, is nevertheless a genuine

revelation of the thought, an authoritative declaration of the will of God. For it proclaimed in no uncertain tone, and far in advance of the moral attainments of the age, the conditions essential to the maintenance of social well-being. What is social is spiritual. What is for the good of man is for the glory of God. The Mosaic law was social and beneficent. Therefore the Mosaic law is the revelation of the Spirit, the declaration of God.

The contrast between sin and law brings judgment. Judgment is simply the declaration of the fact that sin and law are irreconcilable. There is nothing arbitrary or artificial about it. It is not a remote future event. It is a present reality. As soon as an act is performed, it is either lawful or unlawful; it either promotes or injures the social good; and judgment is the perception of that fact by God, by the man who has performed the act, and by all who come to know the act and see it in its true relations. The conscience of the individual and the verdict of society both are reflections and expressions, more or less perfect, of the absolute judgment of God, whose thought includes the act in all its bearings and relations.

The judgment of sin brings condemnation. God's thought includes impartially the good of all his creatures. God is no respecter of persons.

Sin, however, is the sacrifice of the good of others and of society to the fancied good of the individual sinner. Sin is in its very nature, selfish, mean, and contemptible. God's condemnation is his clear perception of how contemptible sin is. The reflection of that absolute judgment of God in the mind of the individual, or conscience, brings shame and humiliation and remorse. It is the conviction that we have done a mean and contemptible thing. We may have enjoyed doing it when we thought merely of our own selfish interest; our own private gratification. But when we come to see it in its larger relations; when we come out of the darkness and illusion of our blind and petty selfishness; when we see the wrong it has done to others; when we see how hideous it looks in the daylight; when we get found out, and see how others despise it; when we look at it as it is in itself; when we look at it in the impartial way in which God looks at it: then we are overwhelmed with guilt and shame. The only refuge of the sinner is concealment. Sin is ever sneaking and cowardly. It loves darkness rather than light, because its deeds are evil. He that doeth the truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be manifest that they are wrought in God.

An excellent test of character is this willingness

to be tested by the light. Art thou willing to be known for just what thou art? Wouldst thou welcome inspection in the inmost recesses of thy heart? Wouldst thou enjoy the companionship of spirits who could see and read the secrets of thy soul? Wouldst thou be comfortable if thy body were transparent glass, revealing in perfect clearness the thoughts and imaginations and desires of thy mind? Then thou art guileless and guiltless. Then the omniscient Judge is not dreadful to thee, but welcome. Then thou art sinless and perfect. Then the spirit-world would be to thee a delightful home.

With this test before us, it is hardly necessary to lay down in dogmatic form the doctrine that all men have sinned and come short of the glory of God. In the clear, white light of such a judgment all stand condemned; all mouths are stopped.

And yet to such a judgment-seat we must all be brought. Before it even now we all stand. The crude, coarse imagery of hell-fire and artificial torture disturbs the minds of men no more. But the certainty that "there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed," this impending and indeed actually present judgment by revelation, is no creation of dogmatic theology; no fiction of the hortatory imagination; no artificial projection of mediæval

horror. It is certain as thought, universal as reason, as old as creation; and never set forth more clearly and forcibly than by Plato, at the close of the *Gorgias*. In these days, when the Christian teaching on this point is regarded by sentimentalists as harsh and irrational, it is well worth while to recall the words of this ancient philosopher, uttered four centuries before the Christian era.

"Listen, then," Plato represents Socrates as saying, "to a very pretty tale, which I dare say that you may be disposed to regard as a fable only, but which, as I believe, is a true tale, for I mean, in what I am going to tell you, to speak the truth. Now in the days of Cronos there was this law respecting the destiny of man, which has always existed, and still continues in heaven, that he who has lived all his life in justice and holiness shall go, when he dies, to the islands of the blest, and dwell there in perfect happiness out of the reach of evil; but that he who has lived unjustly and impiously shall go to the house of vengeance and punishment, which is called Tartarus. And in the time of Cronos, and even later in the reign of Zeus, the judgment was given on the very day on which the men were to die; the judges were alive, and the men were alive; and the

consequence was that the judgments were not well given. Then Pluto and the authorities from the islands of the blest came to Zeus, and said that the souls found their way to the wrong places. Zeus said: 'I shall put a stop to this; the judgments are not well given, and the reason is that the judged have their clothes on, for they are alive; and there are many having evil souls who are apparelled in fair bodies, or wrapt round in wealth and rank, and when the day of judgment arrives many witnesses come forward and witness on their behalf, that they have lived righteously. The judges are awed by them, and they themselves, too, have their clothes on when judging; their eyes and ears and their whole bodies are interposed as a veil before their own souls. This all stands in their way; there are the clothes of the judges and the clothes of the judged. What is to be done? I will tell you: In the first place, I will deprive men of the foreknowledge of death, which they at present possess; in the second place, they shall be entirely stripped before they are judged, for they shall be judged when they are dead; and the judge too shall be naked, that is to say, dead; he with his naked soul shall pierce into the other naked soul as soon as each man dies, he knows not when, and is deprived of

his kindred, and has left his brave attire in the world above, and then the judgment will be just.'

"This is a tale, Callicles, which I have heard and believe, and from which I draw the following inferences: Death, if I am right, is in the first place the separation from one another of two things, — soul and body; this, and nothing else. And after they are separated they retain their several characteristics, which are much the same as in life; the body has the same nature and ways and affections, all clearly discernible; for example, he who was a tall man while he was alive, will remain as he was, after he is dead; and the fat man will remain fat; and so on. And if he was marked with the whip and had the prints of the scourge in him when he was alive, you might see the same in the dead body. And, in a word, whatever was the habit of the body during life would be distinguishable after death, either perfectly, or in a great measure and for a time. And I should infer that this is equally true of the soul, Callicles; when a man is stripped of the body, all the natural or acquired affections of the soul are laid open to view. And when they come to the judge, he places them near him and inspects them quite impartially, not knowing whose the soul is: perhaps he may lay hands on the soul

of the great king, or of some other king or potentate who has no soundness in him, but his soul is marked with the whip, and is full of the prints of the scars of perjuries, and of wrongs which have been plastered into him by each action, and he is all crooked with falsehood and imposture, and has no straightness because he has lived without truth. Him the judge beholds, full of deformity and disproportion, which is caused by license and luxury and insolence and incontinence, and despatches him ignominiously to his prison, and there he undergoes the punishment which he deserves.

"Now I, Callicles, am persuaded of the truth of these things, and I consider how I shall present my soul whole and undefiled before the judge in that day. Renouncing the honours at which the world aims, I desire only to know the truth, and to live as well as I can, and, when the time comes, to die. Follow me then, and I will lead you where you will be happy in life and after death: and do you be of good cheer, for you will never come to any harm in the practise of virtue, if you are a really good and true man. The best way of life is to practice justice and every virtue in life and death."

This same fact of an ever-present judgment

Fichte brings out in a very searching passage in which he shows us how we may anticipate its verdict upon ourselves. "Tell me what direction thy thoughts take, — not when thou with tightened hand constrainest them to a purpose, — but when in thy hours of recreation thou allowest them freely to rove abroad; tell me what direction they *then* take, where they naturally turn as to their most loved home, in what thou thyself in the innermost depths of thy soul findest thy chief enjoyment, — and then I will tell thee what are thy tastes. Are they directed towards the Godlike, and to those things in nature and art wherein the Godlike most directly reveals itself in imposing majesty? — then is the Godlike not dreadful to thee but friendly; thy tastes lead thee to it, it is thy most loved enjoyment. Do they, when released from the constraint with which thou hast directed them to a serious pursuit, eagerly turn to brood over sensual pleasures, and find relaxation in the pursuit of these? — then hast thou a vulgar taste, and thou must invite animalism into the innermost recesses of thy soul before it can seem well with thee there."

The profoundest test of character, however, is that given by our Lord, in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew. There the principle of separa-

tion between the sheep and the goats is shown to be simply genuineness and fidelity in social service. "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? or athirst, and gave thee drink? And when saw we thee a stranger and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? And when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire that is prepared for the devil and his angels: for I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in; naked, and ye clothed me not; sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then

shall they also answer, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of these least, ye did it not unto me."

A man's relations to his fellow-men determine his relations to Christ and to God. For the will of God, the life and work of Christ, has for its end and aim the well-being of men, who are the children of God and the brethren of Christ. Hence our serviceableness to our fellow-men is the exact and infallible measure of our acceptableness to God. No ritualistic, or ceremonial, or ecclesiastical, or doctrinal, or professional substitute can be found which will in the slightest degree take the place of this simple, straightforward rightness of relation with our fellow-men. Religion is the larger aspect, the universal form of our social relationships. For God is not a Being alien to men and remote from the world. God is the Father of all men; the Spirit in whom we all live and move and have our being. And therefore our attitude toward God cannot be different from our attitude toward our fellow-men. Judgment, there-

fore, is based on social considerations. This was the first principle of the teaching of Jesus. He makes social sincerity and social service everywhere the test of religious recognition and religious worth. "I say unto you that every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; and whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of the hell of fire. If, therefore, thou art offering thy gift at the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses."

Life to-day is not so simple as was the life of those to whom these precepts were addressed. The administration of charity and justice, the conduct of business, the adjustment to our infinitely complex economic and social conditions, render it frequently a very difficult matter to see just how this principle of fraternity and charity and mutual service should be applied. Even with the

kindest and most generous intent, we are liable to go sadly astray. And we are so entangled in the meshes of social arrangements not of our own creating or our own choosing, that often what we would we cannot do, without purchasing a particular good at the cost of much general harm. The principle, however, is as clear now as it was in Jesus' day. And according to that principle no man can be acceptable in the sight of God, no man is righteous in the nature of things, who knowingly and willingly permits any man or woman, or any class of men and women, to suffer privation, or degradation, or oppression, or neglect, or injury, or insult, of which directly or indirectly he is the cause, or of which, directly or indirectly, without disregard of nearer duties, he might contribute to the cure. This socially serviceable disposition is the one spiritual quality which has absolute worth in the sight of God. He who has that has God. For that is what God is. God is love. By this principle husband and wife, father and mother, brother and sister, son and daughter, are judged in the home. By this principle the carpenter is judged at his bench; the merchant at his counter; the manufacturer in his factory; the teacher in his school-room; the lawyer in his office; the physician at the bedside; the citizen upon the street;

the statesman in the legislative hall; the ruler on his throne. Just in so far as in and through these concrete relationships the world is better for our being in it, so far and no farther do we receive the divine approval. Just in so far as through our laziness, our wilful ignorance, our thoughtlessness, our unkindness, our inconsiderateness, our envy, our pride, our avarice, our lust, our cruelty, our timidity, our cowardice, our indifference, the burden of any fellow-man is more heavy; the sorrow of any human heart is more bitter; the wrongs of any social class are more intolerable; and the injustice of any institution is more cruel for any word or deed that we have either said and done, or left unsaid and undone, to that extent we are guilty before God, and stand under his righteous condemnation.

God's judgment consists in bringing a man face to face with his own character. It is not a remote event in the dim and distant future. It is a fact here and now. The decision turns upon a principle which we can understand perfectly clearly: and which we can apply, each to himself. So simple, so searching, so just, so inevitable, is the judgment of God. Into the final outcome of this judgment we will not here inquire. It is sufficient for the present that we see that it is a reality.

Our next subject will be the way of salvation. And if judgment is the revealing of a man's real character, as determined by his social spirit, then the salvation which is to deliver him in this judgment day must be real and social too. No legal fictions, no logical contrivances, no theological schemes, will meet the case. The man who is to be judged righteous before that bar must be righteous. Is it then possible for man, sinful and guilty as he is by nature and by his own volition, to present before God a face that has no trace of shame; a spirit from which every stain of guilt is really washed away; a soul against which no fellow-man can bring a valid charge; a heart that has no slightest fear of being known by God and men precisely as it is? Is salvation, like judgment, a fact so real, so definite, so reasonable, so conformable alike to the character of God and the nature of man, that we may be just as clear and sure of salvation as we are of judgment? That will be the subject of the following chapter.

CHAPTER V

REPENTANCE AND FAITH — SALVATION

If sin and law and judgment were ultimate and final facts, man would be lost beyond all hope of redemption. If every act became part of an irrevocable character; if we stood under a hard and fast system of rules and regulations; if every violation was visited with its appropriate condemnation; if there were no possibility of change; no way of escape; no room for mercy, then the outlook for the individual and for the race would be dark and foreboding. And yet sin and law and judgment are stubborn realities: they cannot be toned down, or smoothed over, or explained away. If there is any redemption or salvation or deliverance, it must redeem and save and deliver us out of these very evils; out of the grip of sin; out of the clutches of violated law; out of the teeth of just condemnation; out of the jaws of our own remorse and guilt.

Fortunately, character, especially in its earlier stages, is not a fixture. We can change our mind.

We can repent. Appetite and passion may be too strong for us in the moment of temptation. We may yield, and do at their imperious dictation the wretched act, of which the moment after we are heartily ashamed. But this very fact of shame is the prophecy and witness of better possibilities. It is evidence that we are more than mere creatures of appetite and passion. If the act condemned is our act, the act of condemnation is our own act also. And in this act of condemnation we take sides with God against the base act which we ourselves have done.

We may go farther, and repudiate the act. We may say, "Although I did it, I will never do the like again. The base act, to be sure, is the expression of what I was. It does not express what I now am, and what I am determined to become."

When one sincerely repents, he is on the sure way to deliverance. He has already gone over to the side of the law; and the only question that remains is whether he will be accepted. As Paul says, "But if what I would not, that I do, I consent unto the law that it is good. So, now, it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and

bringing me into captivity under the law of sin which is in my members. So then I myself with the mind serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin."

The law of God and the law of my mind in this case are at one, and both are arrayed against the law of sin which is in my members. Reason is no longer the slave of appetite, but has become, in purpose and endeavour at least, the free servant of God.

Repentance, however, is only the first step toward salvation. It is not enough to repudiate the evil we have done. We must lay hold of the good we have not yet attained. And this apprehension of an unrealized goodness, is faith. Man can no more keep evil out of his heart by repentance and resolution not to sin again, than he can drive the air out of a room with a fan and keep it out by shutting the door. Spirit, no less than nature, abhors a vacuum. The chamber that is merely empty, swept, and garnished, speedily becomes the abode of seven other spirits more evil than that which was first cast out. The mind must have something to think about. The will must have some motive. The heart must have some object of devotion.

Faith is the recognition of the Father's right-

eous will as the ruling principle of conduct: it is the acceptance of Christ as the supreme object of affection and devotion: it is the reception of the Spirit as the inspirer and the guide of life.

Faith, therefore, in the religious sense of the term, has primarily nothing to do with doctrinal creeds. Faith is a personal relation; not an intellectual conviction. He who believes in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit has all the faith that is needful for salvation. Out of this personal faith in God, there will indeed develop new hopes, new aspirations, new fellowships, new activities. And the grounds and principles of this divine life may very properly be precisely stated and logically formulated. Such statements and formulations of the laws and facts of the spiritual life are creeds. And these creeds, if they are faithful to the facts and true to experience, are valuable aids to the spiritual life. Yet we must be on our guard against putting the creed in the place of the person, and confounding intellectual assent to a series of propositions with spiritual faith in the living God.

Belief, in the purely intellectual sense, is independent of our wills. Belief in this sense is the harmony of a given proposition with all the previously accepted propositions which make up the

contents of our minds. What a man believes in this sense depends on his early training, his inherited prejudices, his intellectual environment. The proposition which harmonizes with all the other propositions in his mind he must believe. He cannot help it. The law of intellectual gravitation compels him to believe it. The proposition which does not harmonize with the conclusions already established in his mind he cannot believe. Trying to believe it will do no good. Saying that he believes it will do much harm. It is simply impossible to believe it without intellectual suicide. And neither the wiles of Satan nor the grace of God can make it credible.

People who were trained a generation ago and people who are trained in the critical methods of the library and the experimental methods of the laboratory to-day cannot think alike on historical and scientific questions. To endeavour to impose on the eager and earnest student of to-day the unscientific and uncritical formulations of preceding ages is an insult to reason: and he is warranted in slamming the doors of his intelligence at the first approach of the dogmatic inquisitor. Blind belief is little better than blind unbelief. Both are sure to err.

That the world reveals one spiritual princi-

ple; that history contains one ideal character; that human life is at least partially pervaded by altruistic motives; these fundamental facts no candid citizen of a Christian community can consistently deny. And these three insights, rightly interpreted, give a Father in heaven to worship; a Son of God to follow; a Holy Spirit to revere in the hearts of others and welcome to our own. One who sees and welcomes so much as this is intellectually able to make confession of his faith in the only formula the New Testament prescribes. Other truths are, indeed, desirable for instruction and edification. But to make more than this an intellectual test of spiritual fitness for acceptance with God and fellowship with the Christian community is an unwarranted impertinence. It proceeds on the assumption that belief in something more than Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is essential to salvation. Such zeal for the amplification of intellectual belief is an unwitting confession of lack of vital faith in God.

Neither is faith to be confounded with feeling; or measured by the amount of emotion that accompanies it. Some feeling, of course, there must be in connection with Christian faith. We cannot see the difference between right and wrong, between the purity and kindness and generosity and

love of Christ, and the uncleanness and brutality and cruelty and hatefulness of sin, and remain utterly unmoved. We cannot stand in the midst of the mighty, world-historic conflict, where on the one side multitudes of men and women are being betrayed and maltreated and plundered by the sin of others, and degraded and polluted by sin in their own hearts ; and on the other side thousands and tens of thousands of the best and noblest men and women the world has produced are banded together in the name of Christ in the endeavour, first, to banish sin from their own hearts and lives and then to banish it from the hearts and lives of others, and so remove it from the world ; — we cannot stand emotionless between these contending hosts. We cannot fail to feel some drawing out of our hearts toward Christ. Deep in the real nature of every rational being there is a sound core of loyalty to what is right and true.

This profound response and unswerving allegiance to what is just and true and kind and good, and to Christ as the supreme embodiment and historic champion of truth and goodness in the world, is all the emotional accompaniment that is essential to the reality of faith. This deep response of the whole nature may not make so good a showing on examination ; but the most

silent and imperceptible turning of the depths of our moral nature toward duty, and toward God as the author of duty and the defender of the right, is worth more than whole tempests of froth and foam on the heaving surface of emotional excitement.

The great question, after all, is not, Have I a love for Christ of which I can be conscious all the time? That way lies discouragement, despondency, despair. Faith must lead the way to love. And the question of faith is, rather, Have I Christ? Whether with little emotion or with much, am I resolved that what work I do shall be done in his name; what influence I have shall be cast on his side; however cold and dead my emotions may become, however weak and blundering my efforts may prove, such as I am, I will be his? If we are thus resolved to serve him, we already believe in him; and we shall come to love him in due time.

Faith again is not to be confounded with works, nor measured by them; though works are the ultimate and inevitable fruit of faith. Faith lays hold on the ideal; and our works come far short of that. Faith is the deeper principle. Ideals are more significant than facts. The idealism of the heart rather than the ritualism

of the hands is the true expression of the real self.

So here again the great question is not, What have I done? but, What am I trying to do? Three men are on a mountain-side. The first is only a few steps from the base: the second is half-way up: the third is within a few steps of the summit. Which of these men is nearest the summit? "The third, of course," says every superficial observer, judging by works alone. Let us look deeper at the minds and hearts of these three men. The first has his face set resolutely toward the summit, and is determined to press forward until it shall be reached. The second man is undecided, looking sometimes up and sometimes down. The third has seen enough already and is thinking of descent. Once more, which of these three men is nearest the summit? The third is farthest from it of them all. Whether the second will ever reach it you cannot say. The first man is nearest of them all, for his mind and will are on the heights already and in due time will bring his body there.

Thus faith is mightier than works. The ideal is more potent than the real. Aspiration is more significant than achievement. As repentance is the repudiation of the actual bad, so faith is the

identification with the ideal good. Faith is, first, the acceptance of the ideal presented from without in Christ; but it is at the same time the promise and potency that the ideal shall be realized and the image of Christ reproduced within ourselves. As repentance cancels the past, so far as we can do it; so faith affirms the future, so far as that lies in our power: and both alike appeal to God to ratify our repentance by forgiveness and to confirm our faith by its acceptance.

This appeal of man to God is prayer. Does God listen to our appeal? Does God answer prayer?

Here we are at once confronted by the objection of popular science. We are told that all things are governed by uniform and necessary laws. There are no lawless forces in the world. In the heavens above, in the earth beneath, in the waters under the earth, the scientist sees law. Law has governed the evolution of plant, animal, and man. Laws of ethics, economics, trade, art, are unfolding themselves before our eyes. We all know that our plumbing must conform to the laws of sanitation; our carpentering to the laws of geometry; our bridges to the laws of physics; our navigation to the laws of trigonometry; our conduct to the laws of ethics; our business to the

laws of trade. And we are not so simple as to suppose that by rash petitions for special interference with these laws of nature we can avert the consequences of disregarding them. We carry no check-book on the bank of omnipotence which enables us to get just what we ask for by simply making out the checks and presenting them in proper form. There is no room for partiality and favouritism within this universe of law. Therefore, says the scientist, there is no place for prayer.

Law, indeed, is uniform. No sane man dreams of changing it. Yet our wishes, expressed to our fellow-men, accomplish results. It is a law that certain bacilli, preying upon certain tissues in certain conditions, cause death. When, in these conditions, I call in a physician I do not ask him to change that law in my behalf. I ask him to bring to bear other laws. I ask him to introduce into the problem the action of certain chemicals upon the infected tissues. The introduction of these new forces changes the conditions, and the result of the changed conditions is my recovery to health. No law has been abrogated or broken. The physician brought not less law, but more. This is the sphere in which will operates. It is not in the power of God or man to turn a bullet from its path, or a flash of lightning from its

course, or a bacillus from its prey, by contradicting the laws which govern the action of these forces, any more than it is in the power of either God or man to make two mountains with no intervening valley. It certainly is in the power of man to determine to some extent whether the action of the bullet, the lightning, or the bacillus shall be so combined with other forces as to bring life or death to man. And what is possible with man is not of necessity impossible with God. The scientific objections to the utility of prayer do not touch the real point, which is not whether special sequences are invariable or not, but whether the coördination of these special sequences is under the control of rational will or of blind chance.

That there is room in the world for the effective action of human intelligence without interference with any law whatever, is a fact established by every act of forethought which man performs. That God can answer prayer, if there be a God, is as little doubtful as that my neighbour can grant a favour if he hears my request. To deny the possibility of answer to prayer is equivalent to denying freedom to man and denying personality to God. Between freedom and fate, between a personal God and blind chance, between faith in prayer and trust to luck, we must choose. It is only the

short-sighted and superficial mind that can find a resting-place between these two opinions. That the Father gives the Holy Spirit to them that ask him involves no greater psychological difficulty, and encounters no stronger scientific objection, than that human parents give good gifts to their children.

The new psychology is teaching us that the one stronghold of freedom is the power of self-directed attention. Attention determines motive, motive determines act, and acts seal our doom. Whether we give more or less attention to an object determines the part that object shall play in our character and life. Now, in general terms, the well-being or the misery of our lives, in theological terms our salvation or our damnation, depends upon whether those laws of life which are the conditions of well-being are observed or disobeyed. In the more obvious and superficial sense salvation is by works. The deeper question, however, is, What determines a man's works? What makes him obey or disobey these laws? Here is the test. One man relies exclusively on his past experience, his acquired training, his established habits, to guide him when particular cases of conduct arise. Another man habitually recognizes the presence of the Infinite Spirit who

rules the world by righteous laws; habitually gives thanks for the beneficent fruits of this divine working in the world, and as habitually surrenders his own will to become the instrument of the divine will in so far as that can find expression in his individual conduct. Is it not clear that the second man will have the continuous conscious presence of the Infinite Spirit with him to a greater degree than the first man? Is it not clear that the second man will be found reverently conforming his life to the divine laws in those sudden emergencies which come to us all; while the first man will more frequently be caught napping and will react from passion and caprice, rather than from obedience and reverence for the divine law?

The laws of individual well-being are divine. But the laws of social well-being are, if we may so express it, more divine. That is, they take precedence of the others when the two conflict. The cholera germ, the tiger, the savage, fulfil the laws of their individual being. Civilized man is called upon to do more. Not the laws of his individual well-being alone, but the laws of social well-being as well are entrusted to his care and keeping. Profoundly apprehended, these two laws are doubtless one. Yet this profound

apprehension of the identity of individual and social interest is just what is hard to secure and maintain at the moment of action. To the natural man these laws seem of very unequal urgency. God's will includes them both. And the man whose will is constantly and habitually offered in prayerful surrender to the will of God cannot fail to acquire a settled disposition to give due weight to social obligations as against private interests, which would be lacking to the same man were he withdrawn from this spiritual fellowship with God. The general disposition will find expression in particular acts; and the answer to his habitual prayers will come in the fruitfulness of righteous deeds and holy influences which could have gone forth only from a mind and heart constantly united by prayer to the thought and will of God.

In things so subtle as the relations of motive to act, of character to conduct, it will be as impossible to trace precise sequences of cause and effect in the majority of cases as it is to find the particular rays of sunshine and drops of rain and atoms of fertilizer again in the particular kernels of the ripened grain. The farmer who should boast of his ability to trace such connection would be set down for a fraud, and the man who should expect him to do it would be regarded as a fool.

Nor is the answer to prayer due simply to the reflex action of his own effort upon the man who prays. The God of Christian faith; the God revealed in Jesus Christ, and manifested in the continued presence of the Holy Spirit, is not a purely transcendent being, outside of the world and remote from men, like the gods of Epicurus, who "repose on blissful seats, which never winds assail nor rain-clouds sprinkle with their showers, nor snow falling white with hoary frost doth buffet, but cloudless ether ever wraps them round, beaming in broad diffusion of glorious light. For nature supplies their every want, nor aught impairs their peace of soul." The immanent God, revealed in history, and present in human society to-day, is by his very nature "a prayer-hearing and a prayer-answering God." Prayer is not a mere petition projected into empty space. Prayer is communion. It is fellowship. Prayer lays hold on God; apprehends afresh the mind of Christ; opens the heart to receive the Holy Spirit. The attempt to cheat God by using him as a means to the gratification of our private whims and caprices is doubtless futile. God is not mocked. Eliminate from prayer all its spiritual significance and reality; reduce it to a mere device for getting what one happens to want by simply

going through a verbal form: and then it is easy enough, without much show of scientific learning or any invocation of the aid of natural law, to demonstrate that such prayer is futile and absurd. That prayer can be seriously discussed on this low plane; that men of sense can impute to other men of sense such crude and childish notions of spiritual things, reveals the sad pass to which deistic traditions have brought the religious thinking of our times.

Prayer which makes immediate, particular, material things the end, and God simply the means of getting them, fails as it deserves to. It does not come into communion with God. It is not prayer. And it is not answered because it is not prayer.

Once recognize that prayer is the communion of man with a living God, revealed in Christ and present in the world as the Spirit inspiring every worthy form of social life, and then it becomes perfectly evident that every prayer must bring its appropriate and objective and positive and helpful answer. When I read a book, and get information from it, I do not attribute that information to the reflex influence upon myself of the effort which I put forth in the act of reading. In reading I put myself into communication with the mind of the author. When I talk with a friend, and am made

better by it, I do not credit my improved condition to the reflex influence of my own effort at conversation. Prayer is communion with the thought and will of God. And the answer to prayer is from him; not from ourselves. The man who communes with God will grow to be like him. The man who takes his perplexities and problems and temptations to God in prayer will receive from God light and help and strength, which he could receive from no other source.

Answer to prayer belongs not to the realm of magic and miracle; but lies clearly within the sphere of causality and law. Prayer lifts the desires of the individual up into their larger relations to the will of God: and it brings them back, purified by contact with his holy and higher purpose, and strengthened and confirmed by his approval and sympathy.

When Peter and Zacchæus and Nicodemus came to Jesus when he was on earth, confessed to him their sins and shortcomings, their perplexities and doubts, they went away from the interview wiser and better men. Christ is not dead. His Spirit is not withdrawn from the world. In the Holy Scriptures, in Christian institutions, in the hearts and lives of his followers, in the teaching of the church and the training given by Christian

parents to their children, Christ is a living presence, a positive force in the world to-day. Prayer is the communion of the spirit of man with this ever-present Spirit of Christ; and is as real and objective a communion, and brings as real and definite an answer, as did the communion of the early disciples with their Master when he was present with them in the flesh.

The current misconceptions of prayer are chiefly due to an excessive emphasis upon mere specific petition, and a corresponding neglect of the elements of thanksgiving, praise, fellowship, and communion. Petition for specific and definite material benefits occupies as subordinate a place in true spiritual prayer, as the prediction of precise future events occupied in Hebrew prophecy. Intimate and intense appreciation of the spiritual purposes of God did incidentally enable these ancient seers to forecast the trend of national affairs and the tendency of historical development. And in like manner loving surrender to the will of God and the mind of Christ not infrequently carries material as well as spiritual blessings in its train. If we seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, many other things will be added unto us. But if we seek these other things first, we miss the kingdom and the righteousness,

and with the loss of these we lose also the material blessings which these carry in their train.

Prayer is as welcome to God as it is indispensable to man. For God does not work without means. He does not thrust reforms upon the world before the world is ready to receive them. The desires and petitions of individual hearts and united congregations are the signs by which the Spirit recognizes the fulness of time for a spiritual and social advance.

Prayer, of course, is not a substitute for effort. Indeed the chief form in which answer to prayer is manifest is increased effort on the part of ourselves and others; and renewed courage and confidence in the utility of effort. Prayer is always possible. Work is not. God is always near; though others be far away. Work meets delays obstacles, discouragements. Prayer moves in the sphere of pure, unobstructed will. Hence, while all other forms of expression are outwardly conditioned, intermittent, fitful; prayer is steady, patient, persistent, and never despairs.

Prayer is the appointed means by which the will of the individual becomes emancipated from its finitude and isolation, and becomes consciously united to the large and noble purposes of God. It is spiritually the most elevating, intellectually

the most broadening, socially the most expanding, morally the most quickening, practically the most profitable exercise in which man can engage. And when once we have emancipated ourselves from the deistic notion of a far-away God; when once we have learned to think of him as real with at least as much reality as the wills of men and the forces of society, we shall recognize that answer to prayer, provided that it really is prayer, is just as certain and inevitable as that an adequate cause must produce its appropriate effect.

God rules the world by law; and those laws are inexorable. The physical consequences of sin — the disease, the poverty, the pain — follow as invariably as fire burns and water flows. The social consequences also the sinner cannot escape. The man who has lied will be despised; the man who has stolen will be distrusted; the man who has been cruel will be hated; regardless of his subsequent repentance. The world, except it be transformed by the Spirit of Christ, is as hard and merciless and relentless to the sinner as is nature herself.

In early times men naturally interpreted God in terms of their own moral ideals. And their gods were cruel, arbitrary, and unforgiving beings. It is a late stage of human development which

begins to question, "*Tantæne animis cœlestibus iræ?*"

Even Christianity has found it hard to believe the full gospel of its Master on this point. And it has borrowed its conceptions of the divine government more from the civil governments of the ancient world than from the parables and precepts and actions of its Lord. As long as the Greek or Roman could trace even-handed justice in archon or emperor, they had such reason to be thankful that to have asked for more would have seemed an impertinence. And consequently they thought of God as a world-governor, and ascribed to him justice as his highest attribute. For justice in matters political and social was the highest ideal of the ancient world.

But since the revolutions in America and France, the rise of constitutional liberty in England, and the spread of democratic doctrine everywhere, men have come more and more to recognize that right derives its content and meaning from the good which lies beyond it as its end and aim; justice is compelled to justify itself by the proof of its beneficence; and the right of human kings and lords is respected only in so far as it promotes the well-being of their subjects and dependents. What wonder, then, that this same tendency and

spirit, applied to theology, appeals from the justice to the love of God, and calls him no longer Governor but Father, as Jesus taught men to do.

The conception of the Father to which we were led in our first chapter, as the absolute thought which holds all things and all men in their true relations, shows that he must condemn sin; for sin is the flat contradiction of that truth which the divine thought perceives and of that order which the divine will affirms. To condemn a sinner, because of his sin, to more misery than the direct consequences of his sin involve; to keep him in condemnation and punishment after he had repented of his sin, and was trying to overcome it, would be the act not of a Father but of a brute; not of a God but of a devil. It would be an act, not of truth and light and love, but of falsehood and darkness and malignity. A being capable of that could not command even the respect of the average man to-day; much less obtain the worship of the holiest and best. This belief in the mercy and forgiveness and grace of God is not a piece of sentimentalism, which argues that because we would like to be forgiven, therefore God must do it. It is a transparent truth of reason; which affirms that the confounding of the man and his act, in spite of repentance and aspiration and en-

deavour to do better, would be an act of blindness unworthy of short-sighted man, and therefore impossible to the omniscient God. It is grounded not on what we would like to have done to us; but on what we ourselves would be willing to do to another. We believe in the mercy of God, because we cannot worship in God what we despise in men; because we cannot exclude from our thought of him what is best and noblest in ourselves.

The grace of God is so transparent and self-evident a principle to-day that the marvel is that any one can doubt it. It is only the savage, and the civilized man who has drawn his conceptions of God from a semi-barbarous antiquity, who denies it.

Yet we owe this revelation of the grace of God to noble men like the authors of the second portion of Isaiah and of the book of Jonah, who first proclaimed it to the hard hearts of unbelieving men. We owe it, above all, to Jesus Christ, who revealed it in the compassion and pity and forgiveness with which he met all forms of penitence and faith; who taught it in the matchless parables of the unmerciful servant and the prodigal son, in the precept "Until seventy times seven," and in the petition, "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those that trespass against us";

who sealed it by the prayer upon the cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." This revelation of forgiveness and grace is the central and crowning message of Christianity. "For the law was given by Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

God cannot change. As Christ revealed him, so eternally he is. The time can never come when God will refuse forgiveness to a repentant soul. That souls may sink so low and become so dead as to find no place for repentance is, indeed, possible and probable. But that God should sink so low as to find no place in his heart for forgiveness, — this is simply inconceivable. God cherishes to the last his gracious purpose of redemption; and stands ready to welcome with open arms and robe and ring every returning prodigal, who in any far-off time or place shall find himself morally and spiritually able to leave his sin and shame behind him, and come back to his Father and his home.

In all grace and forgiveness there is a wondrous mingling of suffering and joy. There is more trouble and labour involved in seeking and finding the one lost sheep than in guarding the ninety and nine that went not astray. And yet there is more joy over the recovery of the one, than

over the security of all the rest. The life of Christ, as the supreme manifestation of the grace of God, was of necessity a life pre-eminent in suffering and sorrow. For in sympathy and pity and helpfulness and love he took upon himself the infirmities and sorrows, the guilt and sin of the men to whom he ministered and of the world he came to save. Had he been less faithful to the truth, less eager to reveal God's saving grace to men; he might have lived an untroubled life in the midst of a select circle of admiring disciples. But it was the sick not the whole whom he sought to heal; the sinner and not the righteous whom he came to save. And in loyalty to this divine mission of grace, in fidelity to this human service of sympathy and love, he exposed himself to the envy and jealousy and avarice and hypocrisy and malignity and hate of which the world was full and underneath which humanity lay crushed and bruised and bleeding. "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows. He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed."

All this he bore, not to offer a ransom to the devil, nor, what is the modern equivalent of that

ancient theory, to appease an angry God. All this he suffered, not to vindicate the majesty of the divine law, or to uphold the dignity of the divine government. For neither the law nor the government of God are so feeble and so in need of external props as these theories assume. All this he endured simply because it is in the nature of love to identify itself with its object. To love a good man is to rejoice in and share all the glory and the gladness that his goodness sheds about him. To love a bad man is to suffer with and to share all the shame and pain his badness brings upon him. God loves bad men. Christ came to bring God's love to a wicked world. And that is why he was compelled to live a life of suffering and die an ignominious death.

Thanks to the love of the Father, thanks to the grace of Christ, every man who in sincerity repents of his sins and looks to God for help to live the righteous life is sure of immediate acceptance and complete forgiveness. He will still suffer much from the avenging laws of a violated nature; for a long time he will suffer more from the suspicion and hatred of hard human hearts; but from the moment he truly repents and gives his heart to God for forgiveness and guidance and control, he is admitted with the full privileges of sonship into

the household of faith and the family of God. From that moment he is a child of the Father, a friend of Christ, and a candidate for the life of the Spirit.

By grace, through faith, based on repentance, we receive the assurance of salvation. We do not save ourselves. There is in man the capacity for the divine life, an ability to respond to the divine ideal when once that is presented. But unless this ideal comes home to man, rousing and quickening this capacity into life, the soul remains dormant awhile, and then succumbs to decay and death like an unplanted, unsunned, unwatered seed. The presentation of the divine ideal therefore is the efficient cause of man's salvation. God's effectual calling precedes man's successful choosing. It is by the winsomeness and attractiveness of the divine ideal, presented to our wills and accepted by them, that we are saved. How, then, is the presentation of this divine ideal made to man? The depth and breadth of any system of theology may be tested by its answer to that question.

The divine ideal of human life, the Logos, the Holy Spirit, has never been without witness in the world, and is not far from any one of us. Every natural object is the creation and expression

of the Eternal Reason; every righteous law and beneficent institution of society is the embodiment of the Divine Spirit; and every fellow-man is in his inherent capacity and dignity the image of God.

The call of God, the presentation of the divine ideal of human life, consequently may come through any or all of these its manifold embodiments. It is not a ghost-like apparition, robed in a shroud of mystery, entering unannounced some secret presence-chamber of the soul, when all the doors of sense are closed, and all the avenues of reason are barred by superstitious fear and bolted by blind credulity.

The call of God is the outward, visible, tangible appeal of the divine goodness and glory and love and truth, as it comes home to man's heart through the love of father and mother, the nobleness of brothers, the tenderness of sisters, the sweet charities of family and home, the purity and gentleness of woman, the honour and bravery of man, the call of country, the majesty of law, the grandeur of mountain and sea, the glory of sunlit clouds and starry skies, the solemn rites of temple service, the spoken word of pious exhortation, the attitude of silent prayer, the written Book of special revelation, — the old, old story of

the words and deeds, the life and death of him who was at once Son of man and Son of God.

In these voices of nature and humanity, whereby we are called away from the selfish, sensual, sinful life, God is present in different degrees of fulness and completeness. Response to any one of these calls is a step toward salvation. And the degree and fulness of the salvation thereby attained is proportioned to the degree and fulness of that revelation of the divine to which the response is given. The love of father, mother, wife, and child, the love of nature and of native land, devotion to science or to art, are of divine origin, and have divine potency to lift man out of that exclusive selfishness which is the soul of sin.

Yet they reach and redeem only parts of the man. They do not take the whole man on all sides and in all relations, up into that blessed life of love which is salvation. The salvation wrought by these agencies, though real as far as it goes, is incomplete. The man who feels the noble stirrings of human affection in his breast is not wholly dead in trespasses and sins. Nor have we therein the guarantee that he has entered wholly into life. Life and death may be striving together in him, and the issue may still be doubtful. Response to one of these divine voices does not in-

sure a like response to all the rest. It is at most a ground of hope. And yet, how often is that hope betrayed! Have we not seen men so alive to natural beauty that they could seize and make immortal the fading glory of a sunset, who were yet so far dead to the diviner beauty of the human heart that they could betray to lasting wretchedness and shame a woman's trusting love? Have we not seen a devotion to wife and children truly divine, existing in the same breast with fiendish treachery toward business associates and heartless betrayal of creditors? Have we not seen patriotism and pollution, zeal for a great cause and contempt for humble men, the love of truth and the hate of duty, stamped on the same features, animating the same heart, and struggling for control of the same life?

Just so far as one is faithful to these human loves and duties, his soul will be ripened and expanded by them into fuller love and larger life, and receptiveness for more of God. In so far as he is false, and betrays any of these human claims, to that extent the forces of death are gaining over the powers of life within him.

That man alone who, not by the hearing of the ear nor by the speaking of the lips merely, but by the assent of his heart and the devotion of his will,

has made Jesus Christ his personal ideal; who has made Christ's law of love his principle of life; who day by day strives to follow him, and asks and receives forgiveness for all wherein he falls short of that divine ideal;—that man alone is sure of salvation here and now, always and everywhere.

Not that his life is lifted all at once to the level of his ideal. As we shall see in the next chapter, the divine life is a slow and gradual growth. "We are saved by hope." And yet the intelligent and whole-souled acceptance of Christ and his grace, by faith and love, is the promise and potency of a complete and perfect triumph over every form of selfishness and sin, and an abundant entrance into eternal life. For sincere devotion to him means that his ideal becomes our ideal; his life our life. And since his ideal and life is nothing less than the comprehensive will of God and the complete devotion to the service of man, it follows that every true disciple of Christ is in principle and at heart faithful to every duty, loyal to every relationship, devoted to every cause, friendly to every person, the supporter of every institution in and through which the divine goodness is made manifest to men; and will continue faithful to whatever new forms of goodness and love the future may unfold.

The raw material of appetite and passion, the primitive instincts of self-preservation and self-assertion, are not all at once worked over into spiritual gifts and Christian graces. Repentance, faith, and grace bring God and man into right relations; and thereby give complete assurance of ultimate salvation. The actual working out of this union is the function of the Spirit, and will form the subject of the following chapter.

The thought of God as an arbitrary, external Ruler created artificial difficulties in the way of the divine forgiveness which required equally arbitrary and artificial schemes for their reconciliation. When once we grasp the thought of God as the Universal Will whose aim is the well-being of all his children and the development of the perfect social order, then instantly we see that the free grace of God, and the full forgiveness of every repentant and contrite heart, is not an afterthought and a contrivance of the divine ingenuity, but is a necessary outcome of the divine nature. It is impossible for God not to forgive a sinner the instant he repents; for not to forgive is not to love, and that is impossible with God. An unforgiving spirit is the one unforgivable sin in man; and surely we cannot attribute that to God. God, indeed, hates sin with bitter, uncompromising hate;

but that is because sin is injurious to the men whom God loves, and is inconsistent with that social ideal of mutual helpfulness and good-will which he is seeking to develop among men. But the moment a man renounces his sin, he at once becomes acceptable to God; both for what he is in himself, and for the social service he is now for the first time prepared to render. As Professor Royce has expressed it, "The One Will must conquer. The one aim is stern to its steadfast enemies, but it is infinitely regardful of all the single aims, however they may seem wayward, that can at last find themselves subdued and yet realized in its presence, and so conformed to its will. All these rivulets of purpose, however tiny, all these strong floods of passion, however angry, it desires to gather into the surging tides of its infinite ocean, that nothing may be lost that consents to enter. The One Will is no one-sided will. It desires the realization of all possible life, however rich, strong, ardent, courageous, manifold such life may be, if only this life can enter into that highest unity. All that has will is sacred to it, save in so far as any will refuses to join with the others in the song and shout of the Sons of God. Its warfare is never intolerance, its demand for submission is never tyranny, its sense of the excel-

lence of its own unity is never arrogance; for its warfare is aimed at the intolerance of the separate selves, its yoke is the yoke of complete organic freedom, its pride is the perfect development of all life. When we serve it, we must sternly cut off all that life in ourselves or in others that cannot ultimately conform to the universal will; but we have nothing but love for every form of sentient existence that can in any measure express this Will."

From the social point of view sin is deadly: because it is selfish and anti-social. Law is stern and remorseless: because it is the indispensable condition of social well-being. Judgment is searching and severe: because every trace of selfishness and insincerity must be sifted and burned out of human hearts before the perfect society can come. And on the other hand, from this same social point of view, the true penitent is absolutely sure of immediate acceptance with the Father: because his penitence is the renunciation of his anti-social attitude. His feeble faith and faint aspiration is at once clothed in the garments of that perfect social righteousness which he now accepts as the ideal of character and the aim of conduct. His eleventh-hour service is equally rewarded with the longer labour of those who have borne the heat

and burden of the day: because the spirit of service and not the length of labour or the quantity of work is the essential test of fitness for the new life on which he enters, and the divine society of which he becomes a member. The grace of God is as full and free as his judgment is searching and severe. The salvation of the man who repents is as sure and certain as is the condemnation of the man who persists in selfishness and sin. The reason why men are called on everywhere to repent, or change from the selfish to the social spirit, is the assurance that there stands waiting to receive them this nobler life of social service and this divine society of unselfish servants of God and their fellow-men. This was the gospel with which Jesus redeemed the world, when "he began to preach, and to say, Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

It was not the promise of immunity from individual punishment in another world with which he won frightened adherents to his cause. It was by the immediate presentation of the nobler life and the social spirit, by the establishment of a society founded upon service, and a kingdom rooted and grounded in love, that he saved men from selfishness and sin and imparted to the world a new and eternal prin-

ciple of life. The entrance of that Holy Spirit, and the development and realization of that divine life will be the subject of the following chapter.

CHAPTER VI

REGENERATION AND GROWTH — LIFE

Even faith and grace leave God and man, though reconciled, still external to each other. God is the object of faith ; man is the object of grace. The union of God and man in a new life remains to be accomplished. This is the work of the Spirit, the Lord and Giver of Life. The entrance of the Spirit is regeneration.

Without regeneration there can be no spiritual life. "Except a man be born anew he cannot see the kingdom of God." It is, however, a serious error to confine the Spirit's working to any mode of procedure, to expect it to be clearly defined in time, or to demand that the individual shall be explicitly conscious of the process. The new birth may come as suddenly as a flash of lightning out of the midnight dark. More frequently, however, it comes as gradually and imperceptibly as daylight breaks upon the sleeping world at dawn. It may be occasioned by the burning words of preacher or evangelist at an evening

meeting. It may be due to the silent influence of a father's example and a mother's love, extended over all the years of childhood and youth. It may manifest itself as a sudden revulsion from one's whole past, and a break with all one's old associations; or it may be simply the fuller recognition of the significance of early training, and the more conscious acceptance of established principles of conduct. It may be accompanied by almost any shade of feeling from agony to rapture; and its practical expression may be anything between greater kindness and considerateness in the home to the most arduous foreign mission. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

As we have already seen, it is a serious mistake to regard the Holy Spirit as a mysterious force, a hidden fire, a heavenly dew, a holy gale, coming down only at special times and places, and then withdrawing for a season to his secret habitation. We have learned to recognize the presence of the Holy Spirit in every heart in which the seeds of the Gospel have fallen and borne fruit; in every home where Christian principles are cherished and observed; in the power of Christlike person-

ality which fathers and mothers have over children; which teachers exercise over pupils; which pastor exerts over people; which friend has over friend. And if the Spirit be thus diffused and omnipresent; then we should expect his working to be no less varied and multiform.

Regeneration is the beginning of the process by which the raw material of sensuous impulse and natural appetite is worked over into moral virtue and spiritual grace. It is the entrance of God into man, through which the Spirit of God comes to dwell in us as a perpetual presence; the abiding secret of all our peace, and the permanent source of all power.

The Spirit is, in his very nature, not individualistic, but social. The life of God in man must be a universal life. The Spirit of God is the Spirit of love. And the manifestation of the Spirit is chiefly in and through the institutions and practical relations of society. The third part of this book will be devoted to the social expression which the indwelling Spirit makes in his outgoing life.

Here we are concerned only with the beginning. It is self-evident that if there is to be a life of the Spirit in man, the beginning must be made. "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye

must be born anew." The reason why the absolute and universal necessity of regeneration is not more generally recognized, is that we have looked at the spiritual life as too individualistic. Now selfish and individualistic goodness, if there were any such thing, might conceivably be attained without the Spirit's aid. But social goodness is the very life of the Spirit; and to be without the Spirit and to be without the life of unselfish social service is the same thing.

If we turn away from abstract selfish conceptions of virtue, and consider the concrete relations in which men stand to each other in society, we shall see at once that without regeneration there can be no true and worthy social life. Take the family, business, science and art, social intercourse and the state. In each of these spheres regeneration is an absolute necessity to the realization of its ideal. The principle of life which we derive from nature, and with which we all start out, is one that must be abandoned and destroyed, and a new principle or, rather, the Holy Spirit, must take its place, before a man is fit to be husband and father; before he can be an honour to any craft or business or profession; before he can deserve the name of scholar; before he can adorn any circle of society; before he can be a true and loyal citizen of any state.

First: the family. No man can be rightly married who is not therein born anew. This is simply another way of saying that no man can be rightly married without love. For what is love, if it be not the death of the private exclusive self, which cares for none but self, and the birth within one of a newer, larger, richer self, which includes the being and welfare of another in the aims, interests, and affections which he calls his own. And this new life of unselfish love is ever the life of God; the indwelling of his Spirit.

Hence it is no metaphor, but plain, literal fact, that the well-married husband and wife are born anew; and that except a man to this extent be born anew he cannot see the beauteous and blessed kingdom of family and home. He that climbeth up some other way is a thief and a robber. Whether that other way be the brutal way of gross passion and cruel lust; whether it be the base way of deliberate self-seeking for wealth and family connections; whether it be the giddy way of thoughtless haste and sentimental glamour; or whether it be the vulgar way of "the low-loving herd," who are fond "of self in other still preferred"; that other way, whatever it be, is sure to be thorny, treacherous, and troubled, and the end thereof is misery and woe.

As long as two individuals retain their natural, separate selfhood; as long as each seeks his own; as long as each regards the other as means to his own ends, these individuals are unfit to be united. And the closer the bond that binds them, the more violently will they chafe against its fetters. Only those who are lifted by the Spirit into a new life of self-forgetful love can find the blessed life of harmoniously wedded souls.

Second: labour and business. Honest industry and just commerce are the foundations on which rest all the amenities of life, the sanctities of home, the higher forms of social intercourse, and intellectual and political activity. Now it is not natural for man to do his work or go into business with any such conception of the social significance of his vocation as an artisan, or of his high calling as a business man. Men are by nature lazy. It is natural for the working man to shirk; and to try to get the largest possible pay for the least possible expenditure of effort; regardless of the worth or worthlessness of the product of his work. The natural attitude of men toward business is that of swine toward a trough. It is natural for a man to get out of his business as much as he can, regardless of how he gets it, or whom he takes it from.

Work done in this natural way is slavish and degrading. Business done on this natural plane dwarfs the heart, deadens the sympathies, and shrivels the soul. Except some idea of industry as a social function enter into and possess a man; except he resolve to do good work whether his pay be large or small; except the sacredness of the human interests that depend upon business appeal to him; except the heroic ideal of business integrity lay its authoritative hand upon him; except he be ready to maintain the costly right against the profitable wrong at all hazards; in a word, except the larger interests of the industrial world be reflected in his individual breast; except the Spirit of service and justice animate his soul, he cannot expect to find anything to his credit on the books of God.

Third: science and art. We all know too well the natural approach to these things; the delight in our own smartness; the pride in what we know; the ambition to win fame by some bold stroke or dashing performance. And yet we all know well that no true work was ever done in such a state; that nothing good or true or beautiful ever came from man or institution or nation where such an atmosphere was prevalent. We know what mean jealousies and petty

strifes and bitter animosities such an attitude engenders among poets, painters, preachers, musicians, orators, scientists, and statesmen. We know, or ought to know, that nothing but falsehood and folly, hideousness and hate, can ever be the outcome of such an animus.

The man who will write lines that shall be remembered, or speak words that men shall heed, or do work that shall endure, must quit trying to be smart. He must care little for the fate of his private, pet hypothesis who will extend the domains of real science. He must seek no short cut to fame who will depict on canvas or carve in stone real facts of nature in true forms of thought.

So radical, so searching, so comprehensive, must be the change from the seeking of selfish satisfaction to the service of truth and beauty, in him who will be scholar and artist. The seed of the natural, private self must fall into the ground and die, before the better, higher self, born of the Spirit, can put forth the beauteous flowers of poetry and art, and mature the precious fruit of science and philosophy.

Fourth: social intercourse. Here again the natural attitude is one of subtle, but none the less real, self-seeking. The natural man is bent

on making a good impression. He seeks not so much to give pleasure as to win the consideration and flattery which is the reward of giving pleasure. He fawns upon the rich and frowns upon the poor. He makes distinctions for the sake of distinctions, and is the upholder of an artificial aristocracy and caste. We all have seen the bitter fruits of this social self-seeking. Wherever it exists we find society honeycombed with bitter enmities and base suspicions; the heart all eaten out of it by burning jealousies and mutual distrust; the soul consumed with suppressed hate and hidden grief; the surface all crusted over with artificial form and ostentatious rivalry.

Only when the Spirit of love enters, putting self last and others first, and generously devoting talents, beauty, wealth, position, and accomplishments to the increase of happiness and the upbuilding of character in as wide a circle as kinship of spirit and community of interest can reasonably include, — only then are these gifts reclaimed from corruption; only then is society justified and its members blessed.

Fifth: politics. There are two seemingly opposite, but radically identical attitudes toward politics, which it is equally natural to take. The

indifferent man trusts that things will go about right any way ; he sees that he will make enemies and lose customers if he meddles with politics ; and so he lets politics alone.

The ambitious man sees that with a little ready wit and a fluent tongue ; by spending a little money and doing a little dirty work, he can establish claims upon his party, which sooner or later will be rewarded with office and emoluments, patronage and power. Neither of these natural attitudes is patriotism. Patriotism is a fruit of the Spirit, which nature cannot evoke ; still less maintain. And that is why the maintenance on any considerable scale of a pure and devoted patriotism in times of peace and plenty has ever been the unsolved problem of republics ; the unfulfilled duty of multitudes of otherwise estimable and honourable men. A Spirit higher than his own individual nature must come into a man ; making him see in city and state and nation a sacred worth, a social claim, a divine authority, so high above the pettiness of his private interests and personal ambitions that rivalry between them is impossible.

In each and every sphere of social life a man must become in spirit, attitude, and aim, an entirely new creature, before he can realize the ideal

of that sphere. What is true of the parts is true of the whole. Into social life in its broadest and highest significance; into the kingdom which includes all these separate spheres, no man can enter, except first the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of self-forgetful and unselfish service, the Spirit that recognizes objective and universal interests as its own, enter into him. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

The man who has been born of the Spirit sees life, in all its departments — home, business, study, society, and politics — as one rounded and organic whole of which he is a conscious and co-operating member. One Father's thought embraces this total life of man. One Filial Will is seeking realization in all its several departments. One Spirit animates it all. Before this all-embracing thought of the Father; this all-conquering will of the Son; this all-pervading life of the Spirit, the regenerated man lays down all mean and petty aims that are peculiar to himself as a private, particular individual; and receives into himself as the substance of a new life the larger thought, the higher will, the purer purpose which he has found in God. Thus by the mighty transforming power of the Spirit, received and wel-

comed into the heart of man, he passes from death to life, from strife to peace, from bondage to liberty, from the minding of the flesh to the minding of the Spirit, from identification with the merely natural will of his petty private self into identification with the glorious will of him who is the Institutor of the family, the Law-giver of business, the Source of truth and beauty, the Ideal of good-will and lovingkindness, the Founder and Judge of nations, the Creator of the world, and the Father of our spirits.

As the new life begins in a new birth, not in an individual act, so its continuance is a gradual growth, not an artificial manufacture. Here we see the great difference between morality and religion. Morality undertakes to manufacture character: religion plants the seed, cultivates it patiently and faithfully, and waits for it to grow. The spiritual nature in man is a plant of slow growth. You can get quicker returns by the artificial method of self-conscious moralizing. But to put out and keep out all lust, covetousness, malice, indolence, jealousy, falsehood, pride, and selfishness; and to fill the life and keep it full of purity, generosity, energy, gentleness, meekness, kindness, and love; that, or any considerable approximation to it, by the moral method of culti-

vating one by one the separate moral virtues, is a sheer impossibility. The task is too vast ; the foe too subtle ; the will of man too weak and too inconstant. The natural self is a veritable Hydra. For every vice you cut off two spring up afresh. The bad principle within us, as ascetics and subjective moralists ever have found and testified, is strengthened by our attacks and consolidated by our blows. Morality points us in the right direction. We all owe our first steps in righteousness to this strict pedagogue. But it can take us such a little way; it stops so far short of the goal ; and then the virtue it does attain is so self-conscious, so cold and formal, so akin to pride and so liable to the fall that always follows pride ; that those who have tried this method of a formal, legal, artificial self-righteousness most faithfully have been the first to acknowledge its shortcoming.

Just because the transformation wrought by the Spirit is more deep and fundamental than that wrought by morality, it is more obscure in its working, and more slow in producing visible results. The regenerated man will not be made perfect all at once. And yet from the beginning his salvation is assured. Though temptation will still press hard upon him, though sins will still beset his path, though his falls will continue to be

many, yet he will have strength to resist, grace to repent, power to rise above it all. In the face of his worst failings and shortcomings he can say, "It is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me." In other words, it is not the new true self which he is resolved to be, not the self which he has received from God and which henceforth is to be the inmost centre of his being; it is the old, renounced, repudiated self that sins. It is the not yet arrested momentum of habits that are in principle abandoned; it is the poisonous fruit still clinging to the branches of a tree which has been plucked up by the roots, which still mars the outward life with sin and shame. But from all present and permanent identification of heart and life with the repudiated evil, the birth and growth within him of a new life gives him complete deliverance, assured salvation.

The growth of the spiritual life is largely hidden and unconscious, like the growth of a seed. "So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed upon the earth; and should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring up and grow, he knoweth not how."

Psychical research has been revealing curious facts of late. Things once thought miraculous,

like the stigmata of the cross on the bodies of mediæval saints, can be duplicated to-day wherever the hypnotizer can find a patient sufficiently susceptible; careful experiments go far toward establishing the ability of peculiarly sensitive persons to read, without the aid of ordinary sensuous symbols, the contents of another mind. The fact that there may be in the same body, and connected with the same brain, two distinct selves, each ignoring the presence of the other, each in a way complementary to the other; which take turns in occupying the field of consciousness, one self sleeping while the other wakes, one expressing itself through the voice in speech while the other expresses itself through the hand in writing, — these, and a host of similar facts, once denied and ridiculed, are coming to be accepted data of psychology.

Now, when new facts do not fit into old theories, there is only one thing to do. We must make new theories large enough to give these new facts room. That is just what psychology is doing to-day. To explain these facts we are compelled to assume that the self is more than we are conscious of. As Mr. F. W. H. Myers has expressed it, there is a subliminal consciousness, so deeply buried that ordinarily we are not

aware of its existence. Only when the flow of our ordinary consciousness is arrested or diverted does this deeper consciousness manifest itself. It is in this buried consciousness that all these powers inhere for which the upper or ordinary consciousness has no place and of which it can give no explanation. According to this view, the spirit or soul of man floats in nature like a solid in a liquid. A part only of the solid object is visible. The other part, and usually the larger part, is hidden beneath the surface. The self of which we are conscious is only one section, perhaps a small section, of the total self.

> "Below the surface-stream, shallow and light,
> Of what we *say* we feel — below the stream,
> As light, of what we *think* we feel — there flows,
> With noiseless current strong, obscure, and deep,
> The central stream of what we feel indeed."

If, now, psychologist and poet are right; if a large part of each man's self is below the threshold of his own consciousness and beyond the reach of his own observation, it behooves us in all our practical concerns to take account of this subconscious self.

It is not the infinitesimal fraction of spiritual truth that we have apprehended already; not the poor, petty experiences that we have gone through;

not the filthy rags of a righteousness with which we have succeeded in clothing ourselves, that constitute the worth of our religious life. It is the truth, not that we have gotten hold of, but that has gotten hold of us with such power that, though we know but little of it, we are sure there is infinitely more, and we surrender our minds to its gradual reception; it is the experience, not that we have had, but that we are sure we might have and ought to have, and which we invite into our life by habits of consecration and devotion; it is the conduct, not which we have wrought out as a finished achievement, but which we plant far in advance of present attainment as our ideal and goal, and vow never to cease our aspiration and endeavour until the ideal shall be real and the goal is won, — these are the deep and real grounds of Christian confidence. In other words, we are saved, not by retrospection, nor yet by introspection, but, as Paul says, by hope; by faith and not by works; by aspiration toward what we shall be, not by satisfaction with what we are; by the confession of Christ, not by the profession of our own religion; by the reception of the Spirit, not by any merit in our natural selves.

Two practical conclusions follow obviously from this recognition of the unconscious growth of the

religious nature. First: we must make sure that we plant the seed of truth deep in the soil of mind and heart. When we plant seed in the ground, we cannot see it grow at first. We must have faith in what we cannot see. We must leave the seed to grow of itself. But we must plant it, to begin with. We must know that it is there. The ground does not bring forth fruit of itself. The sower must cast seed into the ground. And this is a conscious process. This is left for each man consciously to do for himself. The winds of heaven will sow all sorts of weeds and tares. The good seed must be selected and planted by the hand of man.

Here, then, is the great question for each thoughtful mind to ponder: Have I planted the seed of a worthy character in my own heart, and am I watering it, and keeping the weeds down, day by day? Notice, please, that the question is not whether the plant has grown to any particular height, or whether the fruit is ripe upon its branches. That is a minor matter. The question is simply whether I have consciously committed my heart to God; whether I have taken Christ as my Lord and Master, my standard and ideal; and whether day by day I am opening my heart in meditation, in aspiration, in communion, to him

and to the gracious influence of his Spirit? It is not a great thing, not a hard thing, to do. There is no possible excuse for waiting. The simplest creed, the slightest stirring of feeling, the feeblest genuine determination to do right, is all one needs to start with. This seed of a sincere acceptance of Christ as Lord, once planted, and faithfully watered and cultivated by systematic habits of devotion, will spring up and grow, and blossom into noble character and splendid usefulness.

Having once received the Spirit, having planted the seed, we may trust this good seed to do its work in its own time and in its own way. Above all things, let us not pull it up by the roots every now and then to see how it is growing. Let us remember that we have just two things to do: to plant the seed, and to keep it provided with proper nourishment and care. And we may rest assured that if we do our part the seed will do the rest. We need not be impatient for the fruit. It will not come all at once. For a long time after planting we shall see no visible signs of even the plant, to say nothing of bud and flower and fruit. That is the time when young Christians who have not pondered our parable fall into dejection and despair. They have planted the seed, and it has not come up. They have nothing to show for it.

They have given their hearts to Christ, and he has given scarcely a token of recognition. They have no sure creed that they can proclaim; no experience that they can relate in meeting; no manifest change in deportment to which they can point with pride as evidence of their conversion. Well, if the parable is true; if there is a deeper self than that which appears upon the surface, this, far from being an occasion for regret, is evidence that the seed of a true Christian character is growing in just the humble, quiet, natural way in which God would have it grow; in just the way in which Jesus tells us that it must grow, if it is to be a vigorous, healthy plant, and bear sound, sweet fruit at last. Silently and slowly, but steadily and surely, the truth that God's service is our first concern, the feeling that Christ's character is our supreme ideal, the determination that our life shall be lived in the Spirit of love which he imparted to the world — these ideals, principles, and aspirations are gradually transforming our ways of thinking, our currents of emotion, our springs of action. Let the good work go on. We must keep near to God by study of his Word, by submission to his will, by fellowship with those who are seeking to know and serve him. But we must think as little of ourselves as possible, and not stop to take ac-

count of stock of our spiritual attainments. The Bible does not tell us that we shall walk all the way by sight. It does not promise quick and visible returns for every investment. Have we really learned, with all our orthodoxy of creed and confession, the one great lesson, so simple yet so essential, that we are saved by the slow transformation wrought within us by a cherished faith, not by the sudden exhibition of accomplished works; and that the source of our salvation is the Christ whom we gradually appropriate by love and trust, and the Holy Spirit whom we receive; not our own power to repeat a creed, or lead a meeting, or accomplish a reform?

Of course, in due time faith will produce appropriate works; the grown stalk will bear fruit after its kind. Yet here, too, we must have much patience with ourselves. We must not expect the ripened and perfected fruit all at once. Our first works will be failures and defeats; our second, blunders and mistakes; after that we may expect such partial and moderate success as invariably crowns fidelity and constancy and courage. Does this seem a gloomy and depressing prophecy? It is merely a modern version of the words: "The earth beareth fruit of herself: first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear."

If the seed of a sincere and sustained desire and purpose to follow Christ is really planted in our hearts and watered by daily prayer and meditation, we may trust God implicitly; trust the seed's inherent power; trust the fertility of our own deeper nature; and wait patiently for God to do his work. We shall fail; we shall err; we shall sin; and for a long time our new purpose will manifest itself chiefly in overtaking our faults after they are committed; and that, we saw, is penitence. By and by our new God-given purpose will grow stronger and gain upon the ingrained habits of selfishness and sin; and then there will come many a bitter struggle into life. In the end we shall conquer; and then our divinely implanted life will get the start of the old and dying impulses of crude, selfish, and sensual desire; then the matured product of our long-buried faith will be manifest in a character confirmed in righteousness, and a conduct visibly consistent with the spiritual standard so long invisibly cherished.

Then the wonder will be all the other way. At first we wonder that a man who has confessed Christ, and is honestly trying to follow him, can give so little evidence of it in conduct. This makes us critical and censorious of others, dis-

heartened and despairing about ourselves. When, however, we look on the mature and developed Christian, when we see such serenity in bereavement, such patience in trial, such fortitude in sorrow, such supremacy over appetite, such self-control in passion, such fidelity to the costly right against the profitable wrong, such loyalty to searching and unwelcome truth against easy and accepted error, such sympathy with the weak and suffering, and such fearless opposition to oppressive wealth and unrighteous power, then the wonder is all the other way, and we ask, How can such strong and sweet and noble character consist with frail human nature? The answer, however, is not far to seek. Long ago, in the days of seed-time, there was sown in this soul the tiny seed of an earnest aspiration to become more and more like Christ. For weeks and months the seed lay buried, giving little or no outward proof of its presence, and even its possessor doubted at times whether it were actually alive. Then came the early years of failure and defeat; then the years of sore temptation and bitter conflict, when the old self and the new fought desperately for the supremacy. And now the new life has so completely conquered that the Spirit of Christ has become a second nature, putting forth the fair

leaves of appropriate conduct, and bearing the precious fruit of Christian character. Then we understand the meaning of another closely related parable which tells us that the kingdom of heaven is very small in its beginning, but very great in its final outcome. It is like "a grain of mustard-seed, which, when it is sown upon the earth, though it be less than all seeds that are upon the earth, yet when it is sown groweth up and becometh greater than all the herbs, and putteth out great branches, so that the birds of the heaven can lodge under the shadow thereof."

Part III

SOCIOLOGICAL

CHAPTER VII

POSSESSION AND CONFESSION — THE CHURCH

HAVING gained the life of the Spirit, it might seem as if nothing remained for man to do but to keep it. Yet if we have apprehended this life aright we have seen that it is something which by its very nature refuses to be kept. God is the universal thought and will whom no finite mind can possibly contain. He is the whole of which our thoughts and purposes are but partial and fragmentary reproductions. And only by constant enlargement and perpetual endeavour can we keep in communion and fellowship with him. Christ is the moral and spiritual ideal; never perfectly realized in us, and only by ceaseless striving can we retain our hold on him. The Spirit is the life of God and Christ in humanity; and only by the continual outgoing of sympathy and service can we share his blessed life of love.

Faith, hope, love, all the graces and qualities of the spiritual life, are social. They lead the individual out of himself into relations with others.

Theology shows us God as implied in the rational and moral nature of man. Anthropology shows us man turning from sin in penitence, laying hold on Christ by faith, and received into the divine life by regeneration. Sociology shows us the union of God and man expressed in divine institutions, wrought out by human service, and embodied in a universal life of love in which the will of God is accomplished through the instrumentality of man.

The life of the Spirit, as we saw in the last chapter, resembles a seed. To keep a seed is to kill it. It must be planted. It must be placed in vital relations with the great forces of nature. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit. He that loveth his life [or his soul] loseth it." "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me." From the unprofitable servant who hid the talent it is taken away. The spiritual life is not a possession which the individual can enjoy off in a corner by himself. Unless he gives it unselfishly to others, and shares it generously with the world, it withers and shrivels to nothingness in his hands.

The more vital and practical expressions of the spiritual life will be considered in later chapters.

The formal manifestation of the spiritual principle concerns us here.

The first duty of the man who has the spiritual life is to acknowledge it. If a man is ashamed of it, it is a sure sign that he has not got it; or at least that he has it in a very unworthy and distorted form. No man can be ashamed of God, who has a worthy conception of his nature. No man can be ashamed of Christ, who has caught the faintest glimpse of the real nobleness of his character. No man can be ashamed of the spiritual life, who has entered ever so little into the secret of its divine unselfishness.

A friend whom we are unwilling to acknowledge publicly as our friend, is no friend at all. "And I say unto you, Every one who shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God: but he that denieth me in the presence of men shall be denied in the presence of the angels of God." This is not a hard saying, pointing to a time in the far future when the offended Christ will pay back in their own coin those who have had the audacity to slight him. The man who refuses to confess Christ is lacking in the first principles of Christlikeness. He is either blind and cannot see Christ's character and worth; in

which case Christ could pity, but scarcely could confess him as already his follower and friend. Or else he sees and is ashamed to own it; and then he is a coward, whom no amount of confession by Christ, even if such confession were possible, could ever make respectable and presentable.

It is a maxim of psychology that "all mental states are followed by activity of some sort." Whoever has a worthy conception of God and the divine life must do something about it. He may confess it like a man; he may conceal it like a coward. Between these two there is no middle ground. "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth." Christ repudiates all weak-kneed, half-hearted followers with the curt remark that they are "not fit for the kingdom of God." Such unseasoned salt he tells them is "fit neither for the land nor the dunghill: men cast it out."

The confession of Christ is not confined to the declaration of individuals. It finds its permanent and corporate expression in the church. The church is the organized and visible witness to Christ. It is the company of those who own him as Lord and Master, unite in the worship of the Father whom he revealed, and devote themselves to the service of the world he came to save.

The church is not in itself the kingdom of God. It is the training-school for it. The kingdom of God is realized in actual service of the world, in costly sacrifice for men; in the heat of the conflict; and in the joy of achieved victory. The church is the institution where the life of service is systematically cultivated; where the principles of the kingdom are systematically taught; where the motives of loyalty are systematically inculcated.

Dr. Gladden has happily compared the relation of the church to the kingdom of God with the relation of the brain to the body. He says, "The kingdom of heaven is the entire social organism in its ideal perfection; the church is one of the organs, — the most central and important of them all, — having much the same relation to Christian society that the brain has to the body. The body is not all brain; but the brain is the seat of thought and feeling and motion. A body without a brain would not be a very effective instrument of the mind; society, without those specialized religious functions which are gathered up in the church, would not very readily receive and incarnate and distribute the gifts of the Spirit of God.

"And yet the brain is of use only as it furnishes to all the other organs and parts of the body feel-

ing and motion. The life and health of the brain are found only in ministering to the whole body. Exactly in the same way is the church related to all the other parts of human society. Its life is in their life: it cannot live apart from them; it lives by what it gives to them; it has neither meaning nor justification except in what it does to vitalize and spiritualize business and politics and amusement and art and literature and education, and every other interest of society. The moment it draws apart, and tries to set up a snug little ecclesiasticism, with interests of its own, and a cultus of its own, and enjoyments of its own — the moment it begins to teach men to be religious just for the sake of being religious — that moment it becomes dead and accursed; it is worse than useless; it is a bane and a blight to all the society in which it stands."

The church is the inspirer and director of social service. The primitive church undertook not only to inspire and guide, but actually to perform a large amount of social work. The institutional church attempts to do that now. In both cases the assumption of such work has been justified by the circumstances. Where the social machinery for the care of the sick, the training of the young, the feeding of the hungry, the clothing

of the naked, and the employment of the unemployed is lacking, as it was in the days when the church was founded, and as to a great extent it is in sections of our large cities to-day, then it is the duty of the church in its official and organized capacity to practise as well as to teach; to perform as well as to direct these social services.

Yet, these are undeveloped and abnormal conditions. The more developed a community becomes, the more specialized become its organs. Then charity, the housing of the poor, education, penology, are turned over to organizations and institutions especially designed to perform these particular services; and the church is left free to do its special work of cultivating the social spirit and keeping alive the altruistic and reverent disposition. The church continues to be responsible for the efficient performance of these social activities; but it exercises its power chiefly in the moulding of the institutions and the inspiring of individuals who do the actual work.

There is, indeed, great danger that the church, when so largely relieved of actual service, will forget to cultivate the spirit of service, and become a dead and fruitless cumberer of the ground. This, however, is the danger that all great opportunity involves. The college, with its four years of

leisure, has a magnificent opportunity to train young men for service. And yet, we all know that this very opportunity is perverted into an excuse for idleness and a preparation for worthlessness by a certain proportion of every college class. The church, like the college, must accept the greater opportunity, with its accompanying risks. A certain proportion of churches are doubtless mere cumberers of the ground. Yet that by no means disproves the importance of the really useful churches as trainers of men for service and self-sacrifice, for the worship of God and the upbuilding of man. No more useless and worthless and pitiful and contemptible creature walks the earth than the mere ecclesiastic, who strives to build up his church as an end in itself. They are the successors of the scribes and Pharisees and chief priests who were so odious to Christ, and who brought about his crucifixion. Jesus ranked them below publicans and harlots; and there are ecclesiastics in nearly every communion to-day, who are less genuine and frank and honest and disinterested than the gambler and the rum-seller whom they denounce. If one of the twelve was a traitor, we must not expect perfection in any line of apostolical succession. The church, like all human institutions, holds its treasure in

earthen vessels. But there is no more reason to abandon or despise the church on account of the frailty and insincerity and pretentiousness of some of its representatives, than there is to renounce allegiance to city or state or nation because aldermen are sometimes rascals and legislators have been influenced by bribes. That there are good priests and bad priests; sensible clergymen and foolish clergymen; laymen who are sincere and laymen who are insincere, may be more lamentable than the fact that there are intelligent physicians and quacks; honest lawyers and dishonest lawyers; competent teachers and incompetent teachers. But neither the profession of the ministry or of law or of medicine or of teaching is thereby discredited.

The clear recognition of the function of the church as the school which trains and educates mankind in the spirit of social service makes clear the duty of the individual to take his place in the church, and the duty of society to generously support it. A man may contrive to secure a fair secular education apart from the secular schools and colleges. Yet in neglecting these established educational institutions, he places himself at a great disadvantage. The self-educated man is very apt to be narrow and one-sided; and out of

touch with the thought and interest of the educated world. And even if he succeeds in thoroughly educating himself, his independence of the school and the university is rather apparent than real. For even then he must read the books, enter into the thoughts, share the interests of the learned world. And these writings, thoughts, and interests are produced and developed and maintained almost wholly by the institutions of learning and the men whom these institutions train. So that even the self-educated man receives all the substance of his education indirectly through the established educational institutions; and differs from the regular graduate of these institutions only in that he has received the influence of the schools at second hand.

In precisely the same way all members of the Christian community owe their highest ideals and most generous principles directly or indirectly to the church. The upright and virtuous man in a Christian community who stands apart from the church gets his spiritual education from the church at second hand. Through fathers and mothers who have been rooted and grounded in Christian character; through ideals and standards which have been laboriously erected by centuries of Christian sacrifice; through laws and institu-

tions which are founded upon Christian principles; these self-righteous despisers of the church owe whatever superior virtue they possess to the unrecognized influence of this great school of virtue. Individuals here and there may live upright, virtuous, and truly Christian lives outside of the church; just as individuals here and there develop genuine scholarship outside of the universities. But for effective influence in cultivating the virtuous disposition in others, and promoting the social spirit in the community at large, the man who stands apart from the church in a merely individualistic righteousness is almost as useless as the soldier who refuses to join a company or regiment or army, but shoulders his individual musket and starts out to fight his country's battles on his own account. Society without the organized education in virtue and kindness and love which the church affords would be as helpless against the disintegrating forces of avarice and lust and selfishness and sin, as a city without police to protect it against crime, or a nation without an army to defend it against a foreign foe.

There are two modes of reception into the church. The one presupposes Christian training in the home and the community; and simply confirms the character and faith already formed by

this long process of Christian education. The other assumes that all that is not consciously Christian must be totally depraved; and demands individual profession of faith and conscious experience of grace as a condition of admission. The former method affords the broader basis of membership; and has the great analogy of the state's reception of its citizens upon its side. The latter method secures a higher average of piety and zeal in its membership: but it does this at the cost of excluding a large number of men who, while practically Christian in the purpose and tenor of their lives, do not wear their hearts upon their sleeves, and hesitate to make public profession of the more sentimental aspects of their personal faith. This relegation of multitudes of the strongest, most efficient members of the community to a secondary place, as members of the parish but not members of the church, because they have not at some stated time become intensely conscious of a great and sudden spiritual change, and because they fail to express their faith in public prayer and pious exhortation, is the great weakness of churches of the Congregational or individualistic type. Democratic in their internal organization, they set up a sort of intellectual or emotional aristocracy as the condition of

admission. It is the churches which are organized on the Episcopal principle which have the most democratic basis of fellowship; and gain the strongest hold upon all sorts and conditions of men.

Membership in the church is the privilege of all who accept the will of the Father as the rule of their lives; who acknowledge Christ as the revealer and interpreter of the Father's will; and who receive the Spirit of love as the substance of the new life in which the will of the Father and the example of the Son is to be reproduced in themselves. Beyond this essential spiritual faith and trust and love, no assent to elaborate articles of intellectual belief should be required. If belief in God and confession of Christ and reception of the Spirit is not sufficient to form a bond of union between the members of a church, no assent to creed or profession of dogma will make good that deficiency. Reliance on the efficacy of a creed for this purpose is virtual distrust of the Spirit.

Creeds indeed, as we have already seen, have their place. Just as nations and states need constitutions, written or implied; just as political parties need platforms; so the church needs some formulation of its principles and some expression of its purpose. Such creeds or confessions, how-

ever, should be regarded as the general sense of the majority, not as binding upon the conscience of the individual.

A theological creed must in the nature of things always be more or less behind the times. Just because it is the conviction of the many, it cannot adequately represent the maturest convictions of the most competent few. A creed is valuable as a conservative force to preserve what is precious in the thinking of the past. When, however, it is set up as a barrier to the progressive thought of the present, it is mischievous and pernicious. Then belief in a dead creed is substituted for faith in the living God: and the church relapses into stagnation and decay.

The Bible is the church's most precious heritage. The Bible is the history and literary expression of the life of God in humanity. As such, it is the product of the Holy Spirit. It is inspired. There are points of resemblance and points of difference between the inspiration of the Bible and the inspiration of other true and noble writings. In all genuine speech the truth uttered is something larger and deeper than the immediate creation of the individual speaker's mind. Unless the larger thought of the community and the deeper truth of nature and life come into him and demand utter-

ance through him, he can have nothing of importance to communicate, and has no right to speak. Yet the inspiration of the Bible is deeper and clearer than this inspiration which is common to all honest literary men. It is the added inspiration of love and worship and service, which in very different degrees gives to the Sacred Scriptures the peculiar charm and authority they have. What Matthew Arnold says of the difference between the inspiration of Socrates and the inspiration of Jesus is true in a general way of the difference between the inspiration of the Bible and the inspiration of the average good book. "Socrates inspired boundless friendship and esteem; but the inspiration of reason and conscience is the one inspiration which comes from him, and which impels us to live righteously as he did. A penetrating enthusiasm of love, sympathy, pity, adoration, reinforcing the inspiration of reason and duty, does not belong to Socrates. With Jesus it is different." The authority of the Bible rests on no external props and arbitrary claims. It proves its own inspiration and authority by its power beyond all other books to quicken and sustain the life of the Spirit. The response of the Spirit in the reader is the witness to the presence of the Spirit in the writers and their words. For

the power to beget holy and unselfish living, the power to inspire brave and faithful service, the power to impart enthusiastic and devoted love to God and to one's fellowmen; — this is ever the prerogative of the Holy Spirit; the infallible proof of the presence of the Lord and Giver of life.

The Bible represents the high-water mark of the spiritual life. It is pervaded by that first glow of spiritual enthusiasm which animated the hearts of those to whom the revelation of the Father first came with a freshness and simplicity which can no more again be equalled or surpassed than the epics of Homer, or the statues of Phidias, or the *naïveté* of childhood. Its broad foundation in the most intense and ideal of national histories; its genuine reflection of the profoundest experiences of the human heart; its realistic reproduction and at the same time its ideal interpretation of the life of the Master, and its presentation of the straightforward letters of the greatest apostle, combine to make a single book composed of many documents of which Professor J. R. Seeley, surely no partial judge, has truly said, "The unity reigning through a work upon which so many generations laboured, gives it a vastness beyond comparison, so that the greatest work of individual literary genius shows by the side

of it like some building of human hands beside the Peak of Teneriffe."

The church may honour the Bible, just as a man may show his faith in a nugget of gold, in either of two ways. He may say, "This is gold; and because it is such a precious thing I will not trust it in so dangerous an element as fire, for fear that the precious thing might suffer harm." Or he may say, "This is gold; and because it is gold I will not hesitate to trust it to the flames; for fire can do pure gold no harm." The church may say of the Bible, "This book is God's gift to men; and therefore no honest criticism shall be allowed to touch it." Or it may say, "This book is a treasury of messages from God; and therefore the more critically it is tested and the more honestly it is examined the brighter will its real jewels shine and the more precious will the whole become."

Nothing short of the most artificial and perpetual and superfluous exercise of miraculous power could possibly have kept a book written in different ages and in different literary forms; employing the most various materials; weaving together poetry and prose, legend and chronicle, statute-books and love poems, epics and lyrics, oral tradition and idealized interpretation, fact and fiction, precept

and parable, from accumulating a good deal of incidental rubbish in the process of composition, compilation, and transmission. Reverent appreciation of the Bible as our ultimate literary expression of the life of the Spirit does not compel one to accept blindly or to interpret literally every narrative or statement it contains. Here, as in all ancient history and literature, criticism has a great sifting process to perform. And the more searchingly and thoroughly this is done, the more valuable and reliable will the book become. It is a very timid and feeble faith in God, amounting really to downright unbelief, which fears that honest criticism of the Bible can either discredit the book or lead to distrust of its Author. Criticism will not take God and the divine life from any man who has once gained the standpoint of spiritual faith. Those to whom spiritual things are merely matters of tradition and hearsay doubtless may have the insecurity of their position revealed to them. But this would not be a permanent misfortune. If a man's faith is not in God, but in some dogma or tradition or institution, the sooner he discovers it the better.

An institution whose essential life is so internal and spiritual as that of the church is in especial need of some outward and visible symbols by

which its inner purpose may be visibly expressed. The church has two such symbols or sacraments: baptism, and the Lord's supper.

Baptism is the seal and symbol of regeneration;—the putting away of the natural, selfish, individualistic life, and the reception of the life of the Spirit. The original method was doubtless, as a rule, that of immersion. In a warm climate, among peoples who live much out of doors, this is the natural and convenient method. In cold climates, on the other hand, where indoor life is habitual, sprinkling is the method which common-sense approves. The amount of material employed in a purely symbolic act is a matter of indifference. A signature to a note does not depend for its validity on whether it is written with a quill in bold John Hancock fashion, or is traced most delicately with a fine gold pen.

The extension of the rite to infants is not directly sanctioned in Scripture, except by implication, as children may be assumed to be included in the household. It is not logically deducible from the spiritual significance of the rite. And yet it sprang up out of an instinct of the parental heart which we can scarcely believe that he who said "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not,"

would rebuke or repress. Little children have always been a puzzle to the logician and the theologian. They are not logical; and their theology is very crude. But if Christian parents desire to solemnly dedicate their little ones to God and the divine life, in anticipation of the ratification and confirmation which maturity will bring, there surely can be no serious objection; and the bonds that bind the child's heart to Christ cannot be too early formed.

As baptism marks the renunciation of self and the world as the determining principles of conduct, the Lord's supper is the symbol of communion with Christ and his followers as the inspiration of the new life. There is nothing magical or miraculous about this most simple and natural of rites. Christ is present in the elements just as the writer of a letter is present in the writing. The reading of the letter is the reception of the writer's mind and heart. We receive Christ in the bread and wine just as we receive a friend when we clasp his hand. All communion between persons must be by symbols. As Professor Dewey says in his *Psychology*, "The first step in the communication of a fact of individual consciousness is changing it from a psychical fact to a physical fact. It must be expressed through

non-conscious media — the appearance of the face, or the use of sounds. These are purely external. The next step in the communication is for some other individual to translate this expression, or these sounds, into his own consciousness. He must make them part of himself before he knows what they are. One individual never knows directly what is in the self of another; he knows it only so far as he is able to reproduce it in his own self."

Jesus, in instituting the Lord's supper, has simply made universal the communication of his sacrificial love. He has made the bread and wine forever, and to all who receive it, the symbol and expression of the life he lived and the death he suffered in love to all mankind. In itself it is mere bread and wine. Translated by the intelligent and devout recipient into terms of the love and sacrifice it is intended to express, it becomes the bread of life and the wine of love to as many as receive it in this faith. Being an objective institution, coming at stated times and places, it is independent of the wayward caprice, the fickle mood, the listless mind of the individual. And so it calls us back from our worldliness, deepens our penitence, quickens our love, and intensifies our consecration; and, above all, identifies us with the

great company of our fellow-Christians, as no mere subjective devotion and private prayer could ever do.

Jesus recognized the truth that everything spiritual, if it is to become a permanent force in practical life, must be embodied in outward and visible and tangible symbols. And at the same time he has guarded as far as possible against the superstitious perversion of his symbols by choosing the most simple and universal elements and the most common and natural of acts to be the vehicles of his grace.

The Sabbath, Good Friday, Easter, and Christmas are among the days which the church has reasonably and rightly claimed for its own spiritual purposes. As such they have sacred associations for those who share the Christian faith. Of these sacred days the Sabbath, by virtue of its frequency, its universality, and its associations with regular and systematic worship, is by far the most important. The Sabbath is as fundamental to the church as is election day to the state, or pay-day to industry. All Christians welcome this day as the great opportunity for the free and full expression of their faith and hope and love; and the extension to others of the blessings which they themselves enjoy. Abstinence from needless work, and the

release of others from all unnecessary labour, is essential to the best uses of the day. The civil authorities may rightly be invoked to secure for as many as possible opportunity for worship and rest and refreshment upon the Sabbath. Beyond the prevention of whatever interferes with the rights of others the church cannot wisely go in the attempt to dictate to those who do not share its faith the manner in which they shall spend the day. The Sabbath was made for man; not man for the Sabbath. And the improvement of the Sabbath through the improvement of man, rather than the improvement of man through the enforced improvement of the Sabbath, is the more hopeful line of effort. Productive industry, except in cases where processes are of necessity continuous, or where materials cannot be left without serious waste, should be prohibited on the Sabbath; not only in the interest of the church, but in the interest of that common humanity which it is the purpose of the church to serve. The Sabbath is the workingman's best friend; and it should be the aim of the church to secure for him the largest possible immunity from toil upon that day. The observance of the Sabbath should be joyous, free, and unconstrained. In this as in everything, the man who is filled with the Spirit; the man who seeks to make

his life effective in social service, may do whatever he pleases on the Sabbath ; and whether he stays at home or goes abroad ; whether he fasts or feasts ; — whatever he does will be right and appropriate, because it will be prompted by love to God and love to man. On the contrary, any observance of the day which is not grounded in this glad recognition of the goodness of God and the fellowship of man, whether it be gay or gloomy, riotous or repressed, is injurious to man and dishonouring to God. Worship, rest, and refreshment ; worship that includes thoughtful regard for the rights and needs of one's fellowmen ; rest that restores and invigorates the powers of body and of mind for service in the days to come ; refreshment that binds the family closer together in common joys and mutual interests and heartfelt sympathies, and lifts the individual out of the isolation of his merely animal existence, — these are the social purposes which the Sabbath is instituted to subserve.

Every institution must have some sort of constitution or polity. Every body must have some form of organization and some kind of authority. Polity is a means, not an end ; and that polity is best which binds together the members of the church most effectively for their common work and wor-

ship, and at the same time leaves them most free in the development of their individual characters and lives. A polity is none the better for being ancient and primitive. The apostles in their first attempt at ecclesiastical organization resorted to the crudest conceivable device for the election of an officer; a device which had been a favourite object of ridicule with Socrates, as it was applied in his day in Athenian politics; — the election of an officer by lot. If when monarchical ideas were dominant in the state, the primitive church adopted an Episcopal form of government, it does not follow that episcopacy is the best polity in a democratic age. If, on the other hand, the little groups of believers were organized on the Congregational plan in the early days when the infant church could count but few adherents, it does not follow that that form of polity is the one best fitted to organize the universal church and to conduct world-wide activities. The organization of the primitive church is an interesting problem for the church historian. The organization of the church to-day is a practical problem which Christian common-sense must settle for itself. Whatever polity will afford the maximum of unity and efficiency with the minimum of machinery and constraint, should be accepted as the ideal to be

realized as rapidly as historic traditions and existing conditions will permit.

The church has offices which bear different names in different communions. The most important of these offices is that of the priesthood or ministry. The office of the priest is not quite the same as that of the minister. The priest conceives himself to be the official representative of Christ; and as such is prepared to hear confession and pronounce absolution. The minister conceives himself to be the herald or messenger of Christ; and as such preaches and proclaims the message of forgiveness and inspiration; but refers his hearers directly to Christ for the guidance and grace they need.

The priest's conception of his function is the more profound and vital: but for that very reason it is the more liable to perversion. It has been fruitful of the most haughty pride, the most extravagant pretensions, the most tyrannical domination, the most mercenary extortion on the part of sacerdotalists who have grasped the power without cultivating the humility and sympathy on which the right exercise of such a high prerogative depends. The minister's conception of his function as chiefly that of preaching is more superficial: but on that account less open to abuse and

misconception. Still there is great danger that the preacher will come to regard his sermon as an end rather than as a means; and that in place of what he regards as the idolatry of the altar, he will introduce the idolatry of eloquence and oratory. When the sermon thus becomes an end in itself, throwing the service of prayer and praise into the background, preaching degenerates into the hollowest and emptiest of forms, and merely presents

"a painted ship
Upon a painted ocean."

The conceptions of the priesthood and of the ministry are complementary half-truths. Christ and the Spirit are present in regenerated humanity so immediately and intimately that when the true priest absolves a penitent he therein imparts directly the divine forgiveness. Yet the priest needs to remember that this absolution is no magical performance, but is the expression of sacrificial love; and he should spare no effort of mind and heart to impress upon the penitent the cost of sacrifice and the depth of love which makes forgiveness possible. On the other hand, hearing is essential to believing. Yet the preacher needs to remember that mere hearing, apart from personal repentance and intimate appropriation of

grace and actual reception of the Spirit, is idle and profitless.

The minister, like every true Christian, is a servant of his fellow-men. The minister differs from other Christians simply in that he serves them in the highest way, and ministers to them in purely spiritual things. It is his function to give embodiment and expression to that Spirit of love, fellowship, forgiveness, inspiration, and grace which is the life of society, and is striving for admission to the hearts and homes of men. The office is no substitute for the spiritual life of him who holds it; though what the office signifies may do its beneficent work in spite of the unworthiness of the incumbent. Yet the richest fruit of the Christian ministry can only come when the Spirit, acting through the officer of the church, is reinforced by the same Spirit, acting through the heart and conscience of the man. Such a priesthood or ministry as that is the highest, purest, noblest, and most blessed form of social service. It is a reproduction of the personal life and a continuation of the spiritual work of Christ.

The division of the church into sects, which is so marked a characteristic of the present time, represents the extreme consequences of the prac-

tical application of that principle of individual liberty and the right of private judgment which was affirmed in the Reformation, and has been reaffirmed in the political revolutions in France and America. Politically that principle received its needed check when the doctrine of secession was defeated in our civil war. Liberty has been sufficiently affirmed; and the problem of the present is to advance "from liberty to unity."

The sects have arisen through the differentiation of the Christian principle, and the attempt to develop special organs for special forms of work and peculiar types of temperament. God and his truth are very great: man and the average mind of man are very small. The best of us get but partial glimpses of his glory. One sees one aspect of the divine; another, another. Each has some line of strength; each some weakness, peculiar to itself. As the colours of the solar spectrum are so many partial reflections of the white light of the sun, so the sects are so many partial apprehensions 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.

None of them is perfect. It is easy to point out defects. The Congregationalist has not a

sufficiently coherent polity. The Baptist has not a sufficiently broad basis of fellowship. The Methodist has not a sufficiently edifying grasp of the ethical and spiritual principles upon which permanent character must rest. The Episcopalian has not a sufficiently democratic conception of the sources of spiritual authority. The Unitarian has not a sufficiently definite body of doctrine. The Presbyterian has not a sufficiently receptive attitude toward historical and scientific investigation. The Universalist has not a sufficiently keen sense of the responsibilities of human freedom. The Roman Catholic has not sufficient respect for human reason, and the rights of the individual man.

Yet each of these forms of church has arisen to meet definite needs in the history of Christian thought and life. Each has borne especial witness to some essential element of the catholic faith.

The Congregationalist has stood for simplicity of worship, clear theological ideas, and the supreme authority of a rationally interpreted Bible as against all meaningless formalities, all doubtful traditions, all mystical interpretations. The Baptist has protested against all cheapening and change in the divinely ordained sacraments. The

Methodist has kept live coals upon the altar of Christian consecration in hearts and homes and hamlets, which otherwise would have been dreary and desolate, and the way of repentance open to multitudes of wanderers who without it had been lost. The Episcopalian has preserved the decency and order of dignified worship, and an organic fellowship, in an iconoclastic and individualistic age. The Presbyterian has made clear how loveless a creature man is apart from God; traced minutely the process by which the grace of Christ gains entrance to the soul; marked off precisely the stages of the Spirit's conquest; and so kept right teaching or orthodoxy alive when doubt and unbelief have been widespread. The Unitarian has affirmed the right of free inquiry when others have distrusted the God-given faculties of man. The Universalist has clung to the grace of God when others have made him almost a demon in the severity of his arbitrary rule. The Catholic has held the strong arm of spiritual authority over great masses of men and women, who would have found little restraint or guidance in the more speculative and individualistic types of Protestant religion.

Sects are evil only when they become sectarian; that is, when differences of apprehension count for

more than the object apprehended; when everything is spent on fences, while the fields themselves are given over to weeds and briers.

Inherited associations are stronger than abstract ideas. The attempt to bring the denominations together by compromise creeds, compromise polities, union houses, and union meetings gives little promise of success. The union of the churches, for the near future at least, must consist in a unity of spirit and a coöperation in work. In this direction there is good ground for hope.

The first step toward such unity of spirit and work is a geniune and hearty respect for the points of excellence in other forms of church life as well as in our own. In polity, for example, the two fundamental types are the Episcopal and the Congregational. The strong point in Episcopal polity lies in its recognition that the mind and heart of the church in all lands and ages is a better interpreter of the mind of Christ than is the individual believer and the local church. The strong point in Congregational polity is its assertion that the mind of Christ does find expression in the hearts of individual believers here and now. Both these positions are true and important. Both may be carried to extreme and dangerous lengths. Let each respect the other; let each

ingraft upon his own system the good points of the other, and gradually the two extremes will be brought together. We see this tendency already. The Episcopal bishops interfere much less than formerly in the internal affairs of the local churches; and the Congregational churches are giving to their missionary secretaries and the heads of their benevolent societies more and more of the authority of bishops.

The two opposite types of worship are the Roman Catholic and the Quaker. One makes liberal use of sensuous symbols; the other limits the expression of worship more or less strictly to extemporaneous speech. Both tendencies have their worth and their dangers. Both are symbolic, as all forms of worship must be. Even extemporaneous speech uses vibrations of air as the symbol of thought and feeling. Why are vibrations of air striking the ear essentially more holy than vibrations of ether striking the eye, or even particles of incense impinging on the olfactory nerve? Speech is doubtless the more adequate and subtle and universal symbol. But it is just as truly a symbol as the wearing of a vestment, the swinging of a censer, or a posture of the body. Here, again, we may observe the non-ritualistic churches enriching their barren services by the larger use

of ritualistic elements; and we may expect a larger recognition of the place of spontaneity in worship on the part of ritualists.

Thus there is a work in the direction of union which each individual can do within his own denomination; in casting out the arbitrary, fantastic, and divisive practices and doctrines that tradition and bigotry have fastened upon it, and ingrafting upon it the better fruits in which other denominations excel his own.

If he is a Presbyterian, his first duty is to labour for liberty of thought and the right of investigation; if a Unitarian, for clear conviction of definite religious truth; if a Baptist, for breadth of Christian fellowship and emphasis upon essentials; if a Methodist, for rational conviction rather than emotional expression of his faith; if a Universalist, for keener sense of the fateful pregnancy of choice; if a Catholic, for liberty and local self-government; if a Congregationalist, for larger recognition of the organic nature of society and social institutions; if an Episcopalian, for that emancipation from the leading-strings of doubtful tradition and fantastic frivolity, and that reliance upon spiritual realities and practical common-sense of which Bishop Brooks was the conspicuous representative.

The extension of itself by missionary effort is always an important branch of church activity. And in this work there is the most urgent need of the substitution of coöperation for competition.

Especially in home missionary work in rural regions such coöperation is essential. However valuable and natural the differentiation of the church into sects along lines of tradition or creed or temperament may be in the city and large town, it is too expensive a luxury for rural districts to indulge in. In every line of enterprise, the methods best adapted to the city are not those best adapted to the country. The graded system of schools, which is the glory of public education in cities and large towns, would be the ruin of sparsely settled regions. The district school must teach all grades. The city can afford to have one store for dry goods, one for groceries, one for boots and shoes, one for music, one for millinery. But the country store must keep everything, from pins and peppermints to shovels and horse-rakes. The church of Christ cannot afford to spend its money in carrying some special variety of the Gospel to communities which have more varieties than they can support already. Yet that is what we have been doing for years. And, in consequence, we find throughout the rural

regions needless organizations, empty churches, half-paid ministers, wasted strength, scattered resources. We do not find in these communities strong, vigorous churches, uniting the intelligence, the resources, the society of the whole village in uplifting worship, hearty good-fellowship, dignified social life, and aggressive Christian work.

The duty of coöperation in church extension is imperative from every point of view. We owe it to the contributors who support home missions. The contributions for home missions in the United States for 1890 were $6,717,558.03. At the very lowest estimate one quarter of this sum (if you could pick out the right quarter, the quarter that went for the support of superfluous churches) would have done more good if it had been cast into the depths of the sea. It was spent not for the building up of the kingdom of God, but for the building up of particular denominations at the expense of and to the injury of the kingdom of God.

We owe it to the brave and devoted missionaries who are working to keep the old towns of the East and the new towns of the West faithful to the standards of Christian living. They have responded to the call of the church for volunteers in its most arduous service. Like loyal soldiers

of the cross, they have gone where their commanders have ordered :

> "Not though the soldier knew
> Some one had blunder'd.
> Theirs not to make reply,
> Theirs not to reason why,
> Theirs but to do and die."

Alas! in this case it is not that some one has blundered. Our whole plan of founding churches in rivalry and maintaining them in competition is one gigantic blunder. And a large proportion of the men who enlist for missionary service under this system are betrayed into needless sacrifice for a hopeless cause; needless, because a wiser policy of coöperation would have permitted others to do the work which they were sent to do; hopeless, because there is not enough material for all the labourers to work upon to good advantage.

In business such blunders bring bankruptcy. In war, such blunders cost officers their commissions. We owe it to our noble army of missionaries, home and foreign, to adopt a policy of coöperation which shall guarantee to every man who enters the service that his life shall not be spent in vain.

We owe it to the people whom we seek to

evangelize. It is not of much use to make a man a Republican or a Democrat unless you also make him a patriotic citizen. It is not of much use to make a man a Baptist or an Episcopalian, unless you also make him a Christian. Yet the tendency of the minute subdivision of the church in small towns is to make men sectarians without making them Christians. There is enough that is petty and narrow in rural life, without introducing into it sectarian rivalry and strife.

We owe it to Christ and our common Christianity. Christ came not to be ministered unto, but to minister. The church should do likewise, or else do nothing. Unless the church can be a benefactor to the spiritual life of a community, unless it can be a leader of its daily work, a lawgiver to its business and political morality, a sanctifier of its social life, an educator of its youth in virtue, a comforter of its homes in sorrow, a safeguard of its manhood against temptation, it has no business there. Yet under the system of rivalry, these cannot be the most prominent features which the church presents.

It is as circulators of subscription-papers, as managers of competing festivals and fairs, as originators of rival money-making devices, as centres of oratorical, musical, or ceremonial attractions that

these superfluous and feeble churches figure in the public eye. We must adopt the policy of planting strong, self-respecting, self-supporting, community-serving churches where they are needed, in place of the wretched policy of thrusting in mendicant, impotent, self-seeking, community-plundering churchlings where they are not needed. The churches should not stand as beggars asking alms alike of saint and sinner, but be a mighty power to help the poor man, be he virtuous or vicious, and to rebuke and awe the knave and the oppressor, whether he be poor or rich.

Hundreds of abandoned churches, thousands of superfluous organizations, millions of squandered money, hosts of martyr missionaries, proclaim the need of radical reform. Christian coöperation in church extension is no far-off vision of a formal union; no speculative theory of an ultimate catholic church. It is a plain duty which the churches as they are now constituted can and ought to do at once. That the doing of this duty now will lead to large results in the future we may well believe. That it will at once reduce to uniformity the diverse forms of church life which exist to-day, no one need fear. We may, however, speedily bring to

pass what is more in harmony with the organic life of nature, with the trend of history, with the spirit of our civil government. We may develop, not the unity which is a dead and monotonous absence of difference; not the unity which is a shallow and superficial ignoring of difference; not the unity which is an arbitrary and tyrannical suppression of difference: but the deeper, richer, mightier unity which is founded on difference, and is expressed through the harmonious coöperation of many members in one common life. The dream of an American church may be as idle as the dream of an American empire. Yet, as out of the voluntary conference of independent colonies for defence against a common foe, and the establishment of a mutually profitable commerce, there has grown the union of the United States, with supreme authority in national affairs; so out of the coöperation of independent denominations against the common foe of sin and for the establishment of that Christian righteousness which is the common object of them all, may be raised up the united churches of America, clothed with the supreme authority of wisdom and of love, to guide and guard the spiritual interests of the land.

CHAPTER VIII

ENJOYMENT AND SERVICE — THE REDEMPTION OF THE WORLD

The divine life does not consist in preaching and praying and singing psalms: though these are important and well-nigh essential means of keeping it alive and fostering its growth and promoting its extension. The spiritual life is composed of solider stuff than cadences and candles, music and millinery; though these may serve for its decoration and embellishment. If the church is the form; the family, industry, economics, politics, education, society, constitute the solid substance on which that form must be impressed and in which it must be realized.

This glorious work of helping to complete God's fair creation; this high task of making human life and human society the realization of the Father's loving will for all his children; — this is the real substance of the spiritual life, of which the services and devotions of the church are but the outward form. Each has its value in relation to the

other. They ought not to be separated. Yet if we can have but one, social service is of infinitely more worth than pious profession. As Jesus tells us in one of his parables: "A man had two sons; and he came to the first, and said, Son, go work to-day in the vineyard. And he answered and said, I will not: but afterward he repented himself, and went. And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I go, sir: and went not. Whether of the twain did the will of his father? They say, The first. Jesus saith unto them, Verily I say unto you [and it applies to all mere ecclesiastics the world over] that the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you."

One of the first-fruits of the Spirit, as Paul tells us, should be joy. The Christian man above all others has a right to enjoyment. The Creator of this glorious world; the Maker of all things in it beautiful and fair; the Author of that wondrous volume of truth which science is opening to us; the Composer of those infinite harmonies which music suggests; the Artist of that inexhaustible realm of beauty which human art aims to reproduce; the Source of those unfathomable depths of sweet sympathy which human friendship and love reveal: — this Infinite Author of all good the Christian knows

as his Father and his Friend. Knowing himself to be the child of such a Father, he will be eager to take up his inheritance. He will not despise the joys of sense and flesh. For these are God-given and divinely ordained. As Browning has taught us so grandly, he will see that

> "All good things are ours,
> Nor soul helps flesh more now than flesh helps soul."

Like him he will see his ideal in the man who

> "Gathers earth's whole good into his arms."

With him he will exclaim,

> "How good is man's life, the mere living, how fit to employ
> All the heart and the soul and the senses forever in joy."

A healthy, hearty, grateful enjoyment of this sensuous nature God has given us follows directly from the fatherhood of God, which is the first article of Christian faith.

The church has sometimes forgotten this. Shocked by the fearful evils which spring from excess and perversion of sensuous enjoyment, the church has too frequently been afraid of sensuous pleasure. It has sometimes held up as its ideal a gloomy asceticism, a joyless sanctimoniousness; and seemed to demand the crucifixion of these impulses and instincts that beat so wildly in the hearts and flow so swiftly in the veins

of strong-limbed boys and light-hearted girls. Terrible has been the penalty wherever that blunder has been made. It has doomed thousands of lovely young women, without as well as within convent walls, to lives of morbid introspection and stolid self-repression. It has driven tens of thousands of our strongest and noblest young men to dissipation and destruction. It has given over multitudes of churches to stagnation and anility. And all this has been done in the name of Him who came eating and drinking; who was present and participating at festivities and feasts; sufficiently free and joyous in his mode of life to give the pretext of truth which every false charge must have behind it, which made it possible for his enemies to call him a glutton and a wine-bibber. As followers of Christ, no less than as children of the Father, we must recognize the divineness of the body; the sacredness of even sensuous delights.

The mind too, from the Christian point of view, is divine. And all that ministers to our love of truth; all that feeds our hunger for beauty of form and harmony of sound; all the objects at which education aims, must be dear to the Christian. For they are all tokens of the Father's love to his children; they are all means by which we may

grow into his likeness, and enter into his thoughts and purposes. Social institutions; the home, the school, the library, the town, the state, the nation, the farm, the factory, the counting-house; the club, the social circle; all are ways in which the Spirit of God is moulding and inspiring the life of man; and in which it is man's privilege to find healthful and rational delight.

In a civilized and select community, composed chiefly of well-to-do persons, this side of life takes care of itself, and does not need emphasis. But in dealing with uncivilized races, as the American Indians; or with races just emancipated from bondage, like the negro in America; or with classes who have lapsed from decency and self-respect like the inhabitants of the neglected quarters of our large cities, the first and the only effective steps toward their moral and social improvement are the inculcation of a desire to hold property; the capacity for steady industry; an interest in good pictures and good music and good books; a regard for personal comfort and personal cleanliness.

The social settlement and the industrial school, which carries the substance of civilization, rather than the mission which carries the form of evangelization, is the effective agency for the redemp-

tion of these classes. Evangelization without the rudiments of education, and discipline in simple industry, healthful living, and wholesome enjoyment, is as useless as the casting of seed upon unploughed land. Here and there a single seed may take root and spring up. But the harvest will be insignificant in comparison with that yielded by the more thorough and rational method. We shall never succeed in abolishing the saloon, the gambling-room and the brothel, until we provide in other ways the comfort, amusement, and good-fellowship which many who frequent these places do not now find elsewhere.

Wholesome, healthful, rational enjoyment is the foundation of civilization and Christianity alike. If we do not realize it more clearly, it is because in the circles in which we move it is as common as the atmosphere we breathe. Or if it be wanting in individual cases, the absence of it is instinctively and sedulously concealed. The effort to reach those who lack this rational enjoyment is necessary to convince us how essential it is to ourselves.

This easy-going optimism, though an essential element in the spiritual life, is by no means the whole of it. God is our Father: and that thought makes us glad. God is equally the Father of

all; even of the wretched and the wicked; and the thought that they know so little of his goodness, and have entered so little into their inheritance, should make us sad. The enjoyment of God's good gifts is, indeed, our rightful privilege as his children. All that is true; and yet in practical life this truth must be supplemented by a deeper truth, and be modified by a higher law.

That deeper truth is the existence of evil; and that higher law is the law of improvement through service and redemption by sacrifice. Highly as he knew how to prize the world's good things, our Lord declares that a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of goods that he possesseth. The same poet who has already sung for us the praises of the sensuous life also writes:

"Poor vaunt of life indeed
Were man but formed to feed
On joy, to solely seek and find and feast;
Such feasting ended then
As sure an end to men.
Irks care the crop-full bird? Frets doubt the maw-crammed beast?

"Rejoice, we are allied
To that which doth provide
And not partake, effect and not receive!

A spark disturbs our clod:
Nearer we hold of God
Who gives, than of his tribes that take, I must believe.

"Then welcome each rebuff
That turns earth's smoothness rough,
Each sting that bids nor sit nor stand, but go!
Be our joys three parts pain!
Strive and hold cheap the strain;
Learn, nor account the pang: dare, never grudge the throe."

Service not less than enjoyment is our privilege. As Carlyle has taught us with such emphasis, "Work is worship. All true work is religion. Older than all preached gospels was this unpreached, inarticulate, but ineradicable, forever-enduring gospel: Work, and therein have well-being. All true work is sacred; in all true work, were it but true hand labour, there is something of divineness." "Two men I honour, and no third. First, the toilworn craftsman that with earth-made implement laboriously conquers the earth, and makes her man's. A second man I honour, and still more highly: him who is seen toiling for the spiritually indispensable; not daily bread, but the bread of life. If the poor and humble toil that we have food, must not the high and glorious toil for him in return, that he have light, have guidance, freedom, immortality? — These two, in all their degrees, I hon-

our; all else is chaff and dust, which let the wind blow whither it listeth."

The best things in the world do not come to us ready-made. God has given us the material conditions of a blessed life. In Christ we have the pattern and principle of such a life. Yet the actual work of making life noble and beautiful and enjoyable he has left for ourselves. Truth must be searched for with patient toil. Beauty must be wrought out with painstaking devotion. Food and raiment must be wrested from the furrow and woven in the loom. And all our social and political institutions must be fought for on the field of battle, defended in the forum, and vindicated in the courts. Even our religious faiths must be thought out anew in the soul-conflicts of each generation, or they become mere forms of words, devoid of life and power. As Emerson says, "A thing uttered in words is not therefore affirmed. It must affirm itself, or no form of logic or of oath can give it evidence."

This readiness and capacity for service is the fundamental test of a man's social worth; and consequently the best evidence of his Christianity. If we could have but one test of a man's Christianity; if there were but one question which we

could put to him, I suppose that question would be this: "Art thou intent on doing with thy might something which God has given thee to do, to make this world where he has placed thee a healthier, happier, fairer, holier place?" He whose life is a consistent affirmative answer to that question is an accepted son of the Father, whatever be the intellectual process by which that sonship has been attained. This is by no means equivalent to the assertion that faith is non-essential, or that church-connection is unnecessary, or that creeds are superfluous; any more than our Lord's parable of the two sons is an argument for disrespect to parents.

And service involves sacrifice. The world is not merely incomplete, and in need of service. It is deformed and corrupted by sin, and needs redemption. And a large part of one's work for the world has to be devoted, not to the upbuilding of the right, but to the overthrow of wrong; not to the cultivation of virtue, but to the destruction of vice; not to the promotion of good, but to the eradication of evil; not to the cultivation of health, but to the healing of disease. Here comes in the call for sacrifice. The Christian, like his Lord, must become a bearer of the sins and iniquities of the world; that through

his sufferings the sorrows of the world may be lightened, its darkness dissipated, its sins atoned for and its destruction stayed.

Make any serious effort to improve the condition and character of men, and you are brought face to face with this hydra-headed monster sin. Try to relieve poverty in a single family, and you find the extortionate and irresponsible landlord of the unsanitary tenement, the hard-hearted saloon-keeper, the conscienceless "sweater," standing ready to snatch every penny of your charity from the hands of those you try to help. And if you evade these foes, then your gift falls a prey to the more terrible enemy of the poor man's own shiftlessness and lack of self-respect; and his poor wife's inability to cook a wholesome and economical meal, or to spend either his earnings or your gift to advantage. Poverty, intemperance, extortion, irresponsible use of wealth, unhealthful and indecent conditions of life, ignorance, social ostracism, despair, lust, cruelty, laziness, dishonesty, untruthfulness, are so many different manifestations of what ethics regards as perversions of appetites, interests, and instincts in themselves innocent; but which theology must consider as the phases of the one deadly and destructive principle, sin.

Evil and sin confront us as fearful facts. They mar and pervert this fair and goodly world which God has made. And yet they are not positive and enduring forces. Evil is always a negation of good. Wrong is a perversion of what might be and ought to be right. Sin is the missing of the mark of that ideal excellence at which we ought to aim. The measure of the evil of an act is simply the amount of good which it displaces. The sin and wrong and evil of intemperance or licentiousness consists not in the sensuous pleasures for the sake of which men practise these vices. The terrible, pitiful, heartrending evil of these vices appears when we consider the good which they displace and destroy. Property wasted and health impaired; wretched homes and bleeding hearts; weakened wills and deadened sensibilities; loveless marriages and homeless children; these beautiful things so horribly disfigured; these tender ties so rudely torn asunder; these sweet fountains of purity and love so foully polluted and horribly embittered; these goods displaced, perverted, corrupted, and destroyed, measure the enormity and heinousness of these most loathsome and repulsive forms of sin. Sin is a parasite which lives only by destroying that on which it feeds. But though a parasite, it is a mighty one.

It has fastened itself upon everything good and fair in all this world. Sometimes the only way to destroy it has been to destroy the men on whom it has fastened itself. That is the way of punishment, and vengeance, and revolution. The better way to destroy it is to identify ourselves in sympathy and compassion with those who bear the burden of guilt and misery which sin inflicts; to let it fasten itself on us; to suffer with them; to bear with them the burden, and perhaps perish under its weight. That is the way of sacrifice, the way of the cross, the way of atonement and redemption, the way in which Christ walked, and in which he bids us follow.

True self-sacrifice is never for its own sake; never for mere show; never simply to mark off the Christian from the world; never mere playing martyr. It is a poor pitiful type of Christianity that has to resort to the exhibition of artificial and arbitrary impositions and privations to mark itself off from the world. Self-denial for its own sake; self-denial that is sour and ascetic; self-denial that despises the good things of the world and tries to set itself above them, is foolish and false and unchristian. Christian self-denial is always the surrender of a lower for the sake of a higher good.

Sacrifice that is made in the service of the good and in conflict with the evil in the world; self-denial that is incidental to a larger and truer self-realization; self-denial which values at their true worth all the world's delights, and still can do without them for the sake of the larger delight of others and the deeper joy of sympathy and love; self-denial that declines personal indulgence as cheerfully and eagerly and unpretentiously as an athlete throws off his coat to run a race, when there are human needs to be served or human wrongs to be endured and righted; this is heroic, Christian, divine.

Vicarious suffering is not an arbitrary contrivance by which Christ bought a formal pardon for the world. It is a universal law, of which the cross of Christ is the eternal symbol. It is the price some one must pay for every step of progress and every conquest over evil the world shall ever gain.

The redemption of the world means the prevalence of a healthy, happy, holy, human life. Even in normal or sinless conditions, a large part of the highest enjoyment would be found in mutual service, but the service would be itself a pleasure, and would involve no costly sacrifice. The presence of sin and moral evil compels us to carry

our service to the point of sacrifice. And yet even out of this sacrifice comes the deepest joy. "There shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine righteous persons, which need no repentance."

The redemption of the world, like the salvation of the individual, is a gradual process. The individual is saved the moment he renounces sin and surrenders to the will of God. And yet this act of his central will and intelligence does not carry with it all at once the complete conformity of every act to the new principle.

The world has been redeemed from the moment when Christ came into it; from the moment when love was consciously accepted as the true law of human life. This Christian principle of loving service and willing self-sacrifice for the glory of God and the good of men is the central principle of the clearest thinking and most earnest willing in the world to-day. It is the spiritual principle of the modern world. It is the secret of whatever of constancy and courage and hope and high endeavour animates the representative modern man. To be sure, it is not always explicitly conscious of the historic source of its inspiration; it is not always in intellectual sympathy with the formulas in which the Christian tradition is expressed. But

under various names, — altruism, utilitarianism, evolution, science, art, law, public spirit, philanthropy, reform, progress, idealism, — the character we all admire and, under one name or another, confess as our ideal, is not the hard, narrow, petty self-seeking of the natural man; but the broad, sympathetic, generous unselfishness which is the essence of Christ's Gospel and the principle of the kingdom which he came to found.

The presence of this Spirit of love as the accepted and accredited ideal of conduct and character is itself the proof that the world has been redeemed. It is the promise and potency of its complete redemption. The Spirit must do his quiet, silent work for many centuries to come before even present standards of conduct will be universally accepted. And as each form of existing evil is overcome, new spheres of duty, richer experiences of love, larger spheres of truth, deeper springs of life, will be disclosed "in the perpetual progress of the species towards a point of unattainable perfection."

A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. The lump that has the leaven in it is potentially leavened; although there may be large portions of the mass which the leaven has not yet reached. The world already has within it the principle which is

destined to make it a heaven. Multitudes of men and women have this principle in their hearts as the conscious Spirit of their lives. Multitudes more have caught the Spirit of unselfish living from others, without recognizing its historic origin, and without being able to give conscious expression to the principle which really rules their conduct and is moulding their character. Multitudes more still sit in darkness, or stand in deliberate rebellion; unable or unwilling to welcome the love that lights the world.

And yet the Spirit's presence in so many hearts to-day, the steady and increasing conquest of the Christ, is the certain prophecy that every nation and every tribe at no distant day shall hear the message of the Christian missionary; feel the healing touch of the Christian physician; respond to the voice of the Christian teacher; and enjoy the blessings of liberty and light and law and love which Christian civilization, though unfortunately it does not send these forces as its advance guard, ultimately carries in its train.

Doubtless the law of natural selection has still some seemingly severe work to do with the inferior races. It may be that the only difference between Christian and pagan civilization, in their approach to these races, will be the substi-

tution of a slower and gentler for a sudden and violent extermination. Still, the fact that the higher displaces the lower, and survival turns on fitness, indicates a profound beneficence at the heart of even this seeming cruelty. With races, as with individuals, the dealings of God are on so vast a scale that the side turned toward us often seems to be one of unmitigated harshness and severity. Perpetuated physical inferiority would not tend to permanent spiritual superiority. At all events it is our duty to bring to these races the best we have to offer, in material and mental and social and spiritual things; and then, if they are able to endure the light, we shall have conferred the highest blessing in our power; and if they are not, we must accept their elimination just as we do that of the incorrigible individual, as a sad but necessary stage of the progress of mankind and the redemption of the world.

CHAPTER IX

ABSTRACTION AND AGGREGATION — THE ORGANIZATION OF THE KINGDOM

In the last chapter we saw that egoism, or the selfish enjoyment of the world, though good as far as it goes, is a very imperfect good, and requires the addition of altruism, or the service of others, and even sacrifice for the sake of such service, in order to render it in any degree a tolerable principle of life. Yet altruism is itself incomplete and unsatisfying. Let us examine briefly its shortcomings. Here is a man pouring out his life in charity and philanthropy; organizing right and overthrowing wrong; preaching sanitation and temperance and justice, and denouncing the unhealthy tenement, the saloon, and the sweater; giving his days and nights to toil and strife and agitation, to feed the hungry, stay the oppressor, and rouse the indifferent. In a word, he is doing with all his might that work of reform and redemption which Jesus inaugurated, and on which the welfare of society depends. And yet every

one who has undertaken in any earnest way to do these things knows what a terrible sense of disappointment and discouragement and despair comes over one when he stops to think how mighty all these forces of evil are. We find ourselves so feeble and so frail; our puny efforts seem so vain; our blunders are so costly; our negligence is so criminal. No man ever worked hard for a good cause or fought valiantly against an intrenched abuse without at times having this feeling of depression and self-distrust come over him and cast him down. This task of setting the world right is too vast for our puny hands, and the futility of our attempts to accomplish the impossible forces itself in upon our weary souls until we are ready to exclaim with Elijah, as he sat under the juniper tree, "It is enough; now, O Lord, take away my life; for I am not better than my fathers."

Then we need the assurance that we are not alone; that the battle we are fighting is not confined to the brief time and narrow space we occupy; but that it is a single incident in a grand campaign, and that we are members of one great whole, and our work is part of one great comprehensive plan. Then we need to know that we belong to God; that he is with us; and that in his

name we shall ultimately conquer. Such an assurance most religious persons gain through pious feeling. To others it must come as a clear insight, if it is to come at all. They ask the question whether there is any such unity in the spiritual world? They insist on seeing life as a whole, or else they refuse to regard it as divine.

This question whether there be any spiritual unity in the universe, through which our lives may become unified; any great and glorious whole, of which our lives may form noble and worthy members, is the fundamental problem of religion. The briefest answer to it would be to refer back to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and say that the true unity of life is found in union with the living God; to point out that our weakness and isolation is due to sin; that by repentance and faith and grace we may escape, and be born anew, and grow into oneness with the life of God. Such an answer, however, would be a mere summary of what has gone before. It would convince only those who have been convinced already.

Instead of offering this too easy answer, it will be more profitable to take up in this new form the whole spiritual problem afresh, and see whether, in an attempt to find an answer to this practical problem of the spiritual life, we reach the same

conclusion that we have already reached from the speculative side. Plato in the *Republic* teaches us that the problem of individual morality is best solved by studying the larger features of the state. In like manner that emotional and spiritual unity, which we crave as the satisfactory solution of our individual lives, is most readily and surely found in the practical unity of organic social life.

Let us then, in conclusion, consider the fundamental question of all practical philosophy: What is true unity? and how may it be gained?

There are three ways in which you may try to reduce a mass of material to unity and consistency: the way of abstraction; the way of aggregation; and the way of organization.

The way of abstraction eliminates all differences, strips off all definiteness and determination, until there remains the empty form of pure being which, as Hegel tells us, is one and the same as nothing.

Stated in this plain formula, it does not seem as though such an unsubstantial ghost could lead any one astray; much less do positive harm. Yet this pale, colourless nonentity of an abstract unity, hollow and unreal as it appears in its naked metaphysical essence, arrayed in the robes of ethics, sociology, theology, education, has managed to deceive

some of the very elect; and in the privations of ascetics, the mutilations of monastics, the monotonous tautology of mystics, the unsubstantial schemes of socialists, the dreary curricula of pedants, has proved its ghostly potency to make the lives of men and women who cherish it as hollow and empty and shrivelled and unreal as itself.

The attempt to unify life by abstraction leads to asceticism. It is desire, appetite, passion, that leads us astray. Therefore repress desire; eradicate appetite; stifle passion, and the difficulty will be removed. Erect self-sacrifice into an end; self-denial into a virtue; self-mortification into a duty, and apparently the problem of the moral life will be solved.

So says asceticism; whether in the filthy rags of the Cynic; the plain garb of the Stoic; the coarse frock of the Franciscan; or the sombre cloak of the Puritan. By abstracting all principles of difference, you seem to get unity; by excluding all that can make discord, you think to secure harmony; by eliminating the elements of strife, you hope to establish peace.

Alas! Not so simple is the solution of our moral struggles. In abstracting difference, you take away the very stuff that unity is made of. In excluding discord, you strike out the very notes of

which all harmony must be composed. In eliminating the possibility of strife, you remove the very forces which must be the contracting parties to any peace that is worthy to endure.

Heraclitus was right. War is the father of all things. It is out of difference that unity is formed; out of discord that harmony is composed; out of strife that peace is won. And the device of the ascetic is a feeble evasion of the difficulty; a cowardly desertion of the battle-field. To conquer by running away from the enemy is not victory: and the conceit of the Cynic, the pride of the Stoic, are but pitiful counterfeits of the true glory of the moral conqueror. The cheap virtue that comes of self-contraction; the empty duty that consists in formal self-assertion; the hollow pride that is born of self-abnegation, — these are the bitter, sour, disappointing fruits of the futile effort to unify life by abstracting the very substance of which life is made. For it shrivels life to the narrow dimensions of an empty chamber within a hard and hollow shell.

The method of abstraction in sociology gives us socialism. It has much to say of organization, and deals largely in organic analogies. But it is the organization of imaginary rather than of real men and women. It is organization of the

tyrannical military type, rather than the organization of free spontaneous life. It deals with fancies rather than with facts. Like Wharton, in Mrs. Ward's *Marcella*, the socialist of this type is false to what is, in fancied fidelity to what ought to be. This withdrawal from the actual for the sake of an ideal is the very essence of abstraction, whether in the asceticism of the moralist, the unpracticalness of the socialist, or the other-worldliness of the religionist. The attempt to give unity to society by treating men and women as abstractions, rather than as the actual beings that they are, is the characteristic mark of socialism from Plato to the present day.

Ignore the actual facts of our inconsistent human nature; assume that men and women are what they ought to be, instead of reckoning with them as they are; eliminate from them all individuality and independence, and reduce them to the dead level of so many commodity producers and happiness consumers; and then it is the easiest thing in the world to make them fit exactly into the niches you have cut out for them in your abstract socialistic scheme. This abstract man who loves only the abstract woman will be perfectly content with the community of wives in Plato's Republic. The artist who is devoted

to art in general will be perfectly satisfied to have his career marked out for him by a central employment bureau. And so on through all the range of definite concrete affections, interests, and enthusiasms which make up the complex life of man. The only trouble is that these men who are equally in love with everybody, and equally fitted for anything, really love nobody, and are absolutely good for nothing. Hegel's saying that being and not being are the same, translated into these social terms, gives the maxim that the love of everybody is the same thing as the love of nobody; and being good for anything is equivalent to being good for nothing. For these abstract, nobody-loving, good-for-nothing beings, socialism would provide an ideal paradise. Actual men and women of flesh and blood, however, prefer to find their universal in the individual, and through the straitened gate of a particular affection, and the narrow way of a definite devotion, find entrance to the deeper love and the larger life.

Abstract unity in religion presents itself as other-worldliness. "Good bye, proud world, we're going home," is its monotonous refrain. Check the wild beating of your natural heart; curb the eager ambitions of your carnal mind; accept

your work as a stern necessity; assume family and social obligations as a serious duty; shun pleasure as a deadly snare; and thus by abstracting from life all its normal interests, its healthy enthusiasms and its natural charms, you get a thin, pale, morbid, melancholy residuum of a religion whose only claim to be called spiritual is that it is unnatural, and whose only hope of heaven is its manifest unfitness for earth. The reign of the abstract in religion, however, is happily at an end, except in individuals left over from past generations, and in rural regions which remain unreached by the dominant influences of the hour.

The way of aggregation has had numerous and able representatives from Democritus to John Stuart Mill. The hard-headed adherents of this materialistic creed see through the transparent emptiness of your pale abstractions, and will have none of them. Particulars are to them the ultimate and sole realities, and the only unity they know is the artificial and fictitious unity which we give to them by adding and grouping these particulars together.

This type of unity stated in terms of pure metaphysics seems innocent and harmless enough. Yet carried over into ethics it means hedonism;

in economics and sociology it means *laissez faire;* in theology it means agnosticism; in the intellectual life it means chaos and despair. This type of unity has none of the winsomeness and charm of the abstract unity. Cold, hard, soulless, aloof; its weapons are mathematics and formal logic, and its conquests are among men and women of lofty but unimaginative minds; of sincere but unemotional hearts.

The attempt to unify life by aggregation gives hedonism. Reduce all the rich diversity of concrete interests, enthusiasms, and affections to the monotonous, flat, insipid, common form of pleasure; then put your precious pleasures in the scales and weigh them; lay them on the table and measure their length and breadth (hedonists generally forget to mention depth, because there is no depth to pleasure thus conceived); then pile up your weighed and measured pleasures into a heap in your own memory and imagination (pleasures are so fleeting that they cannot be held together long enough to constitute a real heap); then call that man happiest whose memory retains the biggest heap of pleasures that he has enjoyed, and you have the only consistent moral unity which hedonism can impart to life. To be sure, hedonists since John Stuart Mill have sought, in addition to the

crude weighing and measuring of Hobbes and Bentham, to introduce tests of quality, and, by strange tricks of logical jugglery, to stretch pleasure beyond the sensibilities of the individual, to whom alone it strictly can belong, until it is spread out in perilously attenuated form to cover the whole human race. But these are considerations foreign to the fundamental principle of hedonism. You can greatly improve a knife which has a dull blade and a broken handle by putting in a new blade and a new handle, but you abandon your old knife in the process. And so when you prefer a less pleasure to a greater because it is higher, you have introduced a standard higher than pleasure, by which pleasure itself is judged. And when you seek the pleasure of others you are introducing a motive which derives its dynamic power, not from a present feeling in your body, which in the last analysis pleasure must be, but from an idea before your mind, which is a very different thing from pleasure. Into the subtle refinements by which modern evolutionary writers have tried to stretch without breaking, and to change without destroying, the conception of pleasure as the ultimate unit out of which by aggregation the moral life must be built up, we cannot enter here.

Consistent hedonism makes pleasure the ulti-

mate test of the worth of conduct, and makes the aggregate of pleasures the test of the worth of life. And in doing so it sacrifices the spiritual substance of life to its sensuous form; it inverts the normal relations of means to ends; it throws the noblest aims, the tenderest affections, the holiest aspirations, the most refined tastes, into the furnace; melts them all down into the crude material, out of which, according to its theory, they are alike composed; and then tells us that he who can show the largest number of pieces of this common substance cooled down, gauged, weighed, done up in packages, and labelled, is the happiest, and therefore the best of men. To such intolerable monotony, to such insufferable insipidity, does the materialistic method of mere mechanical aggregation reduce the moral life of man.

The attempt to solve the social problem by the method of aggregation, leads one into the indiscriminate and promiscuous helping of individuals as they are. It seeks to relieve poverty, regardless of its cause. It tries to find employment for the idle, regardless of the demand for the product. It aims to relieve suffering, without stopping to inquire whether the suffering is beneficent and disciplinary penalty, or accidental and unavoidable misfortune. It attempts to make the greatest

number of individuals well off, without considering the well-being of the society to which they are related. And, consequently, in adding remedies this method multiplies disease.

The utter futility of attempting to relieve poverty without removing its causes and conditions; the positive mischief of helping an individual, without at the same time helping him to resume his normal connection with society, is everywhere recognized as the first principle of scientific charity. To disengage the individual from society is as grave a practical mistake, as to abstract society from the concrete individuals who compose it is a serious speculative fallacy.

The aggregate conception in religion is to-day everywhere enthroned, and is in the zenith of its power. So far from being a saint's rest for the sanctified, the church, according to this view, is to be the centre of the most multifarious activities. It is to be a "workshop rather than a cathedral." The cooking and serving of food; the manufacture and distribution of clothing; the teaching and training of children; the instruction and entertainment of young people; the provision of homes for the homeless and work for the unemployed; military drill for the boys; benevolent circles for the girls; countless committees for

men and numberless ministrations for women ; — these are the characteristics of the typical modern church. It is said that an applicant for admission to such a church, having some difficulty in satisfactorily expressing her religious experience, finally summed it all up in the single sentence, "I want to be like Martha, cumbered about much serving," and thereupon was admitted to membership at once.

Now we all welcome this tendency as a needed protest against the other-worldliness which went before it. We all honour the institutional churches which are springing up in the more needy quarters of our large cities. Just as in bodily disease, when some of the bodily members are out of order, other members are compelled to do the work of the disabled members in addition to their own ; so in abnormal social conditions the church is called upon to do the work of several social instrumentalities in addition to its own. All honour to the exceptionally located churches which are rising to meet exceptional responsibilities by special efforts and enlarged activities. Yet to erect this exceptional type of church into a standard for the measurement of all churches would be to adopt the aggregate rather than the organic as the type of church work and religious life.

The unity that comes through organization is not so easy to define. It transcends space; almost annihilates time; defies mathematics, and is the despair of formal logic. The whole is in the parts; the parts are in the whole. There is an instantaneous response of each member to the conditions of every other. The whole is more than the sum of its parts, and the internal relationships are so subtle that they cannot be adequately expressed in terms of action and reaction from without. The secret of this organic life is the nervous system which binds each part to every other; makes the whole responsive to the needs of every part, and every part an instrument for the furtherance of the interests of the whole. The whole gives to the parts whatever meaning and significance they have; and the parts in turn give to the whole whatever expression and realization it attains. Not in timid self-repression; not in reckless self-indulgence; not in nursing an abstract virtuousness, nor in hugging an illusive aggregate of pleasures, will man find the unity he seeks. Moral virtue is neither a pale abstraction from all that is attractive, nor a stupid aggregate of undifferentiated delights.

Every appetite and passion of our nature is, in its rightful exercise and normal function, holy,

humanizing, God-ordained. These natural impulses of ours, which, perverted, lead to such swift, sure, and terrible destruction, are yet the only avenues through which we can come into fullest appropriation of the bounties of nature, the beauties of art, the sweet delights of family and home, and the larger life of society and state. Pleasurable though their exercise may be, yet their normal end is not the pleasurable sensations which always accompany the exercise of function; but the wide, rich, blooming fields of nature and humanity into which they lead us, and of which they make us conscious and coöperating members.

The unity of life which comes from organizing all its throbbing impulses and bounding passions, its rapturous pleasures and exquisite pains, its glorious delights and heroic sacrifices, its homely joys and its humble duties into the expression of an ever-expanding will, an ever-widening interest, an ever-deepening love toward all the good this glorious world contains;—this is the unity at which the moral life must aim.

The solution of the social problem by organization does not offer so obvious and speedy remedies for particular social ills as the methods previously considered. Society must enlarge rather than restrict the freedom of its individual members.

And individuals in turn must be bound more closely rather than more loosely to the society to which they properly belong. Society must leave its members free in order to get from them the most effective service; and individuals must serve society loyally in order to realize their own best individual life. Reform from the side of the state must consist chiefly in preventing one class from taking unfair advantage of the necessities of another class. And reform from the side of the individual must consist chiefly in developing the disposition in each to consider the interests of others and of all. Not the forcing upon individuals of a better social order; not the rescue of individuals from the evils of the existing order, but the adaptation of society to the actual needs of individuals, and the adjustment of individuals to the actual requirements of society, and thus the gradual improvement of each element through the improvement of the others;—this is the organic unity of society, toward which all practical social reform must tend. As Mr. Kidd has expressed it, "The avowed aim of socialism is to suspend that personal rivalry and competition of life which not only is now, but has been from the beginning of life, the fundamental impetus behind all progress. The inherent tendency of the process of social

development now taking place amongst us is to raise this rivalry to the very highest degree of efficiency as a condition of progress, by bringing all the people into it on a footing of equality, and by allowing the freest possible play of forces within the community, and the widest possible opportunities for the development of every individual's faculties and personality." Wise social organization is not the suppression of individuality. It is the condition of the most complete individualization, and the richest and fullest development of personality.

Organic unity in the religious life neither withdraws religious spirits from active contact with the world, nor yet does it impose upon the church as such a multitude of special duties and functions. It bids the average Christian live in the world in the ordinary relations of father, husband, citizen, workman, neighbour, and friend; and at the same time bids him make these concrete human relationships the expression of a divine righteousness and a Christlike love. It makes the Christian differ from other men, not in the kind of things he does, nor in the amount of work he undertakes, but rather in the different way in which he does the same things which other men are doing, and in the different spirit in which he

fulfils the simple relationships which are common to us all. The highest type of Christian is not the man who withdraws from the world in pious meditation; not the man who attacks it with the reforming zeal of a John the Baptist, though this is great; indeed the greatest of the natural virtues. Greater, however, than any spirit that is born of woman, or merely natural, is the spirit which comes eating and drinking; makes friends with publicans and sinners; shares the mingled good and evil of man's common lot, and lives and works patiently and quietly to make these common human relationships a glory to God and a blessing to mankind. It is of these quiet, patient, modest, self-forgetful souls, who do their simple duty in plain, humble, homely ways, that the real solid substance of God's kingdom is composed. Unnumbered because, thank God, they are so many; unnoticed because their piety is so natural, their life so normal, their divineness so human; these, whose lips are seldom heard to say, "Lord, Lord," and whose left hands know not the doings of the right, — these simple, child-like hearts are the salt of the earth and the light of the world, the redeemers of man and the children of God.

It is not by getting away from the world, nor

by plunging madly into it, that we shall find the unity of life we seek. It is by binding together thought and life; by making the humblest details of daily duty express the loftiest aspects of our faith; it is by bringing the universal down to the particular, and lifting the definite up into the infinite, that we shall fulfil the social function of religion. Religion should do for the social organism what the nerves do for the body. It is the function of the nerves to bind all the parts of the body together, and so to place the resources of the whole at the disposal of every part. Attack the lion anywhere, and instantly his powerful paw is upon you and his cruel teeth are in your flesh. That is made possible by the nerve which binds the part you rashly ventured to attack to the brain, which instantly transmits along another nerve the order that outraged dignity shall be avenged. In like manner it is the function of religion to bring to bear upon any given point in the social organism the thought and will of God.

The disciples once came back to Jesus rejoicing over the great things that they had done, exclaiming, "Lord, even the devils are subject unto us." Jesus assured them of continued power; yet, with that transcendent insight which made each incident in his career a fresh reve-

lation of divine wisdom and truth, he added, "Notwithstanding, in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you, but rather rejoice because your names are written in heaven." Not what they had wrought by their individual efforts, but what they were by virtue of their spiritual purpose and relationship — this was to be the deep, abiding secret of their joy.

The kingdom of God comes not chiefly with observation, nor are its most faithful members heralded in the press and on the platform with "Lo, here," and "Lo, there." It is not in the range of our opportunity, nor in the amount of our performance, nor in the fame of our attainments, but by the completeness with which we organize the simple relations of our every-day life into an expression of all the truth and beauty and goodness we have learned to love, that we gain the true unity of life, fulfil the social function of the Christian, and maintain our membership in the kingdom of God.

The kingdom of God lies not in some remote sphere which can be reached only in another state of existence; and can be anticipated only by the abstract methods of asceticism, utopian visions, and other-worldliness. No more does it consist of a blind and meaningless aggregate

of pleasurable or charitable or ecclesiastical activities. The kingdom of God is here and now. It is made of just such stuff as human life is made of. It is the coördination and correlation of the appetites, impulses, passions, pursuits, interests, affections, and aspirations of man. Happy homes, cheerful school-rooms, faithful work, honest trade, wholesome food, healthful dwellings, beautiful parks, beneficent government, public-spirited citizenship, official integrity, good books, public libraries, beautiful pictures, refined social intercourse, vigorous out-door life, abundant recreation, — these are some of the positive elements that are essential to the realization of the kingdom of God. And on the negative side, as defences against the forces which are always tending to postpone and defeat the coming of this kingdom, there must be the numerous charities and reforms, the hospitals and asylums and prisons, the police and the courts and the armies, which are necessary to care for the unfortunate and the sick; to restrain the avarice and lust and lawlessness of those who in character and conduct refuse to enter the kingdom and obey its law of love.

All those who sincerely strive to subordinate their purely personal interests and private pleas-

ures to the larger interests and nobler joys which come of conscious participation in the well-being of the social whole, are members of the kingdom. The kingdom of God and the well-being of man are opposite sides of one and the self-same thing. And he who participates in the promotion of human well-being therein partakes of the blessedness of the kingdom of God.

So simple, so inevitable, so automatic, is the process of admission or exclusion. The gates of the kingdom are wide open day and night, that all who love and serve their fellow-men may enter. And yet the walls of service, the steeps of sacrifice, are so high on every side that no thief or robber, intent on securing its benefits without sharing its generous and sacrificial spirit, can climb up and enter in by any other way.

Such is the kingdom of God as we know it here and now. What of the future? There is no way of judging the future save by the past and the present. It is idle to presume to determine the issues of eternity by our interpretation of this or that figurative passage even of Sacred Scripture. Some things are sure. Righteousness and love will be noble and blessed always and everywhere; and the clearer the light in which they are revealed the greater will be their glory.

Sin and selfishness will be mean and miserable always and everywhere; and the more transparent the mode of existence and the more mature the development of these traits, the more odious and wretched they will become. To be seen as he is, to be known in his real nature, to have all disguises stripped from his naked spirit; to have each feature of his selfishness and sin brought out in clear relief against the pure white light of love, so that no associate could be found who should not see and know him as he is; — this would be the severest penalty the sinner could receive. And this would be the only possible fate of the persistent sinner in a spirit-world where souls should see face to face, and know as they are known.

Would sinners in such conditions persist in sin, or would they continue in existence if they did? To this question we must answer squarely that we do not know. Our intensest name for shame is mortification. Disguise and hypocrisy and concealment is the only resource which makes the life of the mean and selfish man endurable in this world. With this withdrawn, the sinner would not wish to continue in sin. And we can hardly conceive that the Father of our spirits would force on an unwilling soul

an existence alike abhorrent to God and miserable for the man himself. The Omnipotent does not stand in need of such artificial, cruel, and sensational devices to maintain the dignity of his law and the majesty of his government.

Will the righteous survive? Is immortality assured to the just? A full discussion of the great question of immortality does not fall within the limits of the purpose of this book. Still this social point of view throws light on some aspects of the problem. Strict proof is impossible. There are, however, the strongest grounds for confidence; the largest reasons for hope.

The man who has entered the kingdom and is living a life of unselfishness and love is obeying a law which is as eternal and universal in the spiritual sphere as is gravitation in the material sphere. Out of just such spirits as his, living on the same principle on which he is living, the kingdom of God must always and everywhere be composed. The essential life which such a man is living must continue as long as the kingdom of God endures. It must exist wherever God holds sway. The life he is living, the spirit and aim and purpose of it, its love and its devotion, cannot die. Without such sons to do his will, God would cease to be the Father.

Without such spirits to constitute his kingdom, the King would occupy an empty throne.

If, then, God's kingdom shall endure, either his loyal subjects and obedient sons who are in existence here and now, must be preserved in existence, or else beings of the same spiritual purpose and life must be created or developed under other conditions to take their places. Annihilation of those who have wrought out their sonship to God and their membership in his kingdom through the hard conflicts of earth and time, and the creation of others to take their places, certainly does not seem either an economical, or a just, or a kind mode of procedure. It is inconsistent with the fatherhood of God. It robs the life of man of its deepest and widest significance. It is not what wisdom, beneficence, and love would prompt us to do to those who ever so feebly and imperfectly had learned to love us. It is inconsistent with all that we know of the wisdom and love of God; inconsistent with the clear insight and confident declaration of Christ; inconsistent with the deepest intuitions and hopes of the human heart.

Immortality is not necessary as a foundation for religion. There have been and are to-day profoundly religious spirits of whose faith this larger

hope forms no certain part. Even if this little life be all, the life of love is better than the life of selfishness; the life of service is nobler than the life of sensual pleasure; God is a more worthy object even for our short-lived devotion, than appetite and passion. Yet while immortality is not a demonstrable fact of science which we can hold up in advance as an inducement for beginning the religious life, it is a confident assurance which grows brighter and brighter with each new experience of the blessedness of love and each fresh revelation of the goodness of God.

The light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ has come into the world; and in proportion to our humility and unselfishness has shined in our hearts. Darkness and clouds are round about many of the problems connected with the nature of God and the destiny of man. Christ has brought life and immortality to light; and the Spirit of Christ dwelling in our hearts gives us an ever-growing assurance that if we are "stedfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, our labour is not vain in the Lord." Out of this deep experience of the present love of Christ; out of the strong courage with which the Spirit helps us to give our lives unsparingly in

social service, there is born the lively hope and the serene confidence that can come to us in no easier way and on no cheaper terms; — the practical certainty that "he that doeth the will of God abideth forever."

SOCIAL EVOLUTION.

By BENJAMIN KIDD.

NEW EDITION, REVISED, WITH A NEW PREFACE.

12mo, cloth, $1.50. Also cheap edition in paper covers, 25 cents.

"The name of Mr. Benjamin Kidd, author of a very striking work on 'Social Evolution,' is, so far as we know, new to the literary world; but it is not often that a new and unknown writer makes his first appearance with a work so novel in conception, so fertile in suggestion, and on the whole so powerful in exposition as 'Social Evolution' appears to us to be, . . . a book which no serious thinker should neglect, and no reader can study without recognizing it as the work of a singularly penetrating and original mind." — *The Times* (London).

"It is a study of the whole development of humanity in a new light, and it is sustained and strong and fresh throughout. . . . It is a profound work which invites the attention of our ablest minds, and which will reward those who give it their careful and best thought. It marks out new lines of study, and is written in that calm and resolute tone which secures the confidence of the reader. It is undoubtedly the ablest book on social development that has been published for a long time." — *Boston Herald.*

"Those who wish to follow the Bishop of Durham's advice to his clergy — 'to think over the questions of socialism, to discuss them with one another reverently and patiently, but not to improvise hasty judgments' — will find a most admirable introduction in Mr. Kidd's book on social evolution. It is this because it not merely contains a comprehensive view of the very wide field of human progress, but is packed with suggestive thoughts for interpreting it aright. . . . We hope that the same clear and well-balanced judgment that has given us this helpful essay will not stay here, but give us further guidance as to the principles which ought to govern right thinking on this, the question of the day. We heartily commend this really valuable study to every student of the perplexing problems of socialism." — *The Churchman.*

MACMILLAN & CO.,

66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.