
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY



AH 2788 9

Proceedings of the Baptist Congress

At Atlantic City, New Jersey, 1911

Topics

- I. In What Sense Is Christ Divine?
- II. What Are the Assured Results of Biblical Criticism?
- III. What Hinders the Union of the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ?
- IV. Immersionists and Church Union.
- V. Pauperism—Its Causes and Cure.
- VI. The Mystical Element in Christianity. What Is It and What Is Its Value?

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Agents

THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY
NEW YORK

—
THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Twenty-ninth Annual Session

OF THE

Baptist Congress

HELD IN

The First Baptist Church
Atlantic City, N.J.

November 14, 15, and 16, 1911

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
MAR 31 1913
HARVARD
DIVINITY SCHOOL

H41,821

Published February 1912

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ADDRESSES OF WELCOME	I
REV. H. M. GESNER	
REV. BIRNEY S. HUDSON, D.D.	
RESPONSE	7
REV. H. M. SANDERS, D.D.	
I. IN WHAT SENSE IS CHRIST DIVINE?	8
PROFESSOR FRANK AUBREY STARRATT, D.D.	
REV. HOMER J. VOSBURGH, D.D.	
REV. JACOB G. WALKER, D.D.	
REV. W. QUAY ROSSELLE, PH.D.	
REV. ROBERT C. HULL	
II. WHAT ARE THE ASSURED RESULTS OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM?	34
REV. PHILIP L. JONES, D.D.	
REV. B. D. HAHN, D.D.	
REV. JOHN R. BROWN	
PROFESSOR HERBERT L. WILLETT, PH.D.	
REV. WILLIAM H. BAWDEN	
PROFESSOR A. W. ANTHONY, D.D.	
III. WHAT HINDERS THE UNION OF THE BAPTISTS AND THE DIS- CIPLES OF CHRIST?	77
REV. PETER AINSLIE, D.D.	
PROFESSOR DOUGLAS C. MACINTOSH, PH.D.	
PROFESSOR W. J. MCGLOTHLIN, D.D.	
PROFESSOR E. B. POLLARD, PH.D.	
PROFESSOR HERBERT L. WILLETT, PH.D.	
PRESIDENT MILTON G. EVANS, D.D., LL.D.	
IV. IMMERSIONISTS AND CHURCH UNION	110
REV. A. T. SALLEY, D.D.	
REV. LUTHER E. SELLERS	
REV. ROBERT T. JONES, D.D.	
PRESIDENT M. G. EVANS, D.D., LL.D.	
REV. JOHN R. BROWN	
PROFESSOR E. B. POLLARD, PH.D.	
PROFESSOR J. P. LICHTENBERGER, PH.D.	
REV. WILLIAM H. BAWDEN	

	PAGE
V. PAUPERISM—ITS CAUSES AND CURE	150
REV. ADDISON MOORE, D.D.	
REV. J. P. LICHTENBERGER, PH.D.	
MORNAY WILLIAMS, ESQ.	
REV. W. QUAY ROSSELLE, PH.D.	
REV. WILLIAM C. LITTLE.	
REV. WILLIAM H. BAWDEN.	
PROFESSOR FRANK AUBREY STARRATT, D.D.	
VI. THE MYSTICAL ELEMENT IN CHRISTIANITY. WHAT IS IT AND WHAT IS ITS VALUE?	179
REV. D. H. CLARE, D.D.	
PROFESSOR ALFRED W. ANTHONY, D.D.	
CLOSING WORDS	194
HARRY W. MERRILL, ESQ.	
REV. RUSSELL H. CONWELL, DD., LL.D.	
REV. BIRNEY S. HUDSON, D.D.	
REV. THEO. A. K. GESSLER, D.D.	

BAPTIST CONGRESS

PLAN OF ORGANIZATION

1. *The object* of the Congress is to promote a healthful sentiment among Baptists through free and courteous discussion of current questions by suitable persons.

2. *The work* of the Congress shall be subject to the control of a General Committee of one hundred members or more. The Committee shall be composed of persons who have consented to contribute five dollars or more annually toward the expenses of the Congress.

3. *The General Committee* shall elect a permanent Executive Committee of fifteen persons residing in or near the City of New York, at the meetings of which Executive Committee any member of the General Committee may be present and vote; and to this Executive Committee shall be intrusted, except as may have been already provided for by the General Committee, entire control over the public meetings—e.g., determination of the time and place, the number of days and sessions each day, selection of the presiding officer, the topics, the appointed writers and speakers, the provision for volunteer speakers, and rules of discussion. The Executive Committee shall also secure a full stenographic report of the proceedings, and funds to meet any other necessary expense.

4. *A Secretary* shall be elected, who shall also be Secretary of the Executive Committee, and of the public meetings, the expenses of whose correspondence, etc., shall be met by a tax levied by the Executive Committee upon the General Committee.

5. *The General Committee* shall meet in connection with the public meetings, and when called together by the Executive Committee.

6. *The Executive Committee* shall secure the appointment of a Local Committee in the city or town where a public meeting is to be held, which shall provide a suitable place for the Congress, entertainment for the officers and appointees of the Congress.

7. *Any member* of a Baptist Congregation may become an Annual Member of this Congress, and thus be entitled to all its privileges, and to a copy of the published proceedings, by the payment of the sum of two dollars.

RULES OF DISCUSSION

1. *The Chairman* of the Congress shall be appointed by the Executive Committee, and on all points of order his decision shall be final.

2. *Any member* of a Baptist Congregation who, by sending his card to the Secretary, shall signify his willingness to speak on the topic under discussion, may be called upon by the Chairman.

3. *All writers* and speakers shall take the platform, address only the Chair, and confine themselves to the subject assigned for the occasion.

4. *No person* shall speak twice on the same subject.

5. *Readers of papers* shall be allowed twenty-five minutes, appointed speakers¹ twenty minutes, and volunteer speakers ten minutes. The Secretary shall notify all participants by stroke of the bell three minutes before, and also at the expiration of their time, beyond which no one shall be allowed to proceed.

6. *No paper* shall be read in the absence of its writer, nor shall any paper be printed in the proceedings except it has been read at the meeting.

7. *No resolution* or motion shall be entertained at the public conferences.

EXPLANATORY

The Secretary has edited sixteen volumes of the *Proceedings of the Baptist Congress* and has never before felt that it was necessary to offer an apology or explanation in connection with the issuance of any volume. This year, however, owing to the inability of the stenographer to meet the exacting requirements of this task, an unusual burden has been laid upon the Secretary.

¹ Appointed speakers must not use MS, the object of their appointment being to encourage the volunteer discussion which follows their addresses.

It is even possible, owing to the gaps in the stenographer's work, that some addresses will be found missing. It is hoped that this may not prove to be the case, but as an entire address by a member of the Disciples denomination was not referred to in the notes of the stenographer, and as the error was only accidentally discovered by the Secretary, this explanatory note is supplied to save the possible suspicion of intentional discourtesy.

CALIFORNIA

BURDETTE, REV. ROBERT J.	Pasadena
Woods, Rev. E. A.	Berkeley

COLORADO

Franklin, Rev. J. H.	Colorado Springs
Pinkham, Rev. Henry W.	Denver
Vosburgh, Rev. G. B., D.D.	Denver

CONNECTICUT

LAWSON, REV. ALBERT G., D.D.	Waterbury
McNALLY, REV. C. R.	New London
Brown, Rev. John R.	Bridgeport
Brown, Rev. T. Edwin, D.D.	New Britain
Fennell, Rev. W. G., D.D.	Hartford
Lent, Rev. Frederick, Ph.D.	New Haven
MacIntosh, Professor Douglas C., Ph.D.	New Haven
Sloper, A. J.	New Britain

DELAWARE

CONK, REV. RICHARD B., D.D.	Wilmington
Jones, L. B.	Wilmington

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HUGHES, MR. JUSTICE CHARLES E., LL.D.	Washington
SHAUD, MILES M.	Washington
WOODWARD, S. W.	Washington
Everett, William W.	Washington
Greene, Rev. S. H., D.D.	Washington
Wright, Fred E.	Washington

GEORGIA

CALLAWAY, JUDGE E. H.	Augusta
JONES, REV. M. ASHBY, D.D.	Augusta
OWEN, REV. WILLIAM RUSSELL.	Atlanta
WHITE, REV. JOHN E., D.D.	Atlanta

ILLINOIS

BALDWIN, HON. JESSE A.	Chicago
BURTON, PROFESSOR ERNEST D., D.D.	Chicago
FOSTER, PROFESSOR GEORGE B., D.D.	Chicago
GATES, PROFESSOR ERRETT, Ph.D.	Chicago
JUDSON, PRESIDENT H. P., LL.D.	Chicago
PARKER, PROFESSOR A. K.	Chicago
SKEVINGTON, REV. S. J.	Chicago
WALDBACH, Wm. E.	Chicago
WELLS, F. A.	Chicago

Bowman, E. M.,	Chicago
Dickerson, J. S.	Chicago
Henderson, Professor C. R., D.D.	Chicago
Hoben, Professor Allan, Ph.D.	Chicago
Magill, Rev. David T.	Chicago
Mathews, Professor Shailer, D.D.	Chicago
Maxson, Rev. C. H.	Chicago
Nuveen, John.	Chicago
Smith, Professor Gerald B., D.D.	Chicago
Smith, Professor J. M. P., D.D.	Chicago
Willett, Professor Herbert L., D.D.	Chicago

IOWA

BATTEN, PROFESSOR S. Z., D.D.	Des Moines
-------------------------------	------------

KENTUCKY

MULLINS, PRESIDENT E. Y., D.D., LL.D.	Louisville
Carver, Professor W. O., D.D.	Louisville
McGlothlin, Professor W. J., D.D.	Louisville
Osborne, Thomas D.	Louisville
Sampey, Professor J. R., D.D.	Louisville

MAINE

ANTHONY, PROFESSOR ALFRED W., D.D.	Lewiston
JEFFERSON, REV. ALBERT W., D.D.	Portland
Salley, Rev. A. T.	Lewiston

MARYLAND

DODD, REV. CHAS. H., D.D.,	Baltimore
LEVERING, EUGENE	Baltimore
Ainslie, Rev. Peter, D.D.	Baltimore
Woods, Rev. F. C.	Baltimore

MASSACHUSETTS

ANDERSON, REV. T. D., D.D.	Brookline
BARBOUR, REV. T. S., D.D.	Wollaston
BROWN, SAMUEL N.	Boston
CALLEY, REV. WALTER, D.D.	Boston
CROSS, PROFESSOR GEORGE, D.D.	Newton Center
DE BLOIS, REV. A. K., PH.D., D.D.	Boston
GIFFORD, REV. O. P., D.D.	Brookline
GRAY, REV. CLIFTON D., PH.D.	Boston
HORR, PRESIDENT GEORGE E., D.D.	Newton Center
JOHNSON, REV. HERBERT S.	Boston
MOORE, STEPHEN.	Boston
Anderson, Professor F. L., D.D.	Newton Center

Barry, Charles C.....	Melrose
Bradbury, Rev. Woodman.....	Cambridge
Brown, Professor Charles Rufus, D.D.....	Newton Center
Bullen, Rev. George, D.D.....	Hingham
Chamberlain, Rev. Harrie R.....	Newton
Coleman, George W.....	Boston
Donovan, Professor W. N., D.D.....	Newton Center
Foster, Rev. Allyn K, D.D.....	Worcester
Francis, Rev. J. A., D.D.....	Boston
Garton, Rev. J. V., D.D.....	W. Somerville
Greul, Rev. Frederick B., D.D.....	Haverhill
Haggard, Rev. Fred P., D.D.....	Boston
Haskell, Edward H.....	Boston
Marble, Rev. F. E.....	Cambridge
Merriam, Rev. E. F., D.D.....	Boston
Mosely, John.....	Needham
Scott, Rev. Walter.....	Cambridge
Spalding, Rev. C. H., D.D.....	Boston
Watson, Rev. C. H., D.D.....	Boston

MICHIGAN

JENNINGS, A. E.....	Detroit
MAUCK, PRESIDENT J. W., LL.D.....	Hillsdale
Grenell, Rev. Z., D.D.....	Detroit
Reed, Rev. Delavan, B., D.D.....	Hillsdale
Slocum, President A. G., D.D.....	Kalamazoo
Walltman, Professor L.....	Hillsdale

MINNESOTA

CRANDALL, REV. L. A., D.D.....	Minneapolis
Sweet, Rev. F. W.....	Minneapolis

MISSOURI

BITTING, REV. W. C., D.D.....	St. Louis
MAYFIELD, W. H., M.D.....	St. Louis
Abbott, Augustus L.....	St. Louis
Davis, E. G.....	St. Louis
Greene, President J. P., D.D.....	Liberty
Knox, George Platt.....	St. Louis

NEBRASKA

ANDREWS, PRESIDENT E. BENJAMIN, LL.D.....	Lincoln
Carpenter, I. W.....	Omaha

NEW JERSEY

BAWDEN, REV. WILLIAM H.....	Perth Amboy
CLARE, REV. DANIEL H., D.D.....	East Orange

COLBY, HON. EVERETT.....	Newark
COLBY, GARDNER.....	Elizabeth
COLGATE, RICHARD M.....	West Orange
COLGATE, SYDNEY M.....	Orange
DAVIS, F. H.....	Elizabeth
DIMOCK, G. E.....	Elizabeth
EACHES, REV. O. P., D.D.....	Hightstown
FOSDICK, REV. H. E.....	Montclair
GARABRANT, D. G.....	Bloomfield
GESSLER, REV. T. A. K., D.D.....	Landing
HULL, REV. ROBERT C.....	Summit
LAWRENCE, REV. WILLIAM M., D.D.....	East Orange
TOMLINSON, REV. E. T., PH.D.....	Elizabeth
Barker, Rev. W. W.....	Morristown
Bronk, Rev. Mitchell, Ph.D.....	Bayonne
Clark, Rev. W. F.....	Point Pleasant
Clyde, Rev. J. A.....	Sewall
Conklin, Rev. J. C.....	Trenton
Conklin, F. C.....	Perth Amboy
Deats, H. E.....	Flemington
Dewolf, Rev. Delavan.....	Newark
Hare, Rev. J. Madison.....	Jersey City
Hudson, Rev. Birney S., D.D.....	Atlantic City
Smith, Rev. Frank A.....	Haddonfield
Walker, Rev. Louis A.....	Demarest
White, Francis L.....	Summit

NEW YORK

BARBOUR, REV. C. A., D.D.....	Rochester
BARNES, REV. L. C., D.D.....	Manhattan, New York City
BERRY, PROFESSOR GEORGE R., D.D.....	Hamilton
BIGELOW, MRS. A. G.....	Manhattan, New York City
BRUCE, REV. JAMES M.....	Manhattan, New York City
BRYAN, PRESIDENT E. B., D.D., LL.D.....	Hamilton
BURNHAM, PROFESSOR S., D.D.....	Hamilton
CASE, REV. C. D., PH.D.....	Buffalo
CLARKE, PROFESSOR W. N., D.D.....	Hamilton
CLINCH, HON. EDWARD S.....	Manhattan, New York City
COLGATE, JAMES C.....	Manhattan, New York City
DICKERSON, FRANK.....	Manhattan, New York City
FARNHAM, REV. E. P., D.D.....	Richmond Hill, New York City
GOODCHILD, REV. F. M., D.D.....	Manhattan, New York City
GOODCHILD, MRS. F. M.....	Manhattan, New York City

GRANGER, REV. W. A., D.D.	Mt. Vernon
GURLEY, W. F.	Troy
HAYWOOD, REV. OSCAR, D.D.	Manhattan, New York City
HEGEMAN, JOHN R.	Manhattan, New York City
HILLMAN, WILLIAM	Mt. Vernon
HILLS, WILLIAM	Manhattan, New York City
JOHNSTON, REV. R. P., D.D.	Manhattan, New York City
KINNE, VOLNEY P.	Buffalo
LORD, REV. RIVINGTON D., D.D.	Brooklyn, New York City
MACDONALD, REV. ROBERT, D.D.	Brooklyn, New York City
MACDONALD, WILLIAM	Albany
MARSTON, EDGAR L.	Manhattan, New York City
MATTESON, REV. W. B., D.D.	Mt. Vernon
MILBANK, JOSEPH	Manhattan, New York City
MOORE, REV. ADDISON, D.D.	Manhattan, New York City
PARMLY, RANDOLPH	Manhattan, New York City
PARSONS, CHARLES W.	Manhattan, New York City
RANDALL, REV. J. H., D.D.	Manhattan, New York City
RAUSCHENBUSCH, PROFESSOR WALTER, D.D.	Rochester
RHEES, PRESIDENT RUSH, D.D., LL.D.	Rochester
SANDERS, REV. H. M., D.D.	Manhattan, New York City
SNAPE, REV. JOHN, D.D.	Utica
STARRATT, PROFESSOR F. A., D.D.	Hamilton
STRONG, PRESIDENT A. H., D.D., LL.D.	Rochester
WILLIAMS, REV. LEIGHTON, D.D.	Manhattan, New York City
WHITE, E. D.	Manhattan, New York City
Anderson, Rev. Frank	Johnstown
Anderson, Professor John B., D.D.	Hamilton
Betteridge, Professor W. R., D.D.	Rochester
Bickmore, Professor A. S., LL.D.	Manhattan, New York City
Blair, Rev. V. W.	North Tonawanda
Bovenizer, George W.	Brooklyn, New York City
Boville, Rev. R. G., D.D.	Manhattan, New York City
Cant, Andrew	Buffalo
Carpenter, Aaron A.	Port Chester
Chard, James F.	Buffalo
Cole, Rev. A. S.	Kingston
Conant, T. O., LL.D.	Manhattan, New York City
Dickinson, Rev. J. T., D.D.	Rochester
Elmer, Rev. F. D.	Poughkeepsie
Griffith, Rev. G. O.	Brooklyn, New York City
Grout, T. J.	Manhattan, New York City
Henson, Rev. L. L., D.D.	Brooklyn, New York City

Jones, Rev. R. T.	Ithaca
Laws, Rev. Curtis Lee, D.D.	Brooklyn, New York City
Leshner, A. L.	Manhattan, New York City
MacMurray, Rev. D. A.	Brooklyn, New York City
Partridge, Rev. W. G., D.D.	Troy
Pattison, Rev. Harold.	Manhattan, New York City
Penney, Rev. Frank D., D.D.	Schenectady
Rhoades, Rev. W. C. P., D.D.	Brooklyn, New York City
Schneck, Gustave H.	Brooklyn, New York City
Schulte, T. E.	Manhattan, New York City
Schurman, President J. G., LL.D.	Ithaca
Sears, Rev. Charles H.	Manhattan, New York City
Strong, Professor John H.	Rochester
Taylor, President J. M., LL.D.	Poughkeepsie
Wallace, Rev. W. B., D.D.	Brooklyn, New York City
White, Rev. C. L., D.D.	Manhattan, New York City
Williams, Mornay.	Manhattan, New York City
Wright, William J.	Brooklyn, New York City

NORTH CAROLINA

Poteat, President William L., D.D.	Wake Forest
---	-------------

OHIO

COLBY, REV. H. F., D.D.	Dayton
COLWELL, PROFESSOR R. S., D.D.	Granville
HUNT, PRESIDENT E. W., D.D., LL.D.	Granville
HYDE, REV. J. CHESTER.	Cleveland
STILLWELL, REV. H. F., D.D.	Cleveland
THRESHER, E. M.	Dayton
Bustard, Rev. W. W., D.D.	Cleveland
Cheney, Rev. J. L., Ph.D.	Hebron
McLean, Rev. A.	Cincinnati
Sage, John D.	Cincinnati
Thresher, Albert.	Dayton
Whidden, Rev. Howard P., D.D.	Dayton
Williams, Professor C. L.	Granville

OKLAHOMA

JONES, REV. CARTER HELM, D.D.	Oklahoma City
------------------------------------	---------------

OREGON

PARKER, REV. F. C. W.	Portland
----------------------------	----------

PENNSYLVANIA

CONWELL, REV. RUSSELL H., D.D.	Philadelphia
EVANS, PRESIDENT M. G., D.D.	Chester

FERRIS, REV. GEORGE H., D.D.....	Philadelphia
HARRIS, PRESIDENT J. H., LL.D.....	Lewisburg
JACKSON, REV. J. L., D.D.....	Sharon
KEEN, PROFESSOR W. W., M.D., LL.D.....	Philadelphia
LINCOLN, W. E.....	Pittsburgh
MEESER, PROFESSOR S. B., D.D.....	Chester
PORTER, HON. H. KIRKE.....	Pittsburgh
ROSSELLE, REV. W. QUAY, PH.D.....	Philadelphia
ROWLAND, REV. A. J., D.D.....	Philadelphia
TORRANCE, HON. FRANCIS J.....	Pittsburgh
TUSTIN, HON. ERNEST L.....	Philadelphia
Adams, Rev. George D., D.D.....	Philadelphia
Bonsall, Rev. A. J., Litt.D.....	Pittsburgh
Hobson, A. Augustus.....	Pittsburgh
Jones, Rev. Philip L., D.D.....	Philadelphia
Lindsley, I. H.....	Philadelphia
Lewis, Rev. Frank Grant, Ph.D.....	Chester
Loxley, B. Odgen.....	Philadelphia
Pollard, Professor E. B., Ph.D.....	Chester
Swift, Rev. G. H.....	Philadelphia
Walker, Rev. J. G., D.D.....	Philadelphia

RHODE ISLAND

FAUNCE, PRESIDENT W. H. P., D.D., LL.D.....	Providence
METCALF, EDWARD P.....	Providence
Hatchman, Rev. H. E.....	Oak Lawn
Holyoke, Rev. Edward M., D.D.....	Providence

SOUTH CAROLINA

JONES, REV. HOWARD L., D.D.....	Charlestown
WILBUR, WALTER.....	Charlestown
Brown, Rev. C. C., D.D.....	Sumter
Moore, Professor Gordon B., D.D.....	Columbia

TENNESSEE

WEAVER, REV. RUFUS W., D.D.....	Nashville
---------------------------------	-----------

TEXAS

Huhns, Rev. F.....	Houston Heights
--------------------	-----------------

VERMONT

HOLTON, H. D., M.D.....	Brattleboro
STICKNEY, HON. W. W.....	Ludlow
Lawson, Principal George B.....	Saxon's River

VIRGINIA

GRACE, REV. E. L., D.D.....	Richmond
-----------------------------	----------

THE BAPTIST CONGRESS

WISCONSIN

Ashworth, Rev. Robert A. Milwaukee

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Pattison, Rev. F. W. Summerland

ONTARIO

Firstbrook, John Toronto

Ryrie, James Toronto

Thompson, D. E., K.C. Toronto

AFRICA

Moody, Rev. Thomas. Metada, Congo

GERMANY

KOHLER, PROFESSOR WALTER University of Giessen

INDIA

Dussman, Rev. John Vinnkonda, Gunter Dist., Madras Presidency

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BAPTIST CONGRESS
FIRST DAY

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.

Afternoon Session

Tuesday, November 14, 1911

3:30 P.M.

DR. A. W. BAILEY: It gives me pleasure to introduce to you the President of the Congress, Mr. H. W. Merrill, secretary of our Y. M. C. A.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: *Members of the Congress:* I appreciate the honor which has been given me at this time. Like every citizen of Atlantic City, and particularly those interested in religious things, I have been looking forward to the meetings of this Congress, and I am sure there is a rich blessing in store for me because of this opportunity to serve you. You are invited to sing hymn No. 669, "The Church's One Foundation Is Jesus Christ Her Lord."

(Hymn.)

PRESIDENT MERRILL: The opening prayer of the Congress will be offered by Dr. Colman of Buffalo:

(Prayer.)

Our Heavenly Father, we thank thee for the richness of the provision thou dost make for the welfare of thy children. Thou hast ordained that the earth shall bring forth provision through which our physical nature is renewed day by day, and thou hast given to us spiritual opportunities through which our spiritual life is advanced, and among the chief of these aids to spiritual advancement is that Word which thou hast placed in our hand. But we know that just as the earth must be tilled in order that the harvest may come, so we must search the Scriptures in order that we may find out the truth that the Scriptures impart, and we thank thee that thy servants are doing this more and more as the days go by in the endeavor to find out that which is written in the volume of the Book. We thank thee for the various agencies and opportunities in the world today, for the church at large, for the Bible classes, for the young people's societies, for the Christian

associations, and we thank thee for this Congress, with its wonderful history running through many years. We know that there has been much interesting discussion and light has been thrown on portions of thy word, and now, as thy servants come from various parts of this land, and as they come representing the branches of the church which have seemed to be strangers, we thank thee for the union that manifests itself now, and we hope it may go on, until it may realize the perfection of the prayer of our blessed Lord, when he prayed that his followers might be one. We ask that thy spirit may be marvelously manifest. May there be no word uttered that shall wound the feelings of any, and as the result of our meetings in the form in which we gather, may there be a handclasping of those who have hitherto walked in separate ways.

Hear us as we pray for a blessing on the city in which we gather. May it be known throughout the length and breadth of Atlantic City that here a band of Christian men have gathered that they may throw light on the blessed Word of God. Help us to live as those who know that for every word we must give an account to thee, and may we feel when we come to the end of life that we have tried according to the measure of our ability, to do faithfully the work thou hast given us to do. We ask this, with the pardon of sin, in Jesus' name, *Amen*.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: I want to present to you, at this time, one of the leading pastors of the city, Rev. H. M. Gesner, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church.

REV. H. M. GESNER: *Mr. Chairman, Members of the Baptist Congress:* I stand before you this afternoon in the unenviable position of a substitute. If you have ever been a substitute you know what it means. I am the stopgap, the makeshift, the second fiddle, and it is I whom you are to hear instead of the first violin. I am not Hon. A. B. Endicott. Add about ten inches to my girth, six to my height, a goatee, and a heart as big as a woodchuck, and I would be a good imitation. To explain his absence, he saw some of the subjects you are to discuss and as he is an old, dyed-in-the-wool Presbyterian, it made him so ill, he took to his bed. Therefore, he is unable to be with you.

While I cannot welcome you with the felicity and grace born of long experience, which the Judge has, I have the same sincerity in wishing and saying welcome to our city, and

in wishing that you may fully partake of all the good things which we have in the city by the sea. We have good things here. You have just heard one of them (*indicating President Merrill*) a moment ago. We have good air, none better in flavor, from France, far-off Spain, Congo Free State, just happens how the wind blows, and how far it comes. We have more good water than perhaps any other city on the coast; more ozone, so the doctors say, in the air. We have good hotels, and if you are stopping at them, you know I am right. We have good streets, good churches, good citizens. We have good, honest, sincere men and women. We have good Baptists.

We have some bad things, but what is the use of looking for them? If you look for the good things in this city you will not have time for the bad. We are glad to have an influence of this kind in our midst. We are glad to have a meeting here of church people, that is not for examination, for questioning, interrogation, nor criticizing, nor inquisition, but for the friendly discussion of certain fundamental questions. The very purpose that brings you here is a good thing for our city. I feel perfectly safe on this platform, because I can sense the friendly spirit in which you come. People are willing to take the *ipse dixit* of any Tom, Dick, or Harry, and for a penny they are willing to buy ideas, and for ten cents an argument, when if they knew the men, they would not give anything at all for them. It is old, very old, the charge made against the people of God—as old as the days of Isaiah: "Israel doth not know, my people do not think." You have no trouble with a church when it thinks. Only when it points the finger of accusation, and when the mob follows, against one whom some leader has stirred up. If people will think, the church is safe. When you come to think on these subjects it is a blessed thing. How good it is to discuss these questions and see them from a different viewpoint. A man can only see straight on, he has not eyes in the back of his head, his viewpoint is limited; there is never a thing which has not two sides. Every subject has two sides; even a sheet of paper has two sides. Unless you know something about the other side you don't know all you ought to know. If my faith only rests upon what seems even

to me a tottering foundation, and I do not know the other side of the question, if that is the only reason I have for belief, I think I then have one solid reason for investigating. The man who has no reason for his belief beyond the *ipse dixit* of some authority is the man who has a poor reason. It is right for us to think about these things. Truth is like light. Truth is like life. You see it now in the tiniest insect that grows, you see it in the flower and you see it in the tree, you see it in the mammoth. It is life, life in each instance. So it is with truth. While a man may say I have a truth, or "see this for a truth," there is no man who has all the truth. You may have monopolies on money, or corners on corn, but thank God, never corners on truth. How congenial are the themes which you are to discuss! May you enjoy yourselves and profit physically, mentally, morally, spiritually, and go home glad that you came, and desiring to come again! (*Applause.*)

PRESIDENT MERRILL: The Baptists of this community desire to present a welcome, and this will be given by Dr. Birney S. Hudson, pastor of this church.

REV. BIRNEY S. HUDSON, D.D.: *Mr. President:* This Baptist Congress has been formally welcomed in other places twenty-eight times. It is no mimicry that at this time welcome is expressed to assure this gathering that Atlantic City opens her doors gladly to those interested in things which bring us together today.

We rejoice in your coming, too, because, as assembled, we represent the triangle of Baptist forces. We hope, however, in the coming of comity and unity, the triangle may be made a straight line and a united bold front may be more able to take strong hold of the world's work.

We meet in a city which represents all phases of life. We have here the serious and the light; those seeking business success and health and pleasure; those in comfort and in distress; the cultured and the crude; the righteous and the unrighteous.

It is from such assemblages as this that beneficence for the hapless, and inspiration for the sluggish, and conviction for the doubter have been realized in various periods of man's history.

From such bodies have influences gone forth that in their course have meant the better meaning of life for all classes. It is here too that every man has opportunity to answer to the hope that is in *him*.

An ancient politician asked the question, "What is Truth?" Whether he asked in seriousness or cynicism, the question has been remembered by every serious soul. That is the question we raise today. It was asked yesterday. It will be pronounced again tomorrow. If we can answer it or discover its answer satisfactorily for ourselves happy shall we be.

The effort of ecclesiasticism has been to answer the question *ex cathedra*. Intelligence and original research undo the contentment and conceit of all such presumption.

Unity of thought will never be realized by the decrees of councils. It has been tried *ad satietem*.

Our pleasure today is to discover our fellow's independent thinking, and not only his conclusions, but also his habits of thought and his mental processes, and his soul behind it all.

If we find ourselves thinking alike we will have cause indeed for self-gratulation. If we differ, we will cheer each other while going in solitary paths and pray that he who is afield from our standards may eventually see the error of his way.

There is no party spirit among us. We are disciples of a faith which insures utmost liberty. We seek truth discovered, about to be discovered, and even undiscoverable. We have a right to investigate, with the instincts of the philosopher or scientist, any field wherein data may be found.

The Baptist Congress is the most Baptist institution on earth. If liberty of conscience and freedom of speech are considered principles of our cult then have we found them idealized, for now is the opportunity for us to declare ourselves. If any, however, believes he has said the last word upon any subject, let him beware, for some other fellow may then take up his side of the cube with a new inscription or hieroglyphic upon it. There is no finality to truth, to any open-minded seeker, unless he can fathom the Infinite. The seeker after truth takes comfort, if together with intellectual harmony so far as he has gone, his

soul, his subjective life whispers to himself that he is going the right way; if he has the assurance that he need not retrace his steps.

This church has heard all types of preachers, orthodox and heterodox, the philosopher and the evangelist, the great and the small, and they sincerely tell every man they have enjoyed his message. They are ready to hear anything if sincerely spoken, and courteously discard the whole if it doesn't taste good. This is what you are here for. We should be sorry if you did not eschew as their judgments may direct, while declaring a genuine pleasure in knowing what others think and feel.

You are welcome, brethren, to say what you please. This is what you are here for. We should be sorry if you did not carry out your mission. We will not be shocked, we will consider.

Every welcome to Atlantic City must in some way or other mention our beach and Boardwalk, to be complete. We need only to mention them. You will do the rest. They are not as important, however, or as interesting as the sessions of the Congress.

Let us know if we can do more for your comfort or happiness. We are wise here with the wisdom of experience. We are glad you have come. We have multitudes of as noble people as dwell upon the planet to welcome you. We also have problems as stupendous as fall to the lot of students of the well-being of the race. One of our problems is the fact that multitudes of religious people come here and drop their religion as they cross the drawbridge.

We need more and more the assemblages of serious students of the problems confronting man. We are in the midst of them. Let us, together, seek a true philosophy of truth, a better knowledge of the means by which we may save the race from sin, to a discovery of mankind's best selfhood in the spirit of the God of all truth, whom we seek that we may serve.

THE PRESIDENT: The response to these addresses will be made by Rev. Dr. Henry M. Sanders, chairman of the Executive Committee.

REV. HENRY M. SANDERS, D.D.: *Mr. Chairman:* It was the farthest from my expectation when I entered this place this afternoon that I should be called upon to perform this service and to take the place of Dr. Gessler to whom it is assigned on the program, but who has been unavoidably detained from this first session of the Congress. I labor under the additional disadvantage of not having heard the first address of welcome, but I assume it was as generous and cordial in its greeting as that of the pastor of this church. So it is a pleasant and easy task to say how greatly we appreciate these hospitable words. Atlantic City is certainly an appropriate place for a meeting of Baptists. We read of another company of the same denomination who met at a certain town "because there was much water there." There is enough of that element here to satisfy the most rabid Immersionist. Matthew Arnold speaks of the ocean as the "salt, unplumbed, estranging sea." But we hope we shall here have discussions that shall be fresh, interesting, and unifying.

Dr. Hudson has admirably expressed the aim and spirit of this Congress. Our one purpose, our sole function has been, for now nearly thirty years, to present a forum where able, earnest, reverent men might discuss questions that are current and important—sometimes even burning and insistent. The Congress itself does not espouse any particular set of opinions. Its friends and supporters embrace all schools of thought and "wings" in our denomination. Among these, and especially those of the Executive Committee, whose duty it is to choose the topics and select the writers and speakers, are to be found conservatives as well as liberals, as these terms are generally used. The object of the Congress is strictly limited to providing a platform to which shall be brought the best that is to be said on all sides of the subjects discussed. It is our earnest and most determined policy to get the strongest and most representative men of all parties to present their views. Each individual participant is alone responsible for his utterances. Our aim is affirmative, not negative; constructive, not destructive.

The Congress believes that things new and old are to be brought out of the treasury of truth; that new wineskins ought to

be provided, when necessary, for new wine. It seeks to free the church from the reproach that it fears the light of modern research and dares not face the questions which earnest men are everywhere today propounding. It holds that each generation has the right to interpret religion in the light of growing knowledge and experience and in the speech of its own age. Its chief desire is to help the denomination to adjust itself to the changes that are taking place in all departments of thought and life.

Such an institution ought to be thoroughly congenial to Baptists who have always been the foremost champions of freedom of discussion. We have no authoritative creeds to which we are tethered, "anchored to a cemetery"; we have no hoary ecclesiasticism which will be shattered by adapting it to modern needs. We, of all denominations, are in a position to welcome and interpret and apply the new light that is breaking out of God's word and world. And no other institution in our denomination, by its aims, its long history, its national, representative character, affords such an opportunity to aid in these readjustments as the Baptist Congress. We sincerely hope that the sessions of this year will add to the rich treasury of truth which has been garnered and preserved in the past.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: It is customary for the Secretary to read the rules. In his absence the Treasurer will do so.

REV. ROBERT C. HULL read the Rules of Discussion of the Congress.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: The subject for consideration this afternoon is "In What Sense Is Christ Divine?" and the first paper will be read by Professor Frank A. Starratt, Hamilton, N.Y.

PROFESSOR FRANK AUBREY STARRATT, D.D., of Hamilton, N.Y., then presented the following paper:

IN WHAT SENSE IS CHRIST DIVINE?

The answer given in the historic creeds, which have been the authoritative voice of Christendom, is a metaphysical one. It affirms that Christ is divine in the sense that he is of the sub-

stance or essence of God. In this answer we have presented to us two persons, distinct from each other, known separately and in different ways. The divinity of the one is assured, that of the other is to be established by showing that he is of the identical essence or substance with the first.

This answer was a product of the Greek mind applying the categories of Greek philosophy to what was conceived to be the facts of the gospel. All the circumstances of the time demanded this kind of an answer. The question was forced upon the early church in such a form as to carry the discussion at once into the field of philosophy. Nor is it at all surprising that such should be the case. There was, at that time, no such clear distinction between philosophy and religion as obtains at present, so that philosophy easily lent itself to the formulations of the doctrine as set forth in the creed; in fact, it furnished the formula in which the doctrine was stated.

But not only were the circumstances of the time favorable toward giving a metaphysical answer to the question, but the conception of salvation current in the Greek church seemed to demand it. Christ was the Redeemer, and his person must be construed in the light of his redeeming work. Now redemption was thought of as a deification of human nature, and this in a metaphysical sense. The essential thing in redemption was immortality. But immortality belonged to Deity alone. It could be imparted to man only as the divine essence should be united with the human. God must become man in order that man may become God, and thus become a partaker of immortality. Thus the necessity for insisting upon Christ being of the essence of God, for only so could he be the redeemer of man.

It is thus easy to see that the answer given to our question by the ancient church was the natural one for that age, and it served a good purpose for its own time. But this answer is in no sense binding upon Christians. Nor is it to be accepted unless it is the best answer that can be given, unless it expresses in the best way the truth for us. In many respects it seems to be very unsatisfactory and for the following reasons.

While the question is being put to the church today with as

much urgency as in the earlier time, and an answer is imperatively demanded, yet it comes today in an entirely different form. Then it was put in such a way as to demand a metaphysical answer. Today such is not the case; the situation demands not a philosophical answer, but a religious one. Philosophy and religion have become so far differentiated that while they are ever reacting upon each other yet each has its own particular interest, so that each can work in a manner independently. Today the interest in Christ is a religious one, and the form in which the question concerning his divinity comes to us demands a religious rather than a philosophical answer.

While the philosophy of the early church provided the formula in which her faith was stated, the philosophy of today has practically eliminated its chief feature—the category of substance—from the field of thought. We know things in their activities, as they can be perceived. If there is any substance or essence, a something which in no way manifests itself, of which nothing can be known, whose presence can only logically be inferred, it can safely be ignored. So it has come about that what to the Greek philosopher was the most certain of all conceptions is now in the modern world the most vague and shadowy. The essence or substance, which made the three persons of the Trinity a unity, and in which the deity of Christ was said to consist, has become the mere shadow of a thing, has practically vanished from human thinking. It is rather an unwarranted proceeding for us today to say that Christ is of the essence of God, since we do not pretend to know anything about the essence either of God or man. We know Christ only in his activities; we know God only in the same way. If there is to be any comparison made it must be in the realm of their respective activities. To press back behind these and posit a substance does not clear up matters and is contrary to modern modes of thought.

The conception of salvation current today is very different from that of the Greek Fathers. We do not think of salvation as consisting in deification or as the impartation to man of divine essence in virtue of which he becomes immortal, but as consisting in the normal development of the truly human. We look forward, not to a metaphysical union with God, but to a normal and

spiritual one. So that, so far as the work of the Redeemer is concerned, there is no rigid demand for a metaphysical explanation, but rather for a religious one, that will bear upon his work for and with us as moral and spiritual beings.

Furthermore the answer given in the creeds does not serve the purpose for which it is needed today. Primarily we need a theory that will explain the person of Christ. But the metaphysical answer does not do this. Applying this theory we have in the one person Christ, two natures, a divine and a human. This statement, two natures and one person, bears on its face a contradiction. How this contradiction can be dissolved; how these two natures can be combined or related to form one person, no one can tell. When pressed for an answer we are referred to the essential mystery of the person of Christ. But we meet this mystery much earlier in our investigation. The mystery confronts us if anywhere in the facts of Christ's life. In order to explain the mystery involved in these facts we have recourse to the theory as to the essence of his person. But in this explanation we still have our mystery and in addition are compelled to adjust ourselves to a contradictory statement. So that the theory fails to explain, but rather increases the confusion and hence fails of its purpose.

For these reasons the answer to our question as given in the creeds is not satisfactory, and we are led to attempt an answer in the form in which the question is put today, that is, in the religious sense.

In doing this we will have to turn to the religious life, in order to learn what we mean by the term "divine." Without attempting the difficult task of defining religion we will perhaps all agree that in the religious realm man deals with God. Man looks out into the unseen and postulates there a being with whom he is in reciprocal activity. However much there may be in common between God and man, however closely they may be related, whatever the degree of dependence of man upon God, the distinction between God and man is maintained. In the religious life man is over against God. So that in religious experience the divine is that with which man deals, which he worships, to which he prays, and from which he receives or believes he receives a

response. Into this field of religion, Christ has entered, and we are to ask whether he stands with God or with man.

The place which he occupies, is it on the human or the divine side? The function which he performs, is it a human or a divine one? Does he stand with God or with man?

The question put in this form is a most baffling one, because Christ seems to stand upon both sides. In some aspects Christ stands with us. He lived, spoke, thought, prayed, suffered, and died as a man. Not only did he live in a human body and express himself in human terms, but we recognize his genuine humanity, his oneness with the race. So prominent and evident are the human characteristics, that according to all the laws of rational procedure he should be classified as a man unless we find activities in him that clearly belong to the divine side, unless we find that in the religious life he has played such a part, fulfilled such functions as belong to the divine sphere. That there are such activities is my conviction, and within the limits of this paper they can briefly be indicated.

As man reflects upon life and its meaning, he is profoundly impressed with its imperfection, its incompleteness. All the way along life leaves raw edges, threads that lead out beyond the margin, that cannot be woven into the life pattern but reach out toward the unseen. When the years of life are over, the life itself does not present the aspect of a finished thing. Nothing in it is finished. There is that within man which forms ideals, arouses hopes far beyond the possibility of realization, and yet man cannot deny these ideals; though he fails to realize them, he feels they ought to be realized. Thus he is oppressed with the feeling of life's imperfection, and he cannot content himself with it. He is profoundly discontented and restless. He stands on the shores of life and looks out into the darkness with an undying demand in his heart that somewhere the complement of life shall be found. He demands from the unseen that something shall arise that will assure him of the final rounding out of life: and out of the unseen man has thought there came an answer to his call, and hope arose in his heart in response to it.

These hopes and aspirations have gathered about the idea of God, not very clearly nor definitely, but nevertheless with deep

conviction man has felt that in God the answer to his age-long quest would be found. In Christ men have perceived with considerable clearness the answer to their questioning. In him they have perceived God in his relation to human life and what they have seen satisfies their religious demands and justifies their religious faith. For the life of Christ is in striking contrast to the life of men. Nowhere does it betray that sense of incompleteness and imperfection that is characteristic of human life. It manifests, rather, in an extraordinary degree the very element the lack of which pressed so sorely on the human spirit. There is that in Christ which satisfies the highest aspirations of the human soul. In his life there is realized that which man had dimly felt ought to be. So that as men consider the Christ and all that his life showed him to be, they declare: "That is what we have been blindly groping after, we could not define it, but now that we see it, we recognize it." The Christ reveals to us a human life in its completeness.

The significant thing for man, in that which Christ presents to him, is not the fact that he has attained, but the way in which the goal was reached. For this has not come alone from human striving, but by divine indwelling. Christ does not present us with a picture of superhuman effort crowned with success, but a divine power so entering a human life as to complete and perfect it.

The significant thing in the Christ is the revelation which he gives of the divine activity in relation to the life of man. Man in his religious life had felt that God must be the complement to human life, that somehow the answer to life's deepest problems must be found in him. In Christ we perceive that answer. Now this answer is one that comes to us from the beyond, not arising out of our own consciousness and projected into the unseen, but arising out of the unseen and taking visible form before our eyes. We do not see Christ coming up from a position similar to our own, and by perceptible stages reaching the position which he occupies. The element in Christ which makes his peculiar character possible is not something acquired. He shows no consciousness of ever having been without it. It is native to him, and we perceive it as his life unfolds before our eyes. This element

is the activity of God in his life. This is the thing in the Christ which gives that life such deep meaning for religion. The Christ is not simply an example to us of the way one ought to live with God, but a revelation of how God did live with a man, co-operate with him, and complete his life; and serves to show how God may live with us or in us and complete our lives.

Thus if we think of the religious realm as that sphere of life where the human meets the divine, then, in one aspect of his life, is the Christ on the divine side, the function which he performs is a divine function. He is not standing with man looking up to God. He is not co-operating with man in his appeal to God. His activities are not directed toward God, but toward man; he comes to man from the other side, bringing something from God to man, and from him man learns, perceives, receives. He performs a divine function in that he is a revelation of God. This revelation is made in the human realm, it is true; it shows God in his relations to man and his destiny, but this is precisely the religious interest which man has in God.

That Christ brings us a divine message and throws light upon the character of God we will perhaps all admit, we will consider that in the civilized world for twenty centuries, Christ has determined the religious conception of God. But someone will say that, while Christ has brought us a divine message and determined for us the development of the idea of God, yet he has done this as a man who with deeper insight into the meaning of things has been able to shed light upon our problems as did the old Hebrew prophets.

But here we are confronted with the fact that one cannot separate Christ and his message as one can in the case of the prophets. He did not simply tell about God, he exhibited God. He did not merely tell people what God would do for them, he showed in his own life God actually at work doing things. He was not a messenger, the bearer of a message in the ordinary sense, he was himself the message. He was not the announcer of a revelation in the sense that the Hebrew prophets were, he was himself the revelation. The prophets perceived the meaning of some activity of God, some manifestation of God in human history, and announced their discovery. They were the ones who

perceived the revelation. Christ was the revelation itself, manifested in his own life the divine activity, and men before whom he stands perceive the message. "In him the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth." So we cannot compare him with the prophets or with any man, whatever his discovery of truth may be; the function is a different one. The prophet perceives, discovers, Christ reveals, shows forth in himself.

There is no way of separating Christ from his message, and treating him as we treat the discoverers of truth, without doing violence to the facts. He occupies a unique place in the world's history, and performs a unique function in the religious realm. We cannot classify him with men. The differences are too pronounced and too significant. It is not a question of more or less of the quality of his moral life or of his religious faith. He serves a different purpose, plays a different part in the religious life. He stands on the divine side and performs a divine function. View him in the light of what he has done and is doing in the world and one cannot account for him in terms of humanity.

Neither can we separate the divine and the human elements. The unity of his life is too evident. The human and the divine are too intimately blended to permit of any analysis. We cannot discover any line of cleavage in his consciousness or in his conduct. The divine manifests itself in the forms of human life, but we cannot concede that humanity supplied only the form. There was what we can recognize as genuinely human content as well. Nor do we know enough about the limits of the human and divine to be sure of distinguishing between them, where combined in such a life as that of Christ. He presents this peculiar character: on the one hand we feel his oneness with ourselves, on the other he far transcends our experience, possessing something that we do not have. He manifests in his life a divine activity. He does not claim that this activity has its source within himself, but everywhere affirms that God works in him, and, at the same time, that his life is related to the life of God in a manner that is unique. He does not set himself forth as a new center of life, occupying an independent position, but as one who would bring God and man together. His life is in a certain way continuous with the life of God on the one hand, and with

the life of man on the other, and the two elements flow together without any line of division. Thus he occupies a unique position, showing a unity with God and also with man. He bridges the gulf which man had thought to exist between himself and God, not by placing himself there as a permanent bridge over which communication might pass, but by showing in himself that there is no such gulf, that God is more like man than we had thought, and that man has unsuspected possibilities of becoming like God.

This then is the position which Christ occupies in the religious realm. While we cannot fail to recognize his humanity and see in him an example which can be a guide to us in life, yet we also perceive in him a revelation of God, not merely that he announces to us discoveries which he as a man has made, but an activity of God, which he presents in his own life. In this sense then is he divine.

When we are asked to give a categorical answer to the question, Is he God or man? we have no answer ready. He never identified himself with God, but shows himself as being conscious of dealing with God as other than himself, yet on the other hand, he does not wholly identify himself with man. We may call him the God-man, but that does not tell us anything, and is often misleading. To say that he is of the substance of both God and man is to confuse the situation still further.

It seems to me, that the explanation of the person of Christ is a problem for the solution of which we are not yet prepared: it must wait upon a fuller knowledge of personality, human and divine. But this unsolved problem does not affect the value of Christ for the religious life. The revelation which he has made is our possession, and its validity is not dependent upon a theory as to the process by which it came, but upon its own authentication in the soul, and its power to satisfy the actual needs of life.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: Is Dr. Craig's paper here?

A member of the Congress arose and stated that Rev. Dr. William Bayard Craig, who represented the Disciples in this discussion, had moved to California and was unable to be present, but had sent the paper by someone else, who expected to be present. This gentleman did not seem to be in attendance. President

Merrill then passed the reading of the paper, and called on Rev. Homer J. Vosburgh, D.D., of Camden, N.J., to open the discussion. Dr. Vosburgh spoke as follows:

HOMER J. VOSBURGH, D.D.: *Mr. President:* It is a disappointment that we have not Dr. Craig's paper. It would add to the interest of this occasion if we could hear his discussion. I find myself in sympathy with the general trend of the paper first read. Yet we must not forget that behind the metaphysical interpretations of the past there are great facts that demanded interpretation then and that demand interpretation today. The final solution of our problem undoubtedly will wait upon the interpretation of personality, human and divine. Personality is the clue to our universe; but personality implies metaphysics. There is so much metaphysics in all of us that we will never rest where the paper left us. The paper having taken us so far should have led us to a more positive conclusion.

I believe that the transcendental interpretation of the person of Jesus is correct. He stands on the divine side, as the paper has said, and on the divine side he is an eternal being whose home is within the Godhead. All the facts point in the direction of the historic faith of the church. There are three lines along which the argument for the deity of Christ may be traced.

First, there is the historical argument. By the historical argument I mean that for nearly two thousand years the church has believed in Jesus as the eternal Son of God. Whether this faith is based on a reality, I will not assert at the present moment, but this has been the faith of the church and the faith has been the inspiration of Christian history and progress. If it had not been for belief in Christ as the Son of God, Christianity would be a forgotten sect with as little historic significance as Ebionitism. Whatever Christianity has accomplished has been inspired not by the influence of Jesus of Nazareth but by faith in Christ as the living, reigning Lord. Now if Christ is the Son of God we would expect from him some appropriate manifestations in the field of history. We would not recognize his divinity if it rested alone on a few texts of Scripture. Conversely, if certain great historic results have been achieved, we may infer an adequate

dynamic. There are three aspects of the historic argument that may be briefly indicated. First, there are the moral achievements of Christianity. "The world has changed and Jesus is responsible for the change," said Theodore Parker. Frances Power Cobbe affirmed: "Jesus is in the highest philosophical sense the world's Savior." The source of the historic greatness of Christianity is found in the experience of the individual believer. The elect souls of the race have found forgiveness through Christ's cross and moral renewal through the action of his spirit upon their lives. I do not think that thus far today we have done justice to the fact of sin. Men and women have come to Christ not to obtain immortality but to obtain salvation. This they believe they have found and this experience is at the center of the whole moral movement in Christianity. Does the moral achievement of Christianity rest upon a fact or upon a misinterpretation?

Second, there is the historic stability of the church's faith. There have been variant forms of faith in succeeding centuries that have departed from the orthodox conception, such as Ebitonism, Arianism, Socinianism, and Unitarianism, but they have not affected the great current of the church's faith. It may be noted that among those who have departed from the church's faith two tendencies appear: on the one hand there is a tendency to return to the historic faith, and on the other hand to descend to lower levels, accepting simply a humanitarian Christ and finally even denying his greatness and moral uniqueness. The stability of the church's faith is due to the fact that the human spirit, bringing all of its composite powers to bear upon all the facts involved, can come to no other conclusion than that Jesus is God's eternal Son. Is this historic faith of the church a complete misinterpretation or does the solemn voice of the ages point in the direction of a great fact?

Third, there is the spiritual experience of believers. People have felt that they have the actual contact with Christ as living Lord and Redeemer. This may be mysticism, of which we shall hear more later; but there is a valid factor in mysticism. I recall the words of Mr. R. H. Hutton, the brilliant Englishman who passed from Unitarianism to the orthodox faith: "To read

the history of the Christian church without the belief that Christ has been in vital and organic relation with it, seems to me to read it under the impression that a profound illusion can, for centuries, exercise more power for good than a dream. I cannot understand the history of the Christian church at all, if all the fervent trust which has been stirred by faith in the actual inspirations of a Nature at once eternal and human has been lavished on a dream." Christianity would speedily collapse if it were believed that Christ were in no more real contact with men than other departed souls.

Such, in brief, is the argument from history. Christianity does not simply rest back upon Jesus of Nazareth; it rests down on Christ as its living Lord. Does this history all rest upon an error and misinterpretation or does it rest upon a fact? The achievements, faith, and experience of two thousand years constitute a serious contribution to our discussion.

The second line of argument is the scriptural. We narrow our appeal to the New Testament. Christianity has its origin historically, not in the New Testament, but in the larger, broader life of primitive Christianity of which the New Testament is the great historic reflection. I do not appeal in this connection to the New Testament as an inspired authority, but as a fair expression of the faith of the early church. The tendency of criticism is to strengthen the faith of the church in the received authorship, for the most part, of the New Testament books, and to push their dates back to an earlier point. Thus McGiffert puts the conversion of St. Paul in the years 31 or 32 A.D., the writing of the Epistle of the Galatians to 46 A.D., and the writing of the Epistles to the Thessalonians in 48 A.D. The New Testament literature, therefore, may be taken as a faithful transcript of the life of the early church. There are some intimations of christological controversies in the early church, but they were of very minor importance and touched very small areas. The early church had serious controversies on other matters, but there was agreement in transcendental interpretation of the person of Christ. The New Testament writers do not express their faith in metaphysical terms but they place Christ in a position of aloofness from men and nearness to God that justify the historic faith of the church. Everywhere in the New Testament men look up to him

as unto God. In the Epistles to the Thessalonians, which are of a confessedly early date, you will find this attitude. The church "is in God and the Lord Jesus Christ." Christ and God are united in the benediction: "Grace to you and peace from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ," "The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all." Salvation consists in being eternally in his presence: I Thess. 4:17. Future retribution consists in being banished from his presence: II Thess. 1:9. The Epistle of James is supposed to be barren in its Christology, but in it you find Jesus referred to as "the Lord Jesus Christ" and as the "Lord of Glory." In it, the term "Lord" in some places is applied to Jesus, in some places to Jehovah; while in some places it is impossible to tell whether Jesus or Jehovah is the object of reference. Paul uniformly regards Christ from the transcendental point of view: he is the crucified, sinless Redeemer, the Risen One, the Reigning Lord, who shall come again as the Judge of men. In Rom. 9:5 Paul refers to him as the one "who is over all, God blessed forever." In I Cor. 8:6 and in Col. 1:15, 16, his cosmic and eternal significance are asserted. In II Cor. 8:9, and in Phil., chap. 2, his pre-existence is explicitly taught. Right here I may briefly remind you that faith in the pre-existence of Christ does not depend exclusively or chiefly upon the passages of Scripture in which that doctrine is expressly affirmed, but upon the transcendent character that is attributed to Christ and upon his post-existence influence in history. When St. Paul refers to him as God, when he associates his name with that of the Father, when he says that "in him all things consist," he is teaching his pre-existence in a most impressive way. The Epistles of Peter, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of Jude, the Book of Revelation, the Johannine writings, all agree in the transcendental interpretation of Christ. They do not use the language of any of the creeds, but their attitude toward Christ justifies those creeds. I am not now asserting the authority of the New Testament, but I am asserting that the apostles and friends of Christ and the earliest believers in him put him in the place of God. We have seen that faith in the supernatural Christ has been the historic faith of the church; that this faith originated historically in the attitude of the early church. Whence did the early church

derive its faith? Was it the outcome of a mythical process? Very few would suggest that today. Of illusion or misinterpretation? So we are told by some. The real Christ, so some assert, has never been known or understood, until his figure has been restored to us today by critical processes.

This leads us to the third argument, which is the testimony of Jesus to himself. It is generally agreed that our most immediate access to the mind of Christ is found in the Gospel of Mark and in the source known as Q that contains much that is common to Matthew and Luke. If we cannot find the mind of Christ in these sources then our task is hopeless, but we have sufficient reason for believing that certainly here we have the testimony of the Master himself. The self-assertion of our Lord as here found justifies the faith of the church and the faith of primitive Christianity. It is impossible to unfold all that is found in these sources concerning Christ's self-witness. At his baptism, if not before, he becomes conscious of his unique relation to God and to God's kingdom. The same convictions are deepened in his temptation. In the Sermon on the Mount he assumes the attitude of finality as a teacher of religion and the atmosphere of finality pervades all he says. He claims to be the judge of man, a claim of tremendous import, in which he takes to himself the prerogative of God himself. He asserts his power to forgive sins, another exclusive divine prerogative. He assumes that the eternal welfare of men depends upon their relations to himself. He imposes tests of discipleship such as only God can make. He is the Son of Man with human and at the same time transcendental powers. He is the Savior of men who gives his life a ransom for many, and in the Last Supper his Saviorhood is impressively announced. He is the unique Son of God. In Matt. 11:27, his incommunicable relationship as "the Son" to "the Father" is taught in a manner that naturally leads to the Johannine interpretation. In the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (Mark, chap. 12) and in the statement as to the date of the Parousia in Mark 11:32 the same unique relationship is implied. The mind of the Master as thus revealed does not justify necessarily any particular creed, but it does justify and involve the historic attitude of the church. To his direct testimony to himself we must add

the facts of his sinlessness and resurrection which show his uniqueness and give weight to his self-witness.

Limitations of time furnish only an imperfect outline of the argument that may be traced, but may briefly summarize my position. Jesus put himself in the place of God. The early church freely accorded him that place. So does the church of the ages. The church has had the support and the strength in its life and in its faith that come from his real presence. Accepting the divinity of Christ, the whole Christian movement has a natural and normal development. If we accept the humanitarian interpretation, we must suppose that either Christ or the first Christians practiced deception or were the subjects of illusions that invalidate their testimony and that the whole of Christian history rests not upon a transcendental fact but upon a supreme misinterpretation. To arrive at the humanitarian conclusion also involves the use of arbitrary processes that would make all history an uncertainty. I believe that we have a firm basis for our faith in Jesus Christ as one whose being is within the Godhead.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: Our next speaker is Rev. Jacob G. Walker, D.D., of the Mantua Baptist Church, Philadelphia.

REV J. G. WALKER, D.D.: "In what sense is Christ divine?" Well, in what sense is he not divine?

There are at least two notable occasions on record in the New Testament Scriptures when such questions engaged the attention of a "Baptist Congress," so to speak, of religious thinkers and teachers. The first Congress was held in the synagogue at Nazareth, when the wonderful *sayings* and yet more wonderful *doings* of Jesus prompted the inquiry, "Whence hath this man this wisdom and these mighty works?" (Matt. 13:54). The second Congress was held, presumably on foot, within the borders of Caesarea Philippi, and the discussion was opened by the Great Teacher himself, when he asked his disciples "Who do men say that I the Son of Man am?" (Matt. 16:13-16).

There have been many other conferences since those long-gone days, in which many and diverse opinions have been elicited on these very same questions. There were conferences in the first century, in which there were certain Jewish Christians, called

Ebionites, who discarded the miraculous stories that were told about Jesus by those who knew him best, but who yet chose to revere him as "an illustrious prophet superior in wisdom to all who had gone before him." And there were conferences in the second century by a class of thinkers styled Gnostics, who felt that the Ebionites did not do Christ justice, and who spoke of him as "an intermediary being holding chief place in the long line of angels that spanned the chasm between heaven and earth." And there were conferences in the third century among the neo-Platonists, who claimed that Jesus was but a "lovely man." And there were conferences in the fourth century when a distinguished Christian preacher in Alexandria named Arius ventured to discount the higher conception of Jesus as entertained by the early church, and to claim that, notwithstanding his exaltation and pre-incarnate existence, his subsequent incarnation was not an incarnation of Deity. And there were conferences in the sixteenth century when the Socinians exploited Jesus as one "who was born a man, but who by complete submission to God became at last a god himself, earning for himself the right to be master of the ages and the judge of our race." And so on, and so on, and so on.

And conferences are still being held in these twentieth-century times, when some of these old-time views find occasional indorsement, and when those who indorse them are occasionally referred to as "advanced thinkers." Strange, is it not? that *advanced* thinking must shape present-day conclusions by the jumbled thinking of bygone centuries!

The question in either case involves the essential investments of personality: not mere sentimental conceptions, as when men speak of the "divine" in art, or music, or poetry, or fashion, but the inborn possessions that determine personal being. If these investments are measured by the capacities and limitations of the natural man, we speak of the one who holds them in possession as a human personality. If they exist and operate in the realm of the supernatural, we do not hesitate to speak of them as the attributes of a divine personality. When Peter speaks of being made "partakers of the divine nature" he uses words that are descriptive, not of abstract, immaterial, impersonal essence

or quality, but of essence personified. “*θείας κοινωνὸν φύσεως*”: i.e., sharers of the constituent properties of deity (II Peter 1:4).

Nor do we hesitate to say that when Christ became “God manifest in the flesh,” he was a human being in so far as he made manifest the attributes of our common humanity, but that he was divine in those identities that were beyond the compass of human attributes and functions. He was divine, not because he was human, but because he was more than human.

Let me briefly note a few of these superhuman and supernatural identities, giving heed only to what the Bible has to say concerning them. “These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God” (John 20:31). I have certainly no other knowledge upon which to base my conclusions, but the knowledge of the Word of God, and I have not as much of that perhaps as I ought to have. But even a limited knowledge of what is here told us concerning Christ should serve to make clear several important conclusions.

1. To begin with let us set before ourselves the fact of his pre-existence.

This certainly cannot be predicated of any being possessed only of earthly and human limitation. But Christ did not hesitate to affirm it concerning himself: “I came down from heaven” (John 6:38); “Before Abraham was, I am” (John 8:58); “Glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was” (John 17:5).

Nor do the inspired writers hesitate to assert and to emphasize the fact of Christ’s pre-existent personality: “He that is of the earth is earthly and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven is above all” (John 3:31); “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; the same was in the beginning with God” (1:1, 2).

2. And added to this fact of Christ’s pre-existence is the fact of his sinlessness.

In some way or other all other characters mentioned in Scripture story confess themselves to be sinners. When Isaiah beheld the King, the Lord of Hosts, whose glory filled the temple, he

said of himself, "Woe is me, for I am undone: because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips" (6:5). If we who are human say "we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (I John 1:8). But Jesus dared to say to the religious leaders of his day, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" (John 8:46). When he taught his disciples a form of prayer he put into the petition the words, "Forgive us our sins"; but he never offered that prayer for himself. Jesus is the only person in history who was able to say, "I do always those things that please him" (John 8:29). His supernatural birth was the starting-point of an innocent earthly life, and that innocence continued up to and beyond the crucial day when Pilate was compelled to say, "I find no fault in him," and up to and beyond the day when even Judas threw down his thirty pieces of silver before the chief priests and elders, saying "I have betrayed the innocent blood" (Matt. 27:4).

3. And furthermore: no human personality is invested with the attribute of creative power. He may be able through human wisdom or skill to produce something out of something, but it is beyond his power to produce something out of nothing. But what says the Book? "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God: the same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him: and without him was not anything made that was made" (John 1:1-3). "For by him were all things created that are in heaven or that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him and for him. . . . That in all things he might have the pre-eminence" (Col. 1:16, 18).

And this being so, it is easy to account for his miracles. It was never possible for a man to say to a loathsome leper, "I will: be thou clean"; but Jesus said it, and the leper was cleansed. It was never possible for a man to say to storm-tossed billows, "Peace, be still"; but Jesus said it, and "there was a great calm." It was not possible for a man to stand at the tomb at Bethany and say, "Lazarus, come forth"; but Jesus said it and he that was dead came forth. Or if some incurable cripple at the temple

gate should rise up and walk at the bidding of another human being, it could be because the bidding was accompanied by the words, "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth."

And this being so, it is also easy to account for the resurrection of a dead and buried Christ. No human being could at his own pleasure descend into the grave, and at his own pleasure come up out of it; but Jesus said, "I have power to lay down my life, and have power to take it again."

4. Moreover, the quality of his teaching is an attestation of his divinity: "His word was with power" (Luke 4:32); "Never man spake like this man" (John 7:46); "He taught as one having authority, and not as the scribes" (Matt. 7:29).

5. But the paramount evidence of Christ's divinity lies in the place he occupies in the scheme of human redemption. Nowhere is man so helpless as in attempting to satisfy the demands of a transgressed law, or to overthrow his inborn tendencies toward transgression. But, "What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (Rom. 8:3, 4). And when a redeemed man is yet compelled to find a law in his members, "warring against the law of the spirit," he can also add this testimony, "Nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me" (Gal. 2:20).

And what is true concerning the growth of Christ's regnant power in a single sin-enslaved life is true also concerning the growth of his kingdom in a sin-enslaved world. The church is an aggregation of individuals, and it grows, not by natural but by supernatural forces. Christian history is but a continued story of what Jesus began to do and to teach in the earliest days of apostolic service. "History is his story."

Scan the story closely. Here is a Jewish peasant, born of a

race whose national identity has been lost in the dominations of other nationalities. He never wrote a sentence that has been preserved. He formulated no systems of philosophy. He established no schools of learning. He built no temples. He marshaled no armies. He died in early manhood, cast off by his own race, and forsaken even by his own followers. And yet, twenty centuries after he hung upon his cross there are millions of people in every land and clime, who never saw Christ's bodily form, who love him because he first loved them, and who in the power and demonstration of that love "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." Today there are unnumbered multitudes who can sing with the spirit and the understanding:

Thou, O Christ, art all I want,
More than all in thee I find.

Of course there are other multitudes who, while they may not ignore the fact of Christ's personality, are yet seemingly content to relegate that personality to the realm of speculative analysis. To such people Christ is simply an unsolved problem, an unexplained enigma, an intellectual puzzle. They speak of him perhaps as the best among the good, and the greatest among the great. They classify him as the sublimest specimen of moral virtue, and the most heroic of ancient or modern martyrs. But, if Christ be nothing more than an aggregate of all these opinions, he fails to establish his own claims to supremacy, and remains as the most unexplainable problem in human history.

And not only so. If Christ be nothing more than an aggregation of human excellences, he not only fails to establish his own claims but he fails also to assure me of any adequate supply for the necessities of my own soul.

The people of Nazareth failed to dissociate him from his father and mother and brothers and sisters. They looked upon *him* as one of *them*—unlike them indeed in many ways, but so linked to them as to become a human mystery instead of a divine revelation. But the answer given to their question, and to ours, lies in the fact that he was "made flesh and dwelt among us," and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of *grace* and *truth*.

It would be easier for a race of cannibals or Hottentots to produce a Milton, or a Bacon, or a Shakespeare, than for a race of sinful creatures to produce a spotless and an all-sufficient Christ. If the stable-born and manger-cradled babe of Bethlehem is only the son of Mary, only the carpenter of Nazareth, only a questioner in the temple, and an expositor in the synagogue, then he is a being unpossessed of all the essential fulness of God, and I am a being unpossessed of the essential assurance of personal salvation, "having no hope," and "without God."

There is reason to fear that much of the so-called religious literature of these modern times is sadly deficient in the estimates they furnish us concerning the deity of Christ. Not that men seek to obliterate the fact of Christ, but that they are tempted to dilute his personality. Not that they refuse to see in him more than man, but that they are prone to consider him less than God. Not that he did not die on the cross, but that his death was simply the price paid for his views and a sublime testimony to the strength of his convictions.

But let not the testimony of Scripture be set aside for merely human opinions. The Christ of the Bible is not a problem, but a Revelation; not simply a Messenger, but a Message; not an Ethic, but an Evangel; not a Social Reformer, but a Sacrificial Substitute. He came, not to minimize divine law, but to magnify it. He came not to explain away transgressions, but to blot out the handwriting against them, by nailing it to his cross. And this "shedding of blood" was not the sacrifice of the divine nature, but rather the divine nature, saturated with undying love, sacrificing its human and fleshly enfoldings, "as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." It was "God sending his own son into the world, and for sin, condemned sin *in the flesh*."

If God was not in the Nazarene Teacher, reconciling the world unto himself, then he was not in Christ on the cross. If the one on the cross was not the Christ of God, then the work of reconciliation is still an unfinished work. Then we are yet in our sins; and if we tamper with God's Christ, by according him capacities less than God gives him, we are tampering with our own

salvation, and formulating a false belief that will ultimate in eternal doom.

What think ye of Christ is the test
 To try both our state and our scheme;
 We cannot be right in the rest
 Unless we think rightly of Him.

REV. W. QUAY ROSSELLE, PH.D., D.D., of Philadelphia:
Mr. Chairman: I sent up my card in order to start something, that is, to start a voluntary discussion, and not primarily because I had very much to add myself.

I was exceedingly interested in the paper which was read to us by Professor Starratt. I believe that his statement that this question must not be approached from the metaphysical starting-point, but along the avenue of religious experience, to be the utterance of wisdom concerning the whole matter. I am afraid that the other two brethren violated that principle in their very earnest and interesting discussions. It would be difficult for me to attempt to answer the question, In what sense is Christ divine? In my own thought of him I might almost as well ask, In what sense is the sun luminous? In what sense are the flowers fragrant? In what sense is fire hot? In what sense is water wet? Jesus said, "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me." We act as if he said, Take up the methods of philosophy and learn of me. Betake yourselves to the data of ancient metaphysics and learn of me. I believe that we learn of him in the experience of the passion which was in him; in the experience of the ideals which conquered his life, and the loyalty to those ideals which he displayed. In the sharing with him of the purposes to which he held unswervingly we shall learn in what sense he was divine and in no other way.

Recently four gentlemen spoke from my pulpit in Philadelphia. Three of them were men who had received college educations. Three of them had been reared in homes of refinement and Christian faith. Four of them had become drunkards and for years had traveled to the deepest depths of a drunkard's woe. All of them had been redeemed by coming in contact with the divine Christ,

and as they stood there and related in simple language their own experience, it seemed to me they were making known to the congregation that listened to them in what sense Christ was divine, as all the metaphysical discussions of the matter are wholly impotent to do.

They were able to reveal the divinity of Christ as all the discussions of the German philosophers never could accomplish. Take the Water Street Mission in New York City. Men and women come in there broken, dejected, despairing, lost—back of them shattered hopes, wrecked manhood, dissipated reputations, before them yawning the very mouth of hell. There men and women who have been lifted from conditions like theirs go to them and say there is hope in the divine Christ. If these men begin to inquire in what sense is Christ divine, these workers have only one answer. They take them by the hand and in importunate way and language they plead with them to come forward and, kneeling at the mourners' bench, seek actual contact with this divine life which is its own revelation of divinity.

The yoke is the teacher. The cross is the teacher. The passion of Christ is the teacher. The divine ideals are the instructors, and only as we share these things which were in this man, who spake as never man spake, shall we be able to answer, in my judgment, to our own satisfaction, "In what sense was Christ divine?" (*Applause.*)

REV. ROBERT C. HULL, Summit, N.J.: *Mr. President:* I find myself in hearty agreement with what has just been said in regard to the fact that no one who seeks salvation from Jesus Christ needs fully to understand his personality. If we are to follow after Jesus it is not necessary that we comprehend him, only that we deny ourselves, take up our cross, and follow him. I have in mind a sermon in which I ventured to suggest that the cross ought to be a standard around which the severed hosts of the various Christian churches might rally. At the cross of Christ we could stand even with the Jesuit and sing, "Thou, O my Jesus, thou didst me upon the cross embrace." At the cross with the Episcopalian we might sing, "Onward Christian Soldiers, marching as to war, with the cross of Jesus going on before." At the cross of Christ we might stand with our Unitarian brethren

and sing, "In the cross of Christ I glory." After the sermon, some kind friends came to me and said, "We could stand at the cross with the Episcopalians, or even with the Catholics, but how could we sing with the Unitarians, 'In the Cross of Christ I Glory'?" I replied, "You are willing to sing that hymn, are you not?" "Yes, but we cannot sing it with the Unitarians." I said, "Why not? Perhaps you do not know that it was written by a Unitarian." They replied, "How could a Unitarian write such a hymn?" But the fact remains that a Unitarian did write it, and it is simply proof of the fact that a comprehension of the personality of Jesus Christ as you and I understand him is not necessary to loyalty to his leadership nor to the taking up of his cross and following him.

While heartily granting and maintaining this position, however, I cannot agree with the implication that my religious thinking and my philosophical thinking are to be kept in two watertight compartments with no communication between. He that comes to God must believe that he is, and my religious answer, the answer of loyalty and service, will largely depend on the philosophical answer to the question now before us. In fact, our topic this afternoon asks a question that is not a religious question to all. The religious question about Jesus is that asked by Pilate, "What then must I *do* with Jesus who is called Christ?" To ask, "In what sense is Christ divine?" is to ask a question which is purely philosophical and theological, not religious.

It seems to me that toward this philosophical answer the first paper made a distinct contribution when the writer made the following statement: "Jesus showed in himself that there is no gulf between God and man. God is more like man than we had thought and man has unsuspected possibilities of becoming like God." It is unfortunate that the writer did not consistently take this position in the rest of his paper. Despite his recognition, in the sentence quoted, of the essential unity of the human and the divine, the writer in the earlier part of his paper invited us, on the one hand, to consider the evidence that Jesus was human, and on the other hand he attempted to show us by other evidence that Jesus was also divine. But if the human and the divine are not fundamentally distinct, we do not need one set of proofs to

establish Christ's humanity and another set to establish his divinity. His humanity is his divinity. Man is made in the image of God.

Though He is so bright and we so dim,
We are made in His image to witness Him.

Man is God's child. There is no more central truth in the teaching of Jesus, no more characteristic doctrine than that which is implied in his constant use of that name for God which formed the heart of his vocabulary from the time when the fresh young lips of the boy struck, in his first recorded utterance, the keynote of his life by the question, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" until the day when the dry parched lips of the man in his dying utterance whispered, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." The word "Father" is Christ's distinctive term for God and it implies, if it implies anything at all, that man is like God.

It has been said this afternoon that Jesus never existed as a mere man. Rather would I say that Jesus was not "mere man" but, to use the German expression, he is "mehr Mann." Jesus was more of a man than you or I ever have succeeded in being, and just because Jesus is the realization of the ideal of humanity, because he is the fulfilment of the possibilities of manhood, it is *in* this fact, rather than despite it, that he is also the supreme manifestation of God. The perfect son of man must be by the very completeness of his humanity the perfect son of God. It is because Jesus is completely man that we can see in him "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Because of his perfect humanity we can well believe, as we look upon him, for he that hath seen Jesus hath seen the Father, for he and the Father are one. His character as a man was such that all our hearts echo the words which have been quoted from the ninth chapter of Romans and we confess with joy that, looking upon Jesus Christ, we see in him the one "who is over all, God-blessed forever."

In Jesus we have supremely manifested the character of God and when we speak of God or of man, it is in character that we are chiefly interested. Man has no soul. He has a body, but he is a soul. The body is man's possession, the soul, the character, is man's self, God's self. It is in the realm of character that man

is chiefly distinguished from the brute. Selfishness and all sin man shares in common with the lower creatures; righteousness and character he shares with the infinite Father of his spirit. Because Jesus is the only one to achieve perfect character therefore it is that he is the only begotten son of the Father. Because he is declared to be the firstborn among many brethren we have hope that we too shall eventually fulfil the duty Christ himself laid upon us to be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect. It is only by the recognition of this fact that Christ's unique relation to God is in the realm of ethical character that we can harmonize the two statements of Scripture just quoted, which on the face of them are contradictory, that Jesus is the only begotten, and that he is the first born among them.

Heartily do we indorse the position taken by the third speaker, that Jesus was unique. With the Jews of old we confess that "never man spake like this man." He alone of all those of whom the race has knowledge was tempted in all points like as we are yet without sin. His perfect character is our ideal. If Jesus were only perfect man his ideal character would be our despair, but because it is of the essence of his gospel that his human life of vicarious sacrifice is the true expression of the character of God, he becomes not our despair but our hope; his self-forgetting love as the index to the character of God enables us to believe that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is also our God and our Father, and that he longs to do for us what he did for Jesus and bring many sons into the glory of his fellowship. The unselfish love of Christ for the world, supremely revealed on Calvary's cross, we believe to be but the temporal expression of that eternal love which the infinite Father is continually pouring out for all his children that he may bring them all, in the fulness of the time, to the measure of the stature of Jesus Christ, our divine Lord and Savior.

Prayer and Benediction by Rev. Prof. E. B. Pollard, D.D.,
Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.

Adjourned

FIRST DAY

Evening Session

8 P.M.

PRESIDENT MERRILL opened the evening session and called on Rev. Henry Bawden of Perth Amboy, N.J., to offer prayer.

The subject for discussion this evening is, "What are the Assured Results of Biblical Criticism?" and we will hear from the first writer, Rev. Philip L. Jones, D.D., of Philadelphia.

REV. PHILIP L. JONES, D.D., of Philadelphia, then read the following paper:

WHAT ARE THE ASSURED RESULTS OF BIBLICAL
CRITICISM?

In speaking on the theme assigned to me I desire first of all to disclaim speaking as an expert. For those who know me the disclaimer is not needed; for those who do not it may be in place. Why then speak at all? someone may ask, and it is a question I have propounded to myself more than once since I accepted my appointment. The answer I have made to myself, and now make to you is that, it may not be without profit to see how this great and perplexing subject of biblical criticism looks to an average man who seeks somewhat to keep in touch with current questions and to determine whither they trend. The observation of the private in the ranks may sometimes be of import, even as is that of the general at the head of the division. It is as a private in the ranks of biblical students that I speak.

The framer or framers of our topic have delimited the area of our discussion. They have assigned to me and to my associate, Dr. Hahn, who will make amends for my deficiencies as an expert, as a field biblical criticism. I do not know the purpose of the designation. It may be that it was felt that biblical is a better adjective than "higher," as I think it is, and that all criticism of the sacred writings, whether of text or of setting, is biblical, and the one as much so as the other. At any rate the term opens the door to text as to historic circumstance if we wish to enter it.

By the term "assured" our area of discussion is still more definitely outlined. It was felt perhaps that such a fence was needed to keep our pens or typewriters from straying too far afield and from becoming lost in a territory so vast, and upon portions of which the mists settle down so perplexingly. We may not then cloak speculation with certainty. Hypothesis is not to masquerade as evidence, nor are claims to receive the deference we pay to proof. What we want, if we can find it, is that which is established.

But is there anything in this realm technically known as biblical criticism to which the term "assured" can truthfully be applied? The term itself is debatable. What one man will regard as assured another may wholly disclaim or label as doubtful. What I might consider assured, even in the farthest limit of it, another much more advanced may look at as mere kindergarten material reduced to the status of an axiom that needs only to be stated. But is there anything in this realm assured, in the sense that the consensus of intelligent opinion as expressed in sermon or conversation or journalistic articles or books confirms? Perhaps there is nothing assured as in chemistry the formula H_2O is assured, or as in geometry that the square of the hypotenuse of a right-angled triangle is equal to the sum of the other two squares; but that there are results in biblical criticism assured as completely as any literary or critical questions can be is I believe demonstrable. It shall be our task to try and point some of these out. In the time assigned it is all we can attempt to do.

1. This result is assured: that biblical criticism has made a place for itself in the students' apparatus. It is recognized as one of the tools with which we work. This is true whether we have to do with the text or the historical setting. There was a time not so very long ago when it was looked at askance. It was so even in Germany where it is supposed to have had its home. Men might lose their positions as instructors by declaring the existence of successive prescriptive strata in the Levitical legislation or by the acceptance of the fact of the two Isaiahs. It is hardly so now. Men say, even if they disagree with the critic, we will wait and see. These men may be right. At any rate we will not throw stones at them. They claim to be servants of

the truth. We will take them at their word. In any event in the fastness of its defenses the truth is secure. Of course all do not take this attitude. Some still deal in derogatory adjectives and utter severe denunciations. Criticism to these is a sort of Trojan wooden horse pretending to be a votive offering and being really full of a hostility that will only open the gates to the foe. They even look with unfriendly eyes upon a congress like this because it will give place on its platform to those who will express thought akin to that which I am endeavoring to utter. But this is not the sense of most. They are willing to accord to sincere critics what has been won only after a hard fight, viz., "full rights of citizenship in the historic Christian churches." This result may seem a minor one, but it really is of incalculable moment that scholars may exercise liberty without losing caste and stand in the presence of an attitude willing to abide by the issue when proven, of whatever sort it may be.

2. This result in the second place is assured: that there is a different attitude toward the Bible as a whole on the part of the Christian church. We know what that attitude was within the period limited by the memories of men far younger than I; what it still is in the thought of many who have not been led into what without reflection we may call a clearer light. That attitude was to regard the whole Bible as we have it as equally inspired, equally the word of God, and so of equal authority to us. Dr. W. N. Clark says in his *Sixty Years with the Bible* (pp. 71, 72): "The Bible was regarded as equally inspired throughout, and inspiration meant nothing less than full divine authority. . . . One was no more at liberty to doubt its statements of fact or to reject its judgments upon truth than to disobey it in conduct." There are but few of us who did not meet this attitude in the classroom of our theological course. Doctrinal statements were constantly buttressed by texts indiscriminatingly selected, and whether from Ecclesiastes or Ephesians mattered not. Each was equally God's word and came sealed with an equal authority.

Now this attitude has changed. Whether we acknowledge it or not it has changed, and the change has been wrought by biblical criticism. We no longer group our proof texts without regard

to source and we do not put Ecclesiastes on a parity with Ephesians. To quote Dr. Clark again, "We are beginning to know . . . how much it means that the Bible is a genuinely historical book, having its rise and habitat in the human world, recording vital dealings between God and men, and to be understood in the light of its historical origins, intentions, and development" (*Sixty Years with the Bible*, p. 68). In other words, we have come to regard the Bible as literature. It is more than that, but it is that. As literature, imbedded in human life and coming to us in large measure by human hands, it accords with the same law of growth, and submits itself to the same criteria in getting at its message. That message we know now comes to us through the same media and these cannot help shaping the final judgment and determining its final authority. It comes to us, e.g., through translation and translation is impossible that does not influence the sense. No English sentence can be framed that shall exactly reflect its Hebrew or Greek equivalent. It comes to us, too, this message does, through exegesis, and we all know into what a forest of entanglements this is capable of bringing us. It comes to us likewise, this message of the world does, through the medium of textual criticism, and this as arrayed against the old view of absolute inerrancy is revolutionary. The substitution of one Greek word for another, the change of a Hebrew vowel point or consonant, nay even the transference of a comma will destroy that ideal inerrancy. How many of those there are, such a work as Gregory's *New Testament Canon*, or any recent revision of the Old Testament will tell us. Nay, for us who are common folk, take the standard revision of either Old or New and compare it with the common version and we see at once without being scholars what has taken place. The change of attitude makes itself manifest. The Bible takes its place as literature in the arena of human productions. It is supreme among them, but it is of them. Our reverence for it is no less, but its relation to us is more natural. It is "no longer an unrelieved level of equal authority," but "a book of real life, the life of God in man and of man with God."

3. Another assured result of biblical criticism is the almost universal acceptance of the fact of *composite authorship* in many

parts of the Bible. Without question this result is directly due to biblical criticism. From the time the thought had its birth in the prolific mind of the physician Astruc down to the latest advocate of the dual authorship of Daniel this ideal has been elaborated with many modifications and with marked differences until it has established itself as a fact of modern scholarship.

Now this has nothing to do with the historicity of the materials of such authorship nor with the area of compositeness. Whether there are four principal factors in the production of the Hexateuch or eight; whether these represent individuals or schools; whether there are two Isaiahs as is now generally believed or three as some assert; whether seventeen different strata enter into the composition of Jeremiah as a recent writer declares, or only those of Jeremiah and Baruch, this assertion of the fact of composite authorship does not care. In regard to these particulars there are many opinions, in respect to this fact there is among scholars almost entire agreement. For example, Professor A. H. Sayce, who is one of the most cautious of our leading biblical students, says:

One of the most assured results of the literary analysis of the Old Testament records has been the existence of documents of different age and authorship in the Pentateuch. Opinions may differ widely as to the authorship of certain passages and the dates to which the several documents are to be assigned, but about the general fact of the composite character of the Pentateuch competent critics of all schools are now agreed. The literary foundation upon which the history and religion of Israel rested is in its present form, a composite work (*The Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, p. 31).

In a commentary issued by the American Baptist Publication Society this is written by one of our most conservative scholars:

The more conservative view holds to the Mosaic origin of the legislation of the Pentateuch and its Mosaic authorship in the broad sense that Moses was generally responsible for it. It does not deny but asserts, in view of the fact that writing was in common use for centuries before Moses, that he used documents coming down from the past in the composition of Genesis. He may also have employed others to assist him. The most of those who hold this view also concede that notes and minor portions by later hands may have found a place in our present text (Professor C. Goodspeed, Introduction to *American Commentary on Old Testament*, p. xi).

In an encyclopedia issued in 1906 by Thomas Nelson & Sons, these words are found. "The existence of these four principal strata in the Hexateuch [i.e., J, E, D, P] may be regarded as established." Moreover the writer goes on to say these "represent schools rather than individuals" (Vol. X, art. "Hexateuch"). In the *Standard Bible Dictionary* published by Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls in 1909 is this distinct and definite statement:

It is, from what has been said, evident that Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and Joshua are composite, based upon older and originally independent accounts. Their unity is only apparent, due to editorial adjustment, and not to single authorship (art. "Hexateuch," p. 339).

Professor Charles Foster Kent says, speaking of God's connection with the authors of the Bible:

He did not, however, dictate to them the form of their writings nor vouch for their verbal inerrancy. In time, out of these writings were gradually collected and combined the most significant passages and books and to these was finally attributed the authority that they now rightfully enjoy (*Origin and Value of the Old Testament*, p. 247).

Dr. James Orr in summing up his reasoning as to the substantial unity of the pentateuchal writings uses these words:

To what conclusions have we now been led? For one thing, it is first to be said, *not* to the conclusion that Moses himself wrote the Pentateuch in the precise form or extent in which we now possess it; for the work we think shows very evident signs of different pens and styles, of editorial redaction, of stages of compilation (*The Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 369).

Other testimonies might be cited but these are sufficient to establish our point.

And let this be said: We have, or at least some of us have, so adjusted ourselves to this thought, that the worthfulness of the divine book has not suffered in the least. If Moses did not write the song attributed to him in Deuteronomy, there remains the same infinite comfort in the assurance that "underneath are the everlasting arms." Though it should chance to be proven, as I do not think it will, that David did not write the 23rd psalm, the peace of the green pastures and the music of the still waters and the solace of the staff amid the shadows of the valley remain unimpaired. One Isaiah or two and the sublimity of the 40th

chapter and the pathos of the 53rd and the far-off vistas of the prophet's wondrous visions remain untouched.

4. Biblical criticism thus, as another result, has taken us back to the historic sources of the Scriptures. It would not be accurate to say that it originated the method; it is accurate to say that it has emphasized the method and made it common. It used to be the method of the few; it is now the method of the many. We have learned that the date of authorship, and circumstance are the best exegetes of the meaning of the passage in hand. We no longer therefore cite a text as proof of Bible doctrine without regard to its setting. We no longer regard the prophets as primarily having a far-off vision. We know them as men of their own times. Their messages were modern when they were delivered. They were forthtellers more than foretellers. This may not diminish their vista but it increases their definiteness. We no longer either take poetry and interpret it as prose. When, e.g., in the 139th psalm we read: "Do I not hate them O Lord that hate thee? . . . I hate them with a perfect hatred. I count them mine enemies" (139:21, 22), we know the author is indulging in a poetic outburst and not propounding a moral precept. We are learning to take the Bible more as it really is and not quite so much as tradition has declared it to be. There has been immense gain in this, and the Bible has come closer to human life because of it.

5. As a result of this recognition of compositeness and historic setting we have one of the most beneficent results of biblical criticism: a solvent of scriptural moral difficulties. We have all had trouble with these. It never quite satisfied us to be told as to the indiscriminate slaughter of the Canaanites that it was the judicial execution of a sentence pronounced because of their wickedness. That scene in the valley of Achor when not only Achan suffers for purloining the wedge of gold but all that were his has always troubled us and contravened our sense of justice. Our humanity has always shuddered as we have read these words describing David's treatment of the captured Rabbah of the children of Ammon: "And he brought forth the people that were therein, and put them under saws and under harrows of iron, and under axes of iron, and made them pass through the brick-

kiln: and thus he did unto all the cities of the children of Ammon" (II Sam. 12:31). We have halted and hesitated at the story of Elijah bringing fire from heaven to consume two companies of soldiers sent for his arrest, as we have at that fierce outburst of the 137th psalm: "Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones." These things do not perplex us as once they did. We have ceased so to identify the Old Testament with God as to make him responsible for them. We feel that he could not be so divergent from the New Testament representation of him as this would make him. We know that the current of revelation has passed through the channel of human agency and thereby has gathered the deposit of the ages and passions that have mingled therewith. We have therefore ceased to be troubled by and to endeavor to justify these moral enigmas, and vastly to the advantage of our religion have learned to accept them as the natural record of a book much more natural in its origin and structure than we have been accustomed to think.

6. In just a word I want to speak of another assured result of biblical criticism—that of the fact of a *progressive revelation* in the Word. Others in time past have described it more or less clearly, but modern criticism has established it. Scripture no longer lies upon a dead level. There is marked difference between Esther and Ephesians though both are found between the same lids. The law that has obtained in unfoldment of truth elsewhere has obtained here. As in moral observances and humane relationships and all the amenities of civilized life, so here in the pathway of divine revelation. First the dawn and then the day. The blade everywhere precedes the full ear of corn. First the external law and then the inward principle that is regnant in the soul. Our divine Lord recognized this spiritual progression, and thus we have outlined by him the pathway of a perfect spiritual experience. Ye have heard it said by them of old time, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, but *I say* unto you resist not evil. Ye have heard it said, Ye shall not commit—but I say unto you, ye shall not think.

I know that some draw back from this principle as applied to Holy Scripture, fearing whither it may lead. But shall anything

in the evolution of truth or faith surpass these we have today in Jesus Christ? It does not seem likely. So far we know no light so bright, so beneficent as that of the sun whose rays beam down upon us from above. We will bask in its benignness nothing fearing that aught shall ever displace it.

It comes to us then with an encouraging emphasis that all this change in attitude and method in relation to the Bible of which I have spoken has been wrought out with no dethronement of it as of supreme authority and no diminution of its spiritual power and influence in the whole area of our lives.

In his *Founders of Old Testament Criticism* Dr. T. K. Cheyne says, and he is entitled to full faith in his veracity:

If it should be made decidedly the more probable view that St. John did *not* originate the Fourth Gospel as it now stands, I am sure . . . that all truly religious students would believe with heart and with head as strongly as ever in the incomparable nature and the divine mediatorship of Jesus Christ (p. 258).

If with the transfer of the authorship of John to another there would still be kept the revelation of the Christ intact, surely, e.g., the granting of Isaiah from chap. 40 to the end of the second of that name can detract from it no whit. Dr. W. N. Clark at the close of his *Sixty Years with the Bible* says (p. 253):

By this time in the history of the world the quality of the Bible as the book of divine religion is so established that we may think of it with serene confidence. It is certain that the Bible gives us knowledge of Jesus, and that Jesus gives us knowledge of God, and that God as Jesus reveals him as the true light of life. Our sacred book is thus our guide to Jesus, to God, and to life divine.

And how are the practical lives of those who have breathed the biblical atmosphere as we have indicated it? We all know Henry Drummond as one of this school and of his zeal and consecration and success, and how superbly and trustfully he met suffering when it came. And what of the men who followed him? His biographer, George Adam Smith, says of them: "In every British colony, in India, in China, in Japan, converts or disciples of this movement who gratefully trace to it the beginnings of their moral power are laboring steadfastly and often brilliantly in every profession of life." In editing a history of our pioneer

work on the Pacific Coast I was interested to notice that a young man who came from the one of our educational institutions supposed to be permeated above all others by this critical thought surpassed all his associates in zeal and ministerial success. Thirty-five miles of travel from his school on Friday night and back by Monday morning, preaching meanwhile at half a dozen stations the glad tidings, was a common task for him to perform.

No, neither the critical method nor the critical result need destroy faith. Grip the eternal verities of revelation and with the abandonment of traditional positions and the espousal of scientific procedure the Bible stands still secure, the unfoldment of the divine will and the guide to the divine life.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: The second writer will be Rev. B. D. Hahn, D.D., of Springfield, Mass.

REV. DR. B. D. HAHN, of Springfield, Mass., then read as follows:

ASSURED RESULTS OF HIGHER CRITICISM

Under the caption, "assured results," it is in order to move the previous question, Is our apparatus sufficient for such a product? We may examine the machine as well as the output. The results are not like wood, iron, steel, or silver, which are capable of other and immediate tests by recourse to chemistry or tension and torsion machines. Critical conclusions are still dependent upon our confidence in our methods of inquiry to create assurance. When the material in question, in this instance a body of literature, is set aside as direct evidence, arguments pro or con must depend upon general principles and alien instances for their validity. What the prospect of assured results may be under these conditions of debate is ours to determine. Is criticism—higher criticism—entitled to the name of science? Higher criticism—and by that term is meant reconstructive criticism of the Bible—is a self-sufficient and scientific method if a revolving hypothesis, conjectural historical frame, literary divination, and a singular psychology can vindicate its principles.

I. THE REVOLVING HYPOTHESIS

The days of bushwhacking skepticism are over. The potting of discrepancies and the speculative exploitation of items of distaste is a crude and indecisive mode of warfare. After all the particular objections to revelation are registered, there remain certain irreducible facts which in their turn demand of the skeptic a rational account or he cannot claim that his case is complete. The specter of an actual nationality, the Jews, with a place in the geography of the past, in Palestine, must be laid with an adequate account of their history, or the battles of the campaign must be fought continually.

When Bopp, Grimm, Humboldt, Mueller, and Whitney expounded the science of language we found ourselves in a new world-atmosphere. Stories, ideas, customs, numerals, and games were traced across the world and the ages to their origins in India. What word-roots indicated was verified by this western drift of myths, fables, arts, and practices. By comparative philology we learned the secret of mythology, an unconscious pun, a trip of the lip, which raised as by incantation vast, radiant forms which marched along the horizon of time. Indra was the sky-god and Varuna the upheaved heavens, and Ushas the dawn, with her two horses, the Aswins. Zeus was Dyaus and Jupiter was Dyaus-pitar, heaven-father. With Indian precision comparative religion followed upon comparative language step by step in the new trail. All mythologies from Benares to Mexico, from world's end to world's end were resolved as solar myths. But the Christian faith and the Hebrew records only heard the storm moaning about the battlements.

Our natural sciences then took all matters of life and thought in hand and classified all the beliefs and worship of mankind in an ascending series from fetishism to monotheism and then asked, What next? This classification was taken as the program of progress from the nature-worship of aboriginal tribes to the personal first cause of the Christian church. Dr. Wellhausen as the representative of the new doctrine arose and explained that the Hebrews, an amalgam of Canaanite tribes, were the Huns of western Asia, who swept down upon the seacoast out of the desert and drove their wedge of permanent conquest into the

midst of the cultivated nations, and split civilization asunder. They were animistic, nature worshipers. They honored wells and fountains and trees and stones, all striking natural objects, and carried about with them a meteorite in a box or ark. In their proud stupidity here was a people who passed from animism to monotheism according to the steps of a theoretical reconstruction. They were the embryo which rehearsed the progress of humanity. They had been barbarous animists, then peasants with agricultural deities, then villagers with formative ritual, and finally, by political concentration, by the founding of Jerusalem and its central sanctuary, a nation and monotheists. At the time of the Exile the people and their institutions undergo a metamorphosis. Then it is that the whole tuneful choir of the Isaiahs and Jeremiahs and the psalmists burst into song and prophecy. Then we have the utopian priests, and the pragmatic and minimistic scribes and the burning, fanatical seers of apocalypses and particularist doctors of talmudic learning—a most amazing versatility and literary activity of a backward people in the depths of misfortune and poverty.

The next phase of the hypothesis is pan-Babylonianism. It is but a further development of the original proposal of the school of Dr. Wellhausen. Its culmination was the celebrated Babel and Bible controversy. About everything is Babylonian. The Jews might be a Babylonian tribe. With all Asia they are under the sway of that culture. But the Pentateuch has its Amraphel and his laws and the Hebrew literature has back of it the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, and the Book of Esther the recovered palace of Susa. Hebrew civilization and letters and laws and narratives will not wait for the Exile.

In its present shape the revolving hypothesis is more impressive. The astral hypothesis is in the ascendant. It stands in the house of Jupiter. We would name it the astrological hypothesis. Astrology is the consummate ancient wisdom of the East. As a scheme of interpretation it is a great advance upon the solar theory of the days of philology. It is persistent. Pennsylvania farmers still plant potatoes and all root crops in the dark of the moon and all stem crops in the light of the moon. It is not well to shingle a building in the light of the moon because

the shingles will turn up. In Babylon the temple tower is the axis of the world and of religion. It is a model of the cosmos. Its angles are set toward the four quarters. There are two heavens and earths—this immediate heaven and earth of our experience and the universal heaven and earth. The lower world is bounded by the heaven of the zodiac. This lower world rises into the higher at the twin-peaked mountain in the north, into the heaven of Anu, into which the gods creep when the flood threatens the ordinary heaven of our experience. The seven stages of the temple tower are devised after the pattern of the universe. And all affairs of empires or of men are reflections of the sway and will of the heavens. These events are interpreted to the wise by the courses of the planets and their place with reference to the zodiac. All mythology and all their science and all their narratives are framed and arranged according to the supernal principles revealed through the divination of the astrologers. In Mexico as well as Babylon men are born, fulfil their careers, and die under the sway of the stars. Hence the horoscope. Land is surveyed by the calendar and wars are determined by auguries from the moon and stars. Every organ of men and animals has an astral significance. Hence the liver, the ancient seat of the soul, is indispensable to the sorcerer. Mathematics is the sacred science. Numbers have a celestial significance. One, three, seven, nine, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, twenty, twenty-eight, and many more have mystical values. So complicated is the system that any event in some fashion can be brought within the determination of the astrologer. Metals and colors are symbols of the ineffable. The history of the world passes through the signs of the zodiac to a consummation; hence the ages of Taurus and Gemini and Aries, etc. Solstice and equinox are the reckoning-points of the year and the dramatic moments of the heavens and the earth. Here is a framework of almost infinite mythological possibilities—latent monotheism, the divine triad, innumerable gods, divine misfortune as Tammuz, the moon, descends into the underworld at the summer solstice, the divine rescue at the vernal equinox. It is a complex system which can be interpreted into everything and interpreted out of anything. That astrology is the framework of the great mythologies and is

current today in popular superstitions is evident. It can be made to parallel the Bible from creation to the final judgment and from the Garden of Eden to the Babylonian city of the Apocalypse (and the woman with child and the dragon which "poured out a river of water"). Here Abram wanders like the moon and with a name, the attribute of the moon-god. Here Tammuz, Lot, is delivered. Are there not twelve tribes, children of Israel, written also in the zodiac?

Certainly the Hebrews were not ignorant of astrology and mythology. Names, words, allusions, customs, all bear witness to the presence of astrology. They could not talk a Semitic tongue without implicit astrology. But in the progress of conjecture there are important gains. Latent monotheism in mythology and the temples calls favorable attention anew to the first chapter of Romans. The program of religious development is reversed and returns to the historical precedence of monotheism over polytheism. Pre-exilic ignorance and an evolution of national culture from the ground up receives its death-blow. Messianic expectations, so painstakingly and ingeniously dissected out of the Hebrew literature, are rediscovered under the auspices of the universal astrological doctrine of a world redeemer and of a new age. But whatever the interpretative profit or loss, the hypothesis of reconstruction of the Bible has revolved. Its present form of astrology, with its wealth of oriental fancies and superstitions, does not provide criticism with a settled and definite system of thought or representation. Certainly the interpretative hypothesis of criticism is not an argument for assured results.

II. THE HISTORICAL FRAME

It is not necessary to review the entire program of any plan of the reconstruction of biblical history to decide what degree, if any, of assurance is to be derived from this field of investigation. As shafts were sunk to bedrock to discover if it would furnish a basis for the Gatun dam, we may test the historical foundation of modernism at three points: the beginning of religious culture in Israel, folklore materials, and the discovery of the artificial structure of the two books of Kings. Rudiments of culture, legendary materials, arranged by an artificial chronology, are the sources for the recovery of the pre-exilic history of Israel.

The sacrificial practice of the time is of the first importance and it is the best illustration of the trustworthiness of the method of recovery of that obscured past. The contrast is drawn between the priest-code, which lays supreme stress upon the where, when, and how; and Jehovist narratives in the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, which regard exclusively the fact that sacrifices must be offered to Jehovah and their quality and quantity. Seeing that one of the canons for sorting the documents of this literature is found in this subject of the nature of the sacrifices it is not surprising that the documents confirm this important distinction. But the sacrificial practice is to be ascertained from books which are written with a social, a political object. There is no intention to describe the sacrifices. Those incidents upon which chief reliance is placed are dramatic episodes in the annals. Some of them are of such a nature that they are recorded as marvels. The sacrifice of Gideon is an act of hospitality, turned into an offering by the act of the divine messenger. How can we assert that it represents the practice of the people? Naaman's sacrifices, we must insist, are not in evidence. He says that he will offer sacrifices but omits to tell how he will go about it. Saul was present at a feast and there was sacrifice by Samuel, but all that Samuel did on that singular occasion is not related, nor does the fact that three men were going up to Bethel to worship justify the conclusion that we can infer the ritual of that high place from the contents of their saddle-bags. Shakespeare has celebrated the spirit of the official "armed with a little brief authority," and we ourselves understand the spirit of petty officers too well to believe that at any time priest or medicine-man allowed his clients to imagine that the offering was all and that his efficiency and methods were unimportant and haphazard. For these and many more reasons we cannot see in these measures for the reconstruction of a history, grounds of assurance, and we are predisposed to agree with Professor Wellhausen when he says,

With the Hebrews, as with the whole ancient world, sacrifice constituted the main part of worship. The question is whether the worship did not also in this most important respect pass through a history the stages of which are reflected in the Pentateuch. From the results already reached

this must be regarded as at the outset probable, but the sources of information accessible to us seem hardly sufficient to enable us actually to follow the process, or even so much as definitely to fix its two termini.

But however rudimentary the practice of Israel, the new astrological view of the great religions of the East assures us that the Israelite knew a more elaborate worship than he practiced, in the days of Joshua and the Judges.

By folklore materials it is not intended to assert that the annals of Israel are but folklore. But it is asserted that they are materials which have suffered by that form of transmission and have often no higher value. They may retain elements of truth both as matters of fact and in modes of representation. But their facts and color of narrative need confirmation at every point. But our attention must be confined to what has been regarded as folklore proper. The lives of Abraham and Isaac especially have been instanced as folklore narratives. Let us consider the most striking feature of these tales, the parallel incidents concerning Sarah and Rebekah. Both Isaac and Abraham fear for their lives on account of the beauty of their wives. Both employ the same evasion, "She is my sister." It is this repetitious story which creates the presumption that here is one legend repeated through a documentary blunder. But is it the literary body which is repetitious or the narrow, nomad life? Flocks, herds, tents, camels, asses, wives and children, wells, grass—it is easy to run the entire gamut of possessions and possible incidents of that monotonous existence. Not once nor twice were wells dug or filled up, or wives relatives of their husbands, or too well-favored for the safety of a sheik or patriarch. Not twice nor ten times in the desert East has it been said, "She is my sister," and that without so much ground for the assertion as we find in the household of Abraham and Isaac. This thing happened yesterday in southern Palestine. It is the groundless suspicion of the sedentary creator of history which leads him to find all reasons in documents and literary usage. Had there been no repetition in these stories they could not have been faithful to the nomad life, unless literary discrimination had already passed upon the historical materials. But when the narrative has been put in question neither the narrowness and uniformity of desert life

nor the suspicions of literary authorities can discredit or establish the story. There is no assured result.

To quote for substance the opinion of many eminent scholars, perhaps the most remarkable discovery of biblical criticism is the demonstration by Dr. Wellhausen of the arbitrary division of the chronology of the books of Kings into periods divisible by the number 40. There are many unsolved problems in this region of biblical history. But no more convincing evidence of its untrustworthiness has been adduced, in the estimation of scholars, than this now manifest, artificial chronology. In this instance the hand of the performer has been exposed. While the writer of this paper disclaims the ability to follow Dr. Wellhausen's calculations, perhaps he may indicate some of his reasons for dissent since our subject is assured results. For one reason, the common mode of addition taught in the schools does not foot up the same total which Dr. Wellhausen reckons. In the chronology of eight kings of Israel he declares that we have this suspicious recurrence of numbers as regnal years of the kings: 22, 2—24, 2, 12—22, 2, 12—22, 2, 12. He says:

The 242 years of the Northern Kingdom are divided by the epoch of I Jehu into 98 and 144. If we take them at 240, the half of 480, the 98 must be changed into 96, which then agree with the contemporary 96 Jewish years. The deduction must be made at the reign of Baasha.

The result is,

The eight kings have together 96 years, the first four and the last four 48 each. Two have the average number 12; the other 6 consists of three pairs of father and son; and the twice 12 years belonging to each pair are divided so that the father gets 12—10 and the son 12—10, obviously because the father was considered much more important than the son.

If these recurrent numbers are the invention of the final redactor of the books of Kings we must admit that he has not been as shrewd in the matter of adjustment of dates as his distinguished critic. Without Dr. Wellhausen's amendments the recurrence of these numbers is remarkable and, although in no case exact, they are sufficiently regular to provoke inquiry. But as an argument for the artificial and therefore untrustworthy character

of this chronology it would be more persuasive had it not been founded upon a miscalculation at the outset—the omission of the reign of Ahaz from the list of the kings of Judah. Had he not made this mistake he need not have concluded that “this shows that no effort was made at first to synchronize the individual reigns in the two series of Israel and of Judah.” But this mistake of Dr. Wellhausen is turned to literary account. It enables him to show an earlier chronology which was not synchronous and thereby a later redaction in which the signs of the two kingdoms were imperfectly synchronized. It is not necessary to review in detail the numbers of the reigns of the kings of Judah. Only the groups by which the dominance of the number 40 in the final redaction is made to appear concerns us at present. The 430 years from the building to the destruction of the temple are reckoned as follows: Rehoboam and Abijam, 20; Asa, 41; Jehoshaphat, Joram, Ahaziah, Athaliah, 40; Joash, 40; Amaziah and Uzziah, 81; Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah, 38. Of course, if the omitted reign of Ahaz is replaced the scheme is disordered and this part of the discovery cannot be reckoned among our assured results.

Although the arguments of Dr. Wellhausen may have the appearance of special pleading, after his amendments are set aside there remain sufficient coincidences to arouse curiosity and awaken distrust. It is true that modern history is often divided according to centuries when a writer is dealing with institutions and philosophy. Such divisions are by many regarded as imaginary as parallels and meridians. Events and movements are under no mathematical law. They are irregular in occurrence and have no relation to chronological schemes. What shall we think of any history with recurrences of dates or events? The great body of students hold them in suspicion, if they do not reject them at once.

Suppose that some modern history were composed in a manner analogous to this biblical history, would it not be rejected at once? Setting aside such remarkable coincidences, however detailed and curious, as the careers of the two Edwards and the two battles of Bull Run, let us take in hand some entire history

and apply still more artificial measures that we may realize the force of the objection to artificial schemes of composition.

The writer did not invent this scheme of French history, but he found it recommended in a popular publication. I quote in abbreviated form: That since France became a kingdom under Hugh Capet, three brothers have ruled in succession, at three different times, and after each of these groups of royal brothers a family with a new name has come upon the throne. In 1314 upon the death of Philip IV, Louis X became king. In two years he was followed by his brother, Philip V, and after six years the third brother, Charles IV, succeeded to the throne. Here ended the house of Capet and arose the house of Valois.

The sons of Henry II and Catherine de Medici in order: Francis II, Charles IX, and Henry III, were the last representatives of the house of Valois. Three brothers of the house of Bourbon: Louis XVI, Louis XVIII, and Charles X, conclude the sway of the house of Bourbon, which is followed by the house of Orleans. This artificial scheme—I had almost said superstitious scheme—was further embellished by the statements: "After a little more than two hundred years come the three Valois brothers," and "After a little less than two hundred years come the three Bourbon brothers." Artificial schemes such as these condemn a narrative as a fabrication. That is not the way in which free events take place. This pseudo-French history far surpasses in artificiality any numbers or coincidences of the biblical history. That is why any sane student casts it aside. But the difficulty surpassing all others is this, that this artificial proposal for a plan of French history is not prepared in satire or jest and that it is correct, is the actual scheme of all histories of France. What is worse, there is a similar condition in English history. The Stuarts succeeded the Tudors. The last Tudors were Edward VI, who was succeeded by Mary, his sister, who was succeeded by Elizabeth, another sister. It is plain that the kind and degree of artificiality which Dr. Wellhausen perfected for the chronology of the books of Kings does not create a presumption against the narrative or lead to assured negative results. This is the more evident when we remember that the Hebrews reckoned the years of accession and death as regnal years.

III. LITERARY DIVINATION (GEN. I:1—2:4)

Ancient and solitary and angular and sublime, this first chapter of Genesis confronts us like a pylon which masks and announces some forgotten Karnak. For milleniums the camel paths passed under its shadow and for other milleniums it has not heard a footfall. It stands in elemental fellowship with wind and sand and sun. It is a desert ruin. It belongs to architecture rather than literature. It is the blue-print of a cosmos. It is a draft recovered from primordial rubbish discarded by divinity. The design is as severe, logical, and inevitable as that of a Doric column. Its style rises like a pillar from the plain in Genesis. It is a cold, clear, brilliant mass of mutually imbedded crystals. Only once again is there an outcrop and suggestion of its planes and angles in the prologue of the Fourth Gospel. It is a literary unit and, like a crystal, wholly embodies its art. It goes back to the point of departure of the legends of the Karens on one side of the world and of the Masai on the other, and to the times of the Sumerian East.

The Cosmogony.—Do we not have it on the highest authority that the first chapter of Genesis is “formal, precise, and repetitious”?¹ Formal it is, for it is formulated like a time table. The parts might have been prepared separately and set in this monotonous framework of phrases, like the jewels of the high priest’s breastplate. Some scholars place its style somewhere between literature and statistics. It is a mosaic of ideas and runs to parallelisms like perpendicular Gothic. It is prose, but it is such technical and periodical prose that it falls into stanzas. It is a composition of eight scenes and seven movements. But it is a paradox to call the first and last incidents, chaos and the divine rest, scenes. When in the beginning we read of “the heavens and the earth,” the ancient wholesale expression for the universe, straightway the Hebrew is strained to find a rigmarole phrase (*tohu vbohu*) to blurr, confound, and annihilate the inevitable picture formed in the mind. It serves to say and symbolize that the raw material of the world is unordered, unqualified, unconditioned

¹ A more artificial, unnatural and purely mechanical treatment of the story can scarcely be conceived. It is needless to add that P is absolutely barren of poetic material—*Gen. of Gen.*, Bacon on Nöldeke.

—mere elemental flux and confusion. This is the fluid without consistency or law over which the Spirit of God broods. It is very different from the water of the third day. The divine rest also is an unpicturable event. It is a pure conception of the understanding. It can be represented neither by figure nor symbol. This creation story, then, begins in abstraction and proceeds to abstraction, from elemental matter to a hallowed act of consecration, from transcendental materialism to transcendental mysticism.

The body of the narrative, the remaining six creative days are divided into two corresponding sections of three days each. Both divisions include a first and second day of single events and a third of two events. On the third day the land and water are separated and vegetation appears, and on the sixth day first land animals are created and then man. Thus the story is divided into two parts, which are duplicates and balanced over against each other. It is a two-leaved device, like double doors.

Yet more rigorous is the formulation of the subdivisions of the narrative which describe the several days. The design is heavily mullioned with the ponderous refrain, "and there was evening and there was morning, one day." It is a sentence and a symbol which by its periodic recurrence suggests the continual operation and advancement of the formative world. Each event is further outlined with the barren phrases, "And God said," "And it was so," "And God saw that it was good." They have no more literary quality than the multiplication table or a stock report. But colorless as they are, they are employed to set apart and define each event, as complete in its place and standardized with the rest.

Now amidst these parallelisms and repetitions and with this periodicity, the smallest variation of expression becomes emphatic, the slightest flow of the narrative impresses us with a sense of freedom and power. Michel Angelo resorted to the same device when he set his angels afloat in the blue between the painted cornices and towers of the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel. If a phrase is but modified so as to say, "And behold it was all very good," each change is doubly forcible upon that uniform background. It arrests attention, as when a gong is struck. And as the slow, stately, and tremendous narrative sweeps on through

ages and orders, the tribes of the world seem to start from the dust and sweep by in procession with all the fascination of movement and the endless charm of the bursting surge.

Habit and education have much to do with taste. It is not surprising if the decorator and all the rhetoricians whose delight is in mere variety, the interminable wanderings and intricacies of superficial discourse, should find little to admire in so definite and elaborate an art-form. The critic too is absorbed with minutiae. He is looking to find the Lord's Prayer on a pin-head. He is hardly prepared to appreciate the grander images of art. He has sharpened his vision at the expense of its scope. He can still see that this is stone and that is brass, but he does not realize that both are statues. We recognize that when he says that this story of creation is "formal, precise, and repetitious," his statement is correct, but it is the opinion of a man who has seen "motion signs" only by daylight. He is correct and trustworthy and yet he is mistaken. And he can never take a position where the whole design will appear to his imagination. He cannot see these six picture panels, three to the left and three to the right, molded and mullioned by these colorless phrases into door-panels. He has been taught that repetition is a rhetorical blemish except for emphasis or resumption. Daring and triumphant is the genius which makes these very repetitions contribute to the might, majesty, repose, and grand art of his story. An eye like Michel Angelo's has swept the scene. When Ghiberti entered his studio and after twenty years of labor came forth with but one of his celestial doors, that great genius found his panels already drawn in his first chapter of Genesis. He had translated into brass what was already cast in literary mold. Literary critics do not readily see such wonders, for they are of the tribe of Noah Webster, not of the Tuscan jeweler.

The conflict between aesthetics and biblical criticism is more clearly and delightfully illustrated in their supposition of the composition of the narrative. Scholars find a high degree of unity, not to say petrification, under a miscellaneous authorship. The poles of common literary judgment are here inverted. Images and structure, here and elsewhere, have been the highest marks of individuality. But as the text undergoes verbal disso-

lution, unity of ideas and personality are divorced. The product is a unit and the authorship is miscellaneous. This contention needs explanation. This cosmogony is regarded not as the work of one mind, nor yet of several, but of at least three cults which are also political factions in Israel. This chapter is composite, not by sections, but by superposed literary styles, fine and transparent as mica films. Moreover, when attentively and penetratingly considered, it is not what it appears to be. It is not fundamentally a priestly document (P) at all, but a prophetic composition (JE), rewritten by the uninventive priestly cults. But he has discovered this condition of the narrative in the first three verses and a still more acute American savant has found thirty verses infected with this original, prophetic style. The farther we proceed in this analysis, the farther we appear to stray from literature proper; the more we discover various authorships by particular words and phrases, the wider is the chasm between unity of concepts and personality. The unique art-form of this literary masterpiece, the "everlasting doors" of the introduction to Genesis, the blank panels of transom and threshold, the two-leaved arrangement of the creative narrative, and the bold and simple pictures which lend themselves to the hand of the brass-founder are only formality and precision and repetition. The invention of a noble literary form by the bold acceptance of what is commonly a literary blemish, the repetition of colorless phrases, is described as mere uniformity and prolixity.

But is it so certain that art-forms are decisive of a single authorship? Our evolutionary views, we are told, have given us a new and universal standpoint of reasoning. If we are ourselves the gradual product of persistent forces of Nature, our works certainly cannot depart from the law of our being. Our whole current literature bears witness to the dominance of this doctrine in the minds of all thinking people. This outward evolution is confirmed by our discoveries in psychology. We have been instructed in the relation of blood pressures and brain tracts to the process of thought. The history of our own species, of the rise of many inventions, and the hypothesis of brain tracts as the highways of thought, therefore, unite to convince enlightened men that invention is small and gradual. Of great devices struck out

at a single effort by any individual they have become skeptical. Theory and experience unite to make the scientific mind secure in the opinion that invention is a gradual process and that this art-form of the first chapter of Genesis, like the substance of the narrative, may nevertheless be the matured device of many minds. This is why "the men of light and leading" should know in advance of inquiry and be able to trace the evolution of Tennyson's "Bugle Song" and Keats's "Ode on a Grecian Urn" and Shelly's "Sky Lark," and, since "the inventor is the poet of things," Edison's phonograph, kinoscope, and electric lamp, and Maxim's machine gun, and many more reputed original inventions back to their forbears and rudimentary condition. Still there are people who would maintain that the art-form of this chapter was projected by a single hand, in spite of the fact that biblical criticism has confirmed the possibility of the most sustained and finished poetry from various sources and by multiple authorship, and in spite of the further fact that if the records of the Patent Office should be lost, some future instructor will gather all the forms of the phonograph, good, bad, and indifferent, arrange them in an advancing order, and edify the undergraduates of the future with another application of the evolutionary principle. What our instructors are now doing for history, posterity will apply to the events and inventions of our time.

Documentary analysis.—Eventually every discussion of higher criticism must arrive at the documentary question. It is named the literary argument but it is literary only in the sense that words and phrases have their service in literature. This is literary research in that it is the grammarian's supreme achievement. Rabbinism has not surpassed it in the wealth and pretentiousness of its apparatus and its claims. Only in the matter of absurdity can the scribes claim superiority. One sees magical properties in the sacred text, the other sees perturbations in words and phrases which invite the genius of Adams and Laverrier. The oriental sorceress who is also a courtesan, graceful as a leopard and as full of guile, stretches her supple length upon her tapestried divan. She incenses herself from the brazier at her elbow. She fixes her eyes upon the rock-crystal globe poised in the silver coils of a serpent and sinks into a trance, and divines by second

sight. She never saw the wonders in her crystal microcosm which the modern scholastic finds with his Scotch-pebble lenses in biblical texts. There are some assured results of a sane criticism. One of these is this that the scholar does not see different superposed styles in the same document. The proof I can only itemize at this time. If art-models have more significance of authorship and documentary divisions than the fortunes of words upon the page, the first documentary division of the text of the Bible is not in the middle of the fourth verse of the second chapter of Genesis. That addition is an excrescence upon a monumental design so precise that as it left the hand of the writer it was ready to the hand of the brass-founder. Right here at the outset the splitting of sentences is instituted to obtain as a conclusion, "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth." No nation, party, or worshiper had but one term for the divine nature so that he should avoid the general title of divinity, God, or find ground of distaste in a personal name, Jehovah. In the Chaldean epic Bel is installed with fifty titles. It is not even claimed that Hebrew parties aligned themselves according to the terms God and Jehovah. There is no psychology for a distinction which is inevitably psychological. There is no dialectical difference in the language of the Hebrews or battle of the dictionary to account for a verbal discrimination of the documents. Only a psychological cause and a morbid condition can justify such rigorous adherence to common terms on the one hand, and aversion toward other common terms on the other, so that the reader can determine the boundaries of a literary document by the usage of speech. The critic who balks at the splitting of sentences and phrases, while he accepts the main conclusions of the documentary discrimination denies the validity of the whole process; for he denies that words have the property of literary distinction. Centuries elapsed since Hebrew and Babylonian speech diverged from their common, original tongue. Words and syntax prove that they are cognate languages. Now of the forty-seven words and phrases which distinguish the P documents, over one-third (nineteen) have the same form and meaning in both languages, as *tselem* and *tsalamu*, "image." Yet we are asked to believe that these words, identical in two languages sepa-

rated by ages and intervening nations, serve also to discriminate parties and religious tendencies in one people, without dialectical divergence of speech, occupying a territory fifty by a hundred miles, on the coast of western Asia. Scientifically considered, the Hebrews were a peculiar people. When we are told that "to meet," "to bear," "generations," "let my people go," show the priestly prepossessions of writers we wonder how the priests put their tabu upon these phrases. These are the N-rays of super-scientific determination. The depth as well as delicacy of literary discrimination has already been explained above in the detection of a JE substratum for P in the first chapter of Genesis. The first chapter of Genesis serves as a test of assured results in the matter of the composition of these documents. One scholar finds that the first three verses of the chapter are a re-edited JE document. Another finds that almost the whole chapter was originally a JE document. That is, the capital instance and type of P documents retains the characteristics of the JE documents. It is so different from JE writings that it serves to discriminate and rearrange the contents of the Pentateuch, yet is so like a JE production that that pedigree can be read from the face of the same text.

When Dr. Wellhausen condemned the Book of Kings as an artificial composition he supplied a canon for the judgment of his own hypothesis. Throughout the East the duodecimal system of reckoning was the basis of its learning. But by ascribing to P documents a decimal system, one characteristic named by Dr. Driver, critics are guilty of an anachronism. The decimal system of reckoning is a late invention. As words are distributed to authors according to an impossible psychology, numbers are subjected to the same prejudice. The war is carried over from the dictionary into the arithmetic. But, we are reminded that, artificial as this general statement makes the process appear to be, this distribution of words and numbers is accompanied by descriptive elements which confirm the assignment of these materials and styles of narrative. In E an angel "calls out of heaven," not in other sources, and, we may add, nowhere else in any narrative. Before Pharaoh sometimes Aaron is the spokesman, sometimes Moses. In P Aaron co-operates with Moses, in conformity

with his appointment on the occasion of Moses' call before the burning bush. In J Moses is represented as addressing Pharaoh. It is further pointed out that Aaron was appointed only to speak for Moses *to the people*. Aaron has no commission to the court of Egypt. One would suppose that the eloquence of Aaron was as important at the Egyptian court as before an assembly of Israelite slaves. The phrase "unto the people," is given a statute technicality that the contention of composite documents may be sustained, and that words are decisive tests of divulgent authorship. As all narratives are variable in detail a minute examination will always be rewarded by small differences, which when finally sifted will leave little peculiarities, which will correspond to almost any literary principle of discrimination, and can then be erected into canons of criticism. By this method of ever minuter search for literary variations, an artificial proposal is certain to find confirmation at last, and any hypothesis will appear to be established by two several departments of inquiry. As long as there are any variations of representation in a document the field is open, and proof by concomitant evidence is inevitable. But this concomitance is what? It is a maxim that one lie must be backed by others. It is also true that one artifice imposes another. The verbal distribution of the documentary hypothesis imposes a sifting of the smallest variations of discourse to find ultimate peculiarities for the confirmation of its massive distinctions. There is neither concomitance nor assurance in the minimistic process.

Our quest is for assured results; our contention is that the apparatus is inadequate, that the higher criticism is not entitled to the worthy name of science. The particular measures of the art are an inconstant, a revolving, reconstructive hypothesis. It has been subjected to four several modifications within the memory of scholars here present. Certainly it cannot establish assured results, because it will not hold still to be photographed.

The historical scheme is also an indeterminate means to a positive conclusion. Tested at three important points we can discover no decisive result. The historic beginning of the cultus cannot positively be inferred from the materials provided when once the records are discredited. This point is admitted by the authors of the reconstruction. The legendary materials of the

history are often repetitious, the principal evidence of their untrustworthy character, but so also is the nomad life. There may be another than a documentary reason for the repetition. And the supreme discovery and test of the artificiality and prepossessions of the final redaction, recurrent numbers, are surpassed both in particular events, individual lives, and the general scheme of at least one modern history. The trusted objections to the historical structure of biblical history yield no assured results, either positive or negative.

But the stronghold, testing-room, and office of the present critical demolition and reconstruction of the biblical books is the first chapters of the Book of Genesis. There it is that Elohist and Jehovist fell afoul of the dictionary and the arithmetic. There a theological divergence was first betrayed by a subtle psychological prejudice about words. There were many strata of literary styles imbedded under the most thoroughgoing priestly style, and masked by one of the most pronounced art-forms which still stands peculiar and monumental in all literature—an art-form which some men of talent and laborious ingenuity have felt to be incomplete and have found it necessary to extend by another sentence and to soften its abruptness with an appropriate introduction, which the same delicacy of artistic perception leads them to feel must originally have prepared for the panorama of creation.

THE PRESIDENT: The first appointed speaker is Rev. John R. Brown, D.D., of Bridgeport, Conn.

REV. JOHN R. BROWN, of Bridgeport, Conn:

WHAT ARE THE ASSURED RESULTS OF MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM?

The old story goes that when Apollo flayed Marsyas, the lute of the victim and the lyre of the executioner were both silent. Dr. Hahn has been more kind: to the music of an exuberant rhetoric, much given to counterpoint, he has stretched some ecclesiastical skins in the sun to dry. It is good to die to such music, even if one must be reminded of Carlyle's aphorism that "Sarcasm is the natural language of the devil," and also of Mrs. Carlyle's rejoinder, "Yes, and the acquired language of saints."

Some of us may be sure that Dr. Hahn is on a vain quest. Like Meredith's egoist in his travels through Europe, he has been "engaged in holding a review of his Maker's grotesques." He is bold enough to tell us that he glories in his lack of sympathy with the modern biblical criticism. Lowell tells us that Diogenes went out with his dark lantern "ostensibly looking for a man, but inwardly resolved to find a monkey." Having reached the house of the primates in the menagerie of the world's follies, Dr. Hahn has been glad that he could poke the animals a bit!

The assured results of modern biblical criticism suggest a possible arrogance or a magnificent assumption. Clough wanted such an assurance for himself in some matters of faith and life, and expressed his wish in these words:

Oh might I for assurance sake
Some arbitrary judgment make!

Assurance may thus be a matter of temper, of credulity, or intellectual tyranny. Every man will have to be persuaded in his own mind what he means by "assurance."

I. A method of interpretation that is as old as Jesus Christ, that was honored by the apostles, that has been used by bold and prophetic souls in all periods of the church's history, that has taken scientific forms in the last century and a half, that has been tried and not found wanting by an increasing number of those who live in the spirit of Jesus, ought by this time to have some results. Some conceptions concerning modern biblical criticism are happily passing. It can no longer be considered a gigantic conspiracy of unfaith against the revelation of God. It is not the modern Apollyon who meets lonely Christian in some narrow place of faith and slays him. It is not the fumes and odors of German beer and tobacco in the face of the Eternal. He who accepts the results of modern biblical criticism is not "hamstrung by doubt" nor "gangrened with fraud"; nor, on the other hand, is he petrified by tradition or terrorized by the dead hand.

We are getting out of our Christian abrasion and getting back to the prophetic spirit of Jesus Christ. And there are assured results as we have won back the spirit of truth and liberty in Christ.

The assured results concerning the form and making of the Bible are now fairly clear. These are the conclusions in their largest character. There are four principal documents in the Hexateuch called by scholars J, E, D, and P. Two are national stories, written from the different standpoints of northern and southern Israel; one is a reformer's handbook; and the last is the priestly shell which made Judaism a crustacean on the shores of time. Deuteronomy was produced during the reign of Manasseh, and the priestly legislation began with Ezekiel and ended with Ezra. The period of the Exile was not one of closed vision and deaf ears: the prophet or prophets who produced Isa., chaps. 40-66 were not one whit behind the chiefest prophets. Jonah, Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, and most of the Psalms are all late, molded by the influences of the Greek period. Daniel is the call to war of the Maccabean period. When we come to the New Testament the synoptic problem seems to reveal two original sources, one of the words and the other of the works of Jesus; for a generation the church lived in the tradition of Jesus without a written or authoritative record of his life. The Book of John was written at least a generation after the Synoptics were given to the church, and is the life of Jesus reinterpreted to the church in the light of Greek metaphysics and under the pressure of the Greek mind of Asia Minor. The Book of Acts was probably written by Luke. The letters that go by the name of Paul are authentic with the exception of the Pastoral Epistles, which may have a Pauline core but are largely interpolated. The little works called Jude and Second Peter belong to the second century when apocalyptic had become the habit of the church. Revelations is the manual at arms of the suffering church in Asia Minor, but the date of its writing is unknown.

This is the stream of revelation with its turns, twists, returns, and backwaters which the church reads today, and on its waters, sometimes clear, just as often turbid, its faith has come down. It is a topographical map of faith, which is a watershed, as well as a single stream.

These are assured results when we study them from the standpoint of *concession*. Every one of them has been controverted, but also every one has been admitted by those who deny the valid-

ity of the modern method. Ellicott is horrified at the late dates proposed for the Psalms, but admits that the Hexateuch has the strata pointed out by ten critics. Sayce is supposed to be a cruel bushwhacker on the edge of this critical camp, but he scoffs at "the inerrancy of Scripture," agrees with the scholars whom he combats with regard to the parts of the Pentateuch, is irritated at the exaggerations in the books of Chronicles, thinks that the figures of the wilderness wandering are absurd, and plumps Daniel among the Maccabees. Johnston, whose book on *Bible Criticism and the Average Man* gave the traditionalists much comfort, was not so inspiring from the old points of view in the second reading. He frankly yielded the point about the composite character of the Hexateuch and Isaiah. Even the successor of Dr. Green, the no-surrender general within the walls of Princeton, stoops to conquer by admitting a documentary origin of the Hexateuch, which as he works it out is fearfully and wonderfully made. Much has been said about "the discordance of the experts." The band-wagon of the conservatives does not always send forth harmony.

The same assured results might be found by striking *averages* and summing up a *consensus*. In criticism as yet the theodolite has been more used than the surveyor's rule. There are many differences of detail, very few with regard to the large conclusions. There is much country yet to be possessed, and it has often happened that the upper and lower springs of a spiritual appreciation are needed to make the critic's conquest of any use. Otherwise it will lie barren under the hot sun of an evil age.

II. The assured results in the realm of psychological integrity are of even more importance. An inerrant book, produced on the dead level of an equal authority throughout, is no longer possible in our thinking. Ecclesiastical definitions of inspiration and revelation are thrown into the melting-pot of a new appreciation. We do not know what form they will have when they come out, but we do know that the pure gold of the word will not be lost. We no longer have to tell men to believe the impossible that they may have faith in God. We no longer suffer from religious overstrain which used to come from an attempt to harmonize the impossible.

The feeling of this relief has been expressed in different ways. Canon Lidden, shortly before his death, expressed himself as profoundly grateful that the church had never in all its history given "an authoritative definition of what Scripture or inspiration really is." Even the conservative Brown has said: "We are the dupes of words when we start back in horror from the thought of myth and legend in the Bible." The free winds that come from the early days of the Reformation blow through the stagnation of our later controversies in such words as these. Luther declined to call the Bible "the Word of God" exclusively. "God does not speak grammatical vocables, but true essential things. Thus sun and moon, Peter and Paul, thou and I are nothing but words of God." Zwingli was getting back to the primitive point of view when he said: "He who is born of the spirit is no longer solely dependent on a book." The church could have been saved many an intellectual and spiritual humiliation if it had only adopted Calvin's honest, "I will never harmonize an oversight or mistake in the sacred writers."

III. The Spiritual results of the modern method are now beginning to show. Whenever in days gone by one who accepted the modern point of view had any spiritual life at all, it was generally supposed that he was a Christian's ape, that it was in him by a kind of atavism, or that he inherited the momentum of other and better days. The fact that in many cases the momentum had long been dead, and that the new life had to begin on the plane of a difficult inertia was not always recognized, and seldom, if ever, acknowledged.

But in many sections of the Christian church the struggle is over and the adjustments have taken place. In some communions there is a new order of things and the spiritual results of the modern method cannot be confused with lines out of the past. The church that expelled Robertson Smith from its fellowship and sent him into the wilderness of suspicion, has gone farther than he ever dreamed of going. A generation has passed since then and the men in Scottish pulpits today have learned the new interpretation from their childhood. Scotland is still a Puritan country, its intellectual greatness has not been quenched, and its spiritual influence in missions, scholarship, and the higher life

was never so great as it is today. In our own country the Congregationalists passed through their struggle, and now even in their Sunday-school periodicals the new point of view is frankly adopted. If spiritual influence, gifts to missions, and social service are any tests the Congregationalists are today the spiritual order. The Methodists have just held their ecumenical council in Toronto. The higher criticism was the order for discussion one day. Professor Peake's paper on "The Higher Criticism" was the point of discussion. When he said that from the modern point of view "we get something better—a view of life itself; we gain in warmth and interest; interest in the Bible has been indefinitely enhanced by the new viewpoint which criticism has brought," the great audience showed that they agreed with him. The Baptists have the prerogative of large and slow bodies—to be behind, their brethren in other communions; but the quiet acceptance of the assured results of the modern point of view is going on so rapidly among laymen and ministers that our very size keeps it from being a striking phenomenon.

The long controversy has forced upon our attention this last and important result for life and faith: the great spiritual leaders have been men who have used this method consciously or unconsciously. No Rabbinit in faith has ever lighted up and led his age. The mystics thought more of life and communion than the book, and the mystics have always been the forerunners in every spiritual advance. Luther would never have broken down the authority of pope and council if he had been like those who followed him and made him a scholastic. He made his own canons, and put aside every book of Scripture which did not feed his soul. "I abide by the books which give me Christ clear and pure" were his great words of freedom. Our modern Baptist advance owes its great impulse to Andrew Fuller, who gave up once and for all the verbal-inspiration theory in his controversy with Dr. Gill. John Wesley was so frank and so amazing in his criticisms of Scripture and so honest in dealing with the discrepancies which he found that Dr. Buckley has called him "the first higher critic of Methodism." The new point of view has made clear once more the springs of intellectual and spiritual integrity, and they reveal to us the deeper world of life, power,

hope, and service. When a certain American scholar was on trial for his faith as well as his orthodoxy, Theodore Monad, of Paris, sent him this message:

Dwell in light, in love abound,
This the guerdon we pursue:
Not that men may call us sound,
But that God may find us true.

THE PRESIDENT: The next appointed speaker is Professor Herbert L. Willett, Ph.D. (Disciple), of Chicago, Ill.

PROFESSOR HERBERT L. WILLETT, PH.D.

THE ASSURED RESULTS OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM

The agitation produced by the critical method in the study of the Scriptures has now given place, largely, to a feeling of assurance regarding certain of the great results of the method, and of gratitude that upon foundations made available by criticism the work of constructive Bible study may now go forward with fresh vigor.

The alarm that the pursuit of critical studies aroused has now quite subsided, save in the most conservative circles. It is now clearly perceived that biblical criticism is a method and not a result, and that it is inevitable as soon as study supersedes the mere reading of the Word of God. Its results may be either positive or negative, but the method itself is a necessary preparation for the competent use of the Bible.

It is sometimes maintained that biblical criticism is a recent enterprise, begotten by the restless spirit of the nineteenth century. While it is true that the most notable achievements of the process were reached during the last half of the past century, the method itself is as old as the Bible.

It is to be seen in the work of the prophets of Israel. It was their task not only to utter the message of their generation as they understood it, but to review and correct the messages of their predecessors. There are notable instances in the Old Testament of such criticism, in which prophets of a later date repudiated and denounced the ideas of those who had previously spoken in behalf of God.

In the work of the law-givers the same principle is observed. The three great bodies of law, which were successively issued in the name of Moses at different periods in the national history, reached ever fresh and more advanced ground, superseding the institutes of an earlier time and establishing radical departures in new directions. No student who has any acquaintance with the progressive legislation of Israel is unfamiliar with this feature of criticism.

Passing by such revisions of the Psalms and the Wisdom Literature as mark the activity of biblical critics in other departments of the Old Testament, one notices the attitude of Jesus toward that entire body of literature. The Old Testament was his Bible. He revered it, nourished his soul upon its great ideals, quoted it with affection, and in large degree reaffirmed its principles. Yet he employed the critical method with free hand in the discussion of its utterances. He recognized its imperfections and its need of revisal. In subjecting it to such scrutiny as revealed its defects, he put himself at once in the ranks of that company of reverent biblical critics whose work has been so notable a contribution to the illumination of the Word of God.

And in the history of the Christian church the work of criticism upon the Scriptures has been almost continuous. From the days of the Fathers to our own time, with varying impulse and activity, the work of scrutiny, review, and correction has gone on, sometimes in the department of textual revision and sometimes in the field of historical and literary inquiry. Today the process has reached that degree of completeness at which it is possible to speak with confidence of its accepted results, which are the basis of almost universal biblical study.

The results of the critical process have been twofold. On the one hand it has removed many of the unfounded traditions of Jewish and early Christian teachers. The single example of the Book of Hebrews, which for centuries was regarded as the work of the apostle Paul, but which practically universal Christian scholarship attributes to another hand, illustrates this negative phase of criticism. A long list of similar results might be named.

On the other hand, the work of criticism has been constructive to an equal or even greater degree, in its vindication of many of the early beliefs of the church regarding the authorship of certain of the documents. The leading epistles of Paul, and the Synoptic Gospels are examples of this type of results.

There are those, to be sure, who would deny that there are any assured results obtainable in the field of biblical criticism. They would point to the fantastic and grotesque suggestions of critical workers here and there as the only results of the process. It need not be denied that many theories have been advanced incapable of proof in the light of fuller examination. But criticism is self-corrective, and such results are sure to receive the assessment they merit at the hands of succeeding inquirers. No result can stand that does not validate itself to the entire group of critical workers.

It would be strange if there were not varieties of opinion expressed in regard to many of the problems which arise in the history of criticism. Many of the criteria are appreciable only through long and careful study. In the nature of the case some of these results will be determined by subjunctive judgment on the part of the critic, and will not at first appeal to the inexperienced opinion of the average reader. Here time and further examination alone can determine whether the results will approve themselves to general critical judgment.

While it is true that a valid criticism ought to be apparent to the uncritical mind, and that the average layman's view ought to be competent to approve or disprove of the results, yet it is beyond controversy that in the last issue the results of criticism will find vindication first in the opinion of experts, and, then by increasing familiarity they will be accepted by less specialized students.

Furthermore, it must be remembered that there is very great variety in the results obtained by critical work. The workers themselves are many. The personal equation of each will determine to a considerable extent his conclusion. And more than this, the eagerness of all to obtain individual results would inevitably lead to wide varieties of opinion, some of which would appear fantastic to a degree.

Yet in spite of all these facts the main lines of critical judgment are marvelously attested by the mass of expert opinion. While there are wide variations in regard to details, the main lines of inquiry reveal a harmony of opinion among the critics which is astonishing in view of the subjective and individual judgments which have wrought at the process.

The work of biblical criticism receives valuable illustration at this point from critical activities in other fields, particularly in the realm of art. It would seem impossible to harmonize the varying opinions regarding the artistic creations of the masters of painting and sculpture. Yet as every student knows, in spite of the conflict of schools and the war of individual opinions over details, the great lines of artistic criticism are firmly established and are accepted by all. Even so are the results of the critical process as applied to the Bible.

It is manifestly impossible to recount these assured results within the limits of a brief comment like this. Among them, however, may be mentioned the clear vindication of the development of prophecy in the Old Testament, through the activity of the moral leaders of Israel, whose records and messages furnish a gradually progressive development of the ideals of religion and morality through the centuries of the national history.

Of equal significance is the accepted verdict in reference to the development of Hebrew legislation, from its beginnings in the age of Moses, through the several codes, the Book of the Covenant, the Law of Deuteronomy to the Priest Code of later times. No reading of the Hebrew history is possible that does not recognize the development of law under the dominant and prevailing spirit of the first great law-giver. And this result is obtained as much by the study of the history as by the examination of the three codes themselves.

The composite nature of such books as Genesis, Exodus, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings is now recognized beyond question. And the four great documents of the Hexateuch have been determined with a definiteness that leaves only few details for further inquiry. The development of psalmody, the literature of the Wisdom school, and apocalyptic in the Old

Testament is equally evident. While the composite character of books like Isaiah and Zachariah are commonplaces of informed biblical study.

In the New Testament the results have been equally significant and convincing. The synoptic problem is still one of the leading inquiries of this literature, but it is far on the way to solution. The inquiries regarding the authorship and date of the Fourth Gospel are less close to a decision, but at least have reached the point of a working hypothesis which seems to meet the present needs of the student. The vindication of the sixth genuine Pauline epistle is one of the noteworthy results of the method. But the problems of the apocalypse and some of the epistles are still engaging the earnest labors of biblical scholars.

The values of these results both positive and negative are unquestionable. They make possible a history of Old Testament religion which was never available before the critical process had done its work upon the documents. They are also providing the foundations for a convincing narrative of the New Testament, now for the first time within reach.

They are also furnishing the basis for a systematic theology which shall be not merely an arrangement of texts, in the interest of special theories, but a truly systematic and convincing statement of New Testament thought. Precedent to this achievement it was necessary that lower or textual criticism should do its careful work of providing an authoritative text. Then the higher or literary criticism followed, with its discussion of the problems of date, authorship, and historicity. On these bases biblical theology has built its presentation of the religious views of the different writers of holy Scripture. And finally upon these foundations the great science of dogmatic theology now proceeds to erect its structure.

The convincing character of the human experiences recorded in the Bible is another of the assured results of the critical process. These human figures, in whose lives the principles of the Hebrew and the Christian faiths were disclosed, and no cloud-land apparitions, as they once seemed, but are now veritable men of flesh and blood, with whose experiences the biblical

student finds himself profoundly concerned. The contrast between the colossal and unreal figures of the prophets as they were painted by Michel Angelo and those human and convincing portraits of the prophets as Sargent has depicted them, is the difference between the older and uncritical biblical material of religious experience and that which the Bible now furnishes as the result of this process.

But most of all, the divine element in the Scriptures is now much more evident and much more truly capable of vindication than before the days of criticism. The human character of these documents has become increasingly evident, but the divine purpose which breathes through them and which utilized men for the accomplishment of the ends of the kingdom of God is now clear as never before. And the life of Christ, in which Old and New Testament alike find their completion, reaches a new value in the history of religion and achieves supremacy as the guide, inspiration, and goal of the redemptive process in humanity.

THE PRESIDENT: The first volunteer speaker will be Rev. William H. Bawden, of Perth Amboy, N.J.

MR. BAWDEN: *Mr. President:* What I believe on this subject has been so much better said by others tonight that I should not trespass upon your time did I not also believe that every ounce of emphasis is needed in this discussion, on one of the most burning questions of the day.

I am carried back in thought to the time when, as a student in the chemical laboratory, I stood with a beaker in my hand, holding a mixture just received from the professor. What did it contain? I might hold it up to the light and observe its color, I might even smell it and possibly taste it, although that would be dangerous. I might give a little of it to some dog or cat, and observe what resulted, or even, taking the word of the professor that it was harmless, drink some of it myself. But I was standing in a chemical laboratory; on the shelves before me were ranged bottles filled with various reagents. For weeks past I had been testing the results of pouring them into solutions of some known substances. I had learned that the metals were divided into certain groups dependent upon the action of certain

reagents. Now I was to apply the knowledge gained to the mixture in hand. The results were assured.

The Bible is placed in our hands. We are asked, What is it? Tradition has its answer; the church has one ready; various sects have theirs. But we are living in an age of scientific inquiry. Results truly wonderful have been spread out before us. Particularly in the field of literature have we a critical apparatus, the validity of which we have tested with literatures other than Scriptures. Why not apply to the Bible the same tests that we apply to other books? There are the laws of the canon, those of the text, and those of literature, whose results are assured. But who shall make the test? Neither you nor I are any more qualified to do it than is a physician to prescribe for one of his own family in serious illness. We shall either be too conservative, fearing to do an injustice because of our personal interest, or we shall go to the other extreme, fearing our own timidity.

If it were possible to secure someone for the task who had never before heard of the Bible, one who could have no possible personal interest in the outcome, what would he report as the result of his inquiry? Of course, it is impossible for us to give any other than a subjective answer. But if one might hazard an answer, I strongly suspect that he would wonder who it was who said that the canon is closed, and why; that he would wonder why some writings were included in the canon and certain others omitted. But on the whole, he probably would be disposed to accept our present canon, as a matter of history. So far as the text is concerned, he would certainly question some readings, and as certainly question some proposed changes, but on the whole be willing to accept our modern text as practically correct. In his literary inquiry he would doubtless recognize that many books are composite, he would admit the pseudonymous character of some books and the anonymous character of others, he would perceive the limitations under which most of the books were written, and grant that some of them are fictional, the while attesting the wonderful unity pervading them all. And if we deny these things it were better that a millstone should be hanged about the neck of our modern learning and that it be cast into the midst of the sea!

But if he progresses farther, and experiments personally with

the Bible as he has discovered it to be, he will come to results before which the others pale into insignificance. For the Bible stands forth as a distinctly human product, a book surcharged with humanity, a book written just as other books have been written, and yet a book at the same time so divine, and thus so far above all other books, that we are brought to our knees in adoration as this wonderful message of God's revelation is spread before us. The assured results of modern criticism is to give us a new Bible, a human book, but one at the same time so divine that there is no collection of books to be found in the history of the whole world to compare with it.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: We will now hear from Professor Anthony, of Lewiston, Me.

PROFESSOR ALFRED W. ANTHONY, D.D., Lewiston, Me.: *Mr. President and Brethren:* Our discussion this evening would not be complete without some adequate reference to the results of the lower, but in no sense inferior, criticism of the textual scholars.

In 1514 there was produced in Alcalá, Spain, a work designed for distribution among some few favored monarchs and students, a text of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, subsequently known as the Complutensian Polyglott. At that time no New Testament in the Greek text had ever been committed to the art preservative, printing. Now a printer in Basel, Switzerland, who had the commercial spirit and recognized that there would be a demand for a Greek New Testament, turned to Desiderius Erasmus, the greatest scholar of the day, and asked him to prepare for printing the text of a testament in the Greek; and in ten months' time, having devoted only a fragment of his leisure to the task, Erasmus had a text ready for the printer. This text came from the press in 1516, before that earlier work had been put in circulation, and was the first New Testament in Greek actually printed and circulated. The preface declares that the text was gathered "from very ancient and correct" manuscripts. Textual critics, however, have discovered by careful comparisons that it was taken from recent manuscripts, near Erasmus' own time, and not from one single manuscript older than the tenth

century; and that the profession in the preface, therefore, is neither correct nor honest. Erasmus himself at one time confessed that the text had been "thrown off, rather than edited," *praecipitatum fuit verius quam editum*. This text put forth hurriedly, and in part, because the manuscripts at hand were defective, translated out of Latin back into Greek, in order to complete the New Testament, this text became the standard of all subsequent texts. When the German and English translations were made, this text of Erasmus became the basis of all translations; and these imperfect readings, taken from recent, not ancient manuscripts, entered into the very bone and marrow of our Bible.

This text of Erasmus was reproduced, with but slight variations, by Robert Stephens of Paris in the middle of the sixteenth century; then by Theodore Beza in the latter part of the century; and by the great printing house of Elzevir at Leyden in 1633, more than a century after the hasty, one may well say slovenly, and uncritical work of Erasmus. But now the century of repetition had cast upon the text a kind of halo, and gathered around it a sort of sanctity. The Elzevirs in their preface say *Textum ergo habes nunc ab omnibus receptum*, "a text hast thou, therefore, now received by all." And hence arose the designation *Textus Receptus*.

What have the textual critics been doing? In the first place they discovered that this *Textus Receptus*, despite the lofty protestations of Erasmus, was faulty and unreliable. Then they searched far and wide, in the monasteries, through the libraries, and even in the tombs of all Europe and parts even of Asia and Africa, for ancient manuscripts which might shed light upon the original readings. Of the older manuscripts, written in large capital letters, the uncials, they discovered more than two hundred, most of them fragments. Of cursives, written in the smaller running hand, they brought to light more than two thousand. Then began the immense task of critical comparison, noting differences, estimating values, and determining causes which led to the variations, in order that, working backward through the variations and the causes, they might reconstruct the original readings of the autograph manuscripts, long since lost. Men spent lifetimes on the labor of textual comparison, twenty-eight

years, thirty years, forty years! Thirty thousand variant readings were soon reported! the number increased; and at length even exceeded one hundred and fifty thousand! It is not needful to name the great scholars who spent their lives in these tasks; and are now remembered by comparatively few. Brian Walton may be called the pioneer; John Fell, John Mill, Richard Bentley, the great Bengel, then Wetstein, Griesbach, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and at length Wescott and Hort followed.

Out of a patience, almost beyond our comprehension, they wrought principles of critical judgment and conclusions of critical insight which have been accepted by an almost concurrent verdict of the scholars of today. If they had done naught else than assure us as they do, that the Vatican Manuscript, preserved at Rome, and its close of kin, the Sinaitic Manuscript, discovered by Tischendorf in the convent of St. Catherine on the slopes of Mt. Sinai, now preserved in St. Petersburg, were the oldest and best manuscripts preserved from the past, their services would have been beyond a just appreciation, and to us of inestimable value.

The Revised Version of the New Testament appearing in 1881, and of the Old Testament appearing in 1885 known as the British Version; and the later revision of the New Testament appearing in 1900, and the Old Testament appearing in 1901 called the American Version, rest, both of them, upon these painstaking, indefatigable labors of the textual critics. Our English Bible in its more accurate and perfect form is due to them; and Moulton's *Modern Reader's Bible*, with its skilful literary arrangement, would be altogether impossible without the conclusions of the textual experts. So, too, must nearly all of our inquiries relative to authorship, time of composition, meaning and interpretation of the separate books go back to these fundamental inquiries and these careful, painstaking conclusions relative to the texts.

DR. A. E. SALLEY, Lewiston, Me., offered the closing prayer and benediction.

Adjourned

SECOND DAY

Afternoon Session

Wednesday, November 15, 1911

3:30 P.M.

PROFESSOR ALFRED W. ANTHONY, D.D., Lewiston, Me., presided over the meeting.

Prayer was offered by Professor Herbert L. Willett, Ph.D., of Chicago, Ill.

VICE-PRESIDENT ANTHONY: When, as one of your vice-presidents, I was asked to preside over one of the meetings of this Congress, I very promptly chose this one of all others, because I thought I recognized a certain fitness, inasmuch as I embodied in my own person a kind of union representative, being now in official relations to two bodies, Baptist and Free Baptist, which are now combining common work in common organizations; and I might, therefore, stand as a sort of object-lesson for the theme under discussion.

The union of Baptists and Free Baptists, while requiring the deliberations of more than seven years, has been wrought out on three very simple fundamental principles. The first was formulated in the fall of 1904, and adopted by the Baptist benevolent societies in the spring of 1905. It was simply the declaration that union "was desirable and might be made practicable." The second, phrased in the fall of 1905, made declaration that in history and genius the two bodies were closely allied and now in doctrine and polity were, "substantially one." The third required somewhat longer time to phrase. It involved differences now prevailing, and had also a look toward the future. It really involved a policy. This was phrased in the spring of 1908 in these terms, "Differences, if still existing, may be left where the New Testament leaves them, to the teaching of the Scriptures under the guidance of the Holy Spirit."

Baptists and Free Baptists, on a platform so simple, are united

and are now in process of making their union more real. I am glad to show by my presence a fact which seems to me a great significance, not only for us who are directly concerned, but for others who may witness our example. Is there not a basis as simple, upon which Baptists and Disciples may unite? This is really the question of the afternoon.

Let me present, as I do with great pleasure, the first appointed writer, Dr. Peter Ainslie, of Baltimore, to address us upon the subject: "What hinders the union of the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ?"

REV. PETER AINSLIE, D.D. (Disciple), of Baltimore, Md., read the following paper:

WHAT HINDERS THE UNION OF THE BAPTISTS AND THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST?

Said one of the church Fathers, "Dig deep enough in the human and you will find the divine." There is a similarity between God and man, and every epoch in history marks an approach to a closer similarity. There is nothing more profound in human experience than the response that mankind has made to personified holiness. Of this Schleiermacher said, "I acknowledge a purely inward and mysterious relation of Christ to human nature generally, which is absolutely unlimited." It is this inward and mysterious relation to the divine that gives foundation to all religions; consequently there must be a similarity among all religions and, in particular, a similarity among Christian communions. Of these, some bear a similarity so close that they almost merge together as they flow along through common channels.

In that large family of Immersionists it may be pertinently asked, "What hinders the union of the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ?" And it will be difficult to find an answer, other than that of which we are ashamed, that perpetuates the separation, for we both believe in the fatherhood of God, the divinity of Jesus Christ, and the convicting and sanctifying power of the holy Spirit; we both hold to the inspiration of the Scriptures, we both baptize by immersion penitent believers only

and we both observe the Lord's Supper; we both emphasize the spirituality of religion, individual freedom, and democracy in government. With all this similarity, there still exists between us the open scandal of division and, what is still more an occasion for mortification is, that there are many in these two communions that are entirely indifferent, if not hostile, to the healing of this ugly sore. But to offset this condition, there are hosts of wide-visioned souls in both communions, who are sincerely anxious, not only for closer affiliation, but actual union of the two bodies, and this number is growing with the years.

The differences between us, while often unyielding and sectional and always sectarian, are, however, lessening with each decade and we are more able now, after little more than three-quarters of a century's separation, to look each other in the face, sincerely regretting the swift movements of prejudice and passion in those early years and, with equal sincerity, wishing that some way might be opened whereby these two democratic communions might find a common ground upon which to plant their united standards.

There are minor differences between us and I suppose there are some differences between all Christians in all communions, as Napoleon, in framing the *Concordat*, when cross-questioning the pope and the cardinals, discovered that each one had a somewhat different religion, which was doubtless true and is true more or less of us all, if we do any thinking. But these differences of viewpoints have nothing to do with separating believers into exclusive bodies of worshipers.

The denominational differences between the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ, however, are due largely to our separate literature and our separate schools of thought, from whence we get our distinctive phraseologies, but these minor differences are no greater than those differences between American Baptists and English Baptists, or between the Disciples of Christ in the United States and those in England. I feel as said Ruskin,

Whenever . . . we allow our minds to dwell upon the points in which we differ from other people, we are wrong and in the devil's power. That is the essence of the Pharisee's prayer of thanksgiving, "Lord, I thank Thee that I am not as other men are." At every minute of our lives we should be

trying to find out, not in what we differ from other people, but in what we agree. And the moment we find we can agree as to anything that should be done, kind or good, then do it. Push at it together. You cannot quarrel in a side-by-side push. But the moment that even the best man stops pushing and begins talking, he mistakes his pugnacity for piety, and it is all over.

If, however, there be any sharply drawn doctrinal differences, it is in the names we wear, and in many quarters these two names furnish the sole ground for our separation. They are names, too, that have such histories back of them and associations around them that in this period at least, neither is disposed to yield to the other. Many Baptists recognize the preferableness of the terms "Disciples of Christ" or "Christians" for believers, as is the growing conviction with all Christians, in all parts of the world, but the Disciples of Christ are unwilling to yield that broad, catholic name for the narrow term, "Baptist," which we feel is not only a party name, but is a misnomer for that great body of believers who emphasize the Christ and not baptism as of the greatest importance in the scheme of redemption. Consequently, aside from its being an emphasis of an ordinance, rather than on the Christ, the Disciples of Christ feel keenly that it is an injustice to our Baptist brethren, whose love for Christ is as deep and whose fidelity to him has been proven as often as our own.

The memory of the traditions of the separation of these two communions is a tremendous hindrance to their union. Alexander Campbell wanted to retain fellowship with the Baptists and, in 1826, he wrote:

I and the church with which I am connected are in "full communion" with the Mahoning Baptist Association of Ohio; and through them with the whole Baptist society in the United States; and I do intend to continue in connection with this people so long as they will permit me to say what I believe, to teach what I am assured of, and to censure what is amiss in their views and practices. I have no idea of adding to the catalogue of new sects. This game has been played too long. I labor to see sectarianism abolished, and all Christians of every name united upon the one foundation upon which the apostolic church was founded. To bring Baptists and Pedobaptists to this is my supreme aim. But to connect myself with any people who would require me to sacrifice one item of revealed truth, to subscribe any creed of human device, or restrain me from publishing my

sentiments as discretion and conscience direct, is now, and I hope ever shall be, the farthest from my desires, the most incompatible with my views. And I hope I will not be accused of sectarian partiality when I avow my conviction that the Baptist society have as much liberality in their views, as much of the ancient simplicity of the Christian religion, as much of the spirit of Christianity among them, as is to be found among any other people. To say nothing of the things in which they excel, this may be said of them without prejudice to any. And that they have always been as eminent friends of civil and religious liberty as any sect in Christendom, will not, I presume, be denied by any. . . . And that there is in the views and practices of this large and widely extended community, as great need of reformation, and of a restoration of the ancient order of things, few will contradict. In one thing, perhaps, they may appear in time to come, proudly singular, and pre-eminently distinguished. Mark it well. Their historian in the year 1900 may say, "We are the only people who would tolerate, or who ever did tolerate, any person to continue as a reformer or restorer among us."

Although Mr. Campbell's prophecy regarding Baptist toleration was not fulfilled, yet Spencer Clark, a Baptist editor, wrote him the year following:

Observe, between you and your Baptist brethren there is no difference of opinion as to rule of faith and practice. On this subject we all speak the same language; we all acknowledge the same authority; all profess to be governed by it. What then, is the difference between us? Simply this: we cannot agree as to what the Bible teaches. The Baptists think the Bible teaches the doctrine contained in their creeds; you think it teaches what you have written and published, and what you will hereafter write and publish.

Both Baptists and Disciples of Christ appealed to the Scriptures, which they both unhesitatingly accepted and their differences lay largely in the interpretations of those Scripture passages, which had nothing to do with fellowship, but out of the heat of controversy, and in many instances on account of illiberal education, their differences were so magnified that in many quarters these differences appeared far greater than they ever were.

That Baptists are now what they have always been, and that the Disciples of Christ are now what they have always been is purely a theory unconsciously borrowed from the Roman Catholic church, whose very history, however, disproves the fallacy. The theory belongs to the spirit of sectarianism, which tries to make

equal with the unchangeable Scriptures the policy and practice of a religious communion, each communion too frequently believing itself as infallible as the Scriptures, from which it claims to have sprung. The facts are that while the Scriptures are unchangeable and that humanity is always the same, yet viewpoints are shifted and thought changes, so that movements regarding mankind advance, retrograde, or merge together. It is so with the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ. There appears to have been justification for the rise of the Baptists in the seventeenth century and for the Disciples of Christ in the nineteenth century, but there is an equally justified reason for the union of these communions in the twentieth century, for their messages have now become so similar and they so frequently overlap each other in their local work, that the fact of their separation weakens each and consequently hinders both.

The conditions that caused the separation do not now exist. Both communions have changed, and God pity us if we had not; each has learned from the other and, best of all, both have gotten more of Christ, so that they not only understand each other better, but, in many instances, they are seeking the way for a common fellowship.

From 1813, when the Brush Run Church of the Disciples of Christ was voted into the membership of the Redstone Association, to 1832, when the Dover Association withdrew from a number of ministers designated as "Reformers," and made that year distinctive in the history of the separation of the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ in Virginia, constant discussions of real and imaginary differences, misrepresentations, divisions in local congregations, anathemas, and estrangement of friends crowded those years. The sting of those controversies and memories of those divided congregations have sometimes been precious heirlooms that even this generation treasures among its religious experiences. At the same time there are many exceptions to this. Pardon me, but my grandfather, whose name I have the honor to bear, headed the list of those ministers from whom the Dover Association withdrew, but no memory of bitterness was ever handed down to me by my forebears. On the other hand, affection for the Baptists as for the Disciples of Christ was instilled in me,

and when I entered upon my ministerial training, I bore letters of introduction to the ministers of both the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ in Lexington, Ky. I believe too that I speak the experience of hosts of my brethren of the Disciples of Christ when I say that every effort to bury the unpleasant features of the separation has been in many instances sincerely made by us and not infrequently has it been graciously met by you.

Another hindrance to the union of the Baptist and the Disciples of Christ is the too common misrepresentation that each makes of the other and to this both communions must plead guilty.

To perpetuate denominationalism, distinctive differences must be kept alive. It was one of the common occurrences of the past, and I wish it were wholly in the past, to show how far one communion differed from the other, or to show how perfectly correct one communion was and how absolutely wrong the other was—a spirit that is now dying, and God hasten the day of its burial. For sometimes this notion was carried so far that a communion would change its historic position so as not too closely to resemble the communion in that locality, as the Armenianism of the Methodists in the South and East drove the Baptists in those regions into Calvinism, while the Calvinism of the New England Congregationalists drove the Baptists of that section into Armenianism. And what was true of the Baptists is true more or less of all communions. The Christian world has been too diligent in seeking for disagreements rather than agreements and in doing so, it has frequently lost the spirit of brotherhood and forgotten the badge of Christian discipleship.

The best friends would be estranged if they spent most of their time in finding out their disagreements and discussing them among themselves and whenever they met a friend of either. Denominationalists tell us that it is with them a matter of principle, behind which they hide this and other like sins, but I wish to remind them that it is more a matter of prejudice and sectarianism, which we ought to seek to have the Holy Spirit put to death in us along with envy, malice, jealousy, and every other sin. It is keeping alive our disagreements that furnishes an opportunity for misrepresentation.

Besides, many of these differences are purely expediencies or theological hair-splittings, but the controversy waxes so hot and the breach widens into such unbrotherliness and isolation that in some quarters a Disciple of Christ has to be rebaptized to become a member of a Baptist church. So long as this spirit exists, not only is the possibility of union between the two bodies remote, but Christian brotherhood is only a name without the warmth of sincere affection.

Misrepresentation is a kind of dishonesty in the rôle of self-justification and is due neither to the lack of scholarship, for scholars do it, nor to the lack of the desire for truth, for truth-seekers are sometimes pre-eminent in it. But, out of inherent human weakness, unconscious prejudice obscures the perspective, so that it is almost impossible for a strict denominationalist to write a correct history of another communion or to state its doctrinal peculiarities, especially if the two communions are very similar, like the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ. In some instances the journals of these two communions have as little regard for the Tenth Commandment when speaking of each other as the Mormons have for the Seventh, and usually this situation exists in no intended spirit of spitefulness, but as an honest contribution to the truth, for which they would perhaps willingly go to the field of martyrdom.

Whittier, Longfellow, and Lowell agreed that they would be such friends that whenever one heard anything good about the other he would tell it wherever he had opportunity. Dean Stanley went farther. He made it a practice always to champion the cause of any man that was abused in his presence, nor would he allow ill-natured sarcasms or gossip at the expense of others to be tolerated in his home. I had rather have a religion like that than worship at the shrine of the strictest orthodoxy and forget there the sin of taking up a reproach against my neighbor.

In most instances, both denominational journals and denominational colleges are hindering the progress of Christian union by perpetuating denominational peculiarities. Our theological professors and religious editors are good men and most of them are making great sacrifices for their causes, but it is rather the exception than the rule that they give as fairly the doctrinal posi-

tion and history of another communion, especially if that communion is closely related to them, as a member of that communion would do it. Sometimes in their spirit of fairness—and I do not dispute their desire to be fair—they think that they are more capable of giving the correct position of another communion, because they are not members of it and therefore can judge it impartially, as a certain secular historian of the North undertook to give what he called a correct history of the southern Confederacy. The correctness of the history was based on the fact that he had never lived in the South, and consequently was free from prejudice in its favor, which no one disputed after reading his unfair contribution.

There are times, doubtless, when an impartial historian is the true recorder of facts, but usually he must not be identified with either cause. It would be difficult for a Baptist to present correctly the cause of the Disciples of Christ, as it would be for a Disciple of Christ to present the cause of the Baptists. Their similarities merging together and their history lines lapping over into each other would make most difficult the task, however fair the historian desired to be. When our journals open their columns and our colleges open their classrooms to information regarding each other at first hand from accredited representatives, a long step will have been taken toward closer affiliation between the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ.

Denominational journals are necessarily narrow and biased because they look out largely upon the fields of their denomination, magnifying their own interests and minimizing the interests of other communions. It would be quite impossible for one who reads only his denominational literature to look out fairly and sympathetically upon another communion, much less upon the whole Christian world. Consequently Baptists and Disciples of Christ should freely exchange literature. I mean that Baptists should read the weekly journals of the Disciples of Christ and the Disciples of Christ should read the weekly journals of the Baptists. The time may come before denominational journals are abolished, and doubtless will come, that a weekly journal will dare to publish on its first page the legend, "A Weekly Newspaper for the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ."

Denominational colleges, where our young men are prepared for the ministry, likewise scan unfairly the world-field, and perhaps, more than the denominational journal, fall into unconscious misrepresentation of other communions in their attempt thoroughly to indoctrinate their young men for the ministry, frequently fastening a church history upon the young minister that will take generations to uproot. But we are on the upward march and the time is yonder in the future when a Baptist college will have a Disciple of Christ to give annually a course of lectures on the message of the Disciples of Christ to the divided church, as a college of the Disciples of Christ will likewise give annually a course of lectures by a Baptist on the place of the Baptists in history. As has been said, "Religion will adjust itself to fact," and in the words of Lord Acton in speaking of Roman Catholic apologies for the St. Bartholomew massacre, "Such things will cease to be written when men perceive that truth is the only merit that gives worth and dignity to history."

That wicked suspicion that Christians of one communion have of the other furnishes another hindrance to the union of the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ. This largely grows out of the lack of association with each other and therefore the lack of knowledge of each other. The Baptists and the Disciples of Christ ought to be personal friends. There is no reason why Baptist ministers and those of the Disciples of Christ should not meet together in a common ministerial association. This is done in some cities and it is apparently agreeable to both parties. Why should it not be? If this is practiced generally and sincerely, later it may be equally agreeable for Baptist state associations and state conventions of the Disciples of Christ to meet in joint sessions, especially where we both cover the same territory.

For my part, I think the time is ripe to exchange preachers, without submitting them to the humiliation of repenting of their errors in theology and being subjected to an examination. Of course there are some preachers among the Disciples of Christ whom the Baptists would not want for their pulpits, neither would many churches of the Disciples of Christ want them, as there are preachers among the Baptists whom the Disciples of Christ would not care for, nor would many Baptist churches care for

them. But in all communions and movements there are men abreast of the great interests of the kingdom of God, and churches equally alive to these broader and higher interests. It is of these that I speak, for there are numbers of Baptist preachers who could fill pulpits among the Disciples of Christ without the slightest criticism, as there are doubtless ministers among the Disciples of Christ who could fill Baptist pulpits in the same spirit.

In view of the fact that we are so close together doctrinally and with the increasing opportunities of knowing each other personally, to maintain the attitude of suspicion and isolation appears unquestionably to be a violation of the fundamental principles of Christian brotherhood. Said Carlyle, "Doubt of whatever kind can be ended by action alone." Thought has its place, but faith springs out of action, whether it be regarding our relationship to God or to men. Intercommunion privileges, granting and receiving church letters, and exchanging evangelistic meetings could be worked now with profit to both, where there is less prejudice and broad culture.

The wall of sectarianism has long divided us, as it has every other communion. From the very beginning of our separation, sincere souls on both sides have discussed the advisability of scaling the wall, which is now crumbling in the atmosphere of a broader faith. We have talked long and prayed much. Has the time not come to batter down this wall? When our country was discussing the advisability of resuming specie payment, Horace Greely blurted out, "The way to resume is to resume." It is likewise so regarding the union of the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ. Each body being a democracy, and opinions being different in different sections of the country, it is not likely that union generally would come by the action of a few, but in those sections of the country where each body sees the necessity and practicability of union, this union should begin—not simply reaching by our hands across the falling debris, but by leveling to the ground the wall of sectarianism between us that its foundations may be buried, and standing under a united standard, to march as common brothers to a common cause.

When suspicion and the heat of controversy shall have died

in our bosoms like smouldering embers, we will seek the silence of God, where the decisive battles of the soul tell for most. There we will forget the sting of the past, there we will find the truth of history, and there we will cease to suspect one another, for our love to God can only be interpreted in our love to those who love him. To be alike in faith and practice and these to be according to the Scriptures, and yet to be unlike the fellowship taught in those same Scriptures, presents a problem that has more to do with ethics than doctrine. When we both have seen more clearly the fundamentals of our common faith, we shall repent of our unbrotherliness one to the other, and somewhere down the years the clouds will be lifted, and we shall possess the true perspective. Then because of our love for each other—Baptists and Disciples of Christ—we shall prove our right to be workers with Christ for the conquest of the world.

VICE-PRESIDENT ANTHONY: The next speaker with an assigned paper is Professor Douglas C. MacIntosh, Ph.D., New Haven, Conn.

PROFESSOR DOUGLAS C. MACINTOSH, PH.D., of Yale Theological Seminary, New Haven, Conn., then read as follows:

WHAT HINDERS THE UNION OF THE BAPTISTS AND THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST?

The question is a timely one. The demand for church union is becoming more and more insistent. From the foreign mission field, from the western frontier settlement, from the eastern village and rural district, and from the down-town and semi-down-town city district there comes the same call for co-operation instead of competition. Christian leaders are urging a consolidation of our forces that the principles of our Christian civilization may be safeguarded at home and extended abroad. It is coming to be pretty generally felt that in the present critical situation the weakness caused by disunion is almost criminal, and that, as soon as it can be accomplished without the sacrifice of any greater benefit, the union of Protestant Christendom is imperative. Points of agreement are beginning to be emphasized, and in view of the fact that Baptists and Disciples both practice the

immersion of believers as the only form of baptism, the question is repeatedly asked, Why should not at least these two similar denominations join their forces and become one body?

Why not, indeed? What *hinders* the union of the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ? The question is well worded. In the early stages of negotiation it is even more important to be clear than to be conciliatory. An external union which ignores differences is to be recommended only when those differences are unimportant; and in spite of the external resemblance between Baptists and Disciples, the differences between them, in the past at least, have been of fundamental importance.

But an examination of differences need not be conducted in a controversial spirit. While two contrary positions cannot both be wholly right, they may both be partly wrong; and so it has been, I believe, in the case before us. The real basis of the important disagreement between our two denominations in the past has been, I take it, a wrong fundamental agreement. In other words, what has hindered the union of Baptists and Disciples has been the literalistic legalism that has dominated the thought of both denominations. Moreover, it must be admitted that this legalistic conception of Christian duty still lingers in both our communions.

But the hopeful feature of the situation is that possibly this common cause of disagreement, this legalism, may prove to be not inherent in the essential nature of either body, but a disease—of long standing, it is true, and yet a curable disease—with which the developing life of each denomination has been afflicted, as have practically all Protestant bodies for more than three hundred years. For complete demonstration of the more favorable view our appeal must be to the future, but strong supporting evidence may be derived from history.

This is particularly true of early Baptist history. Like the other reformers, the Baptists stood for an evangelical, spiritual religion; but, unlike the others, they insisted upon a spiritual church for the preservation and propagation of that spiritual religion. The point upon which the Swiss Anabaptists took definite issue with Zwingli was the question of a regenerate and spiritual church membership. Their organizing principle was their deter-

mination to realize, as far as possible, the ideal of "a pure church and congregation of the true children of God who have the Spirit of God and are ruled and led by him." This is the secret of their vigorous protest from the first against infant baptism, because with infant baptism was bound up the institution of a state church with its membership largely composed of the unregenerate and unspiritual and its policy largely under their control. This interest of the Anabaptists in a spiritual church is in large measure the secret of their appeal to the New Testament authority for a regenerate church membership in argument with their opponents, who also claim to be restoring New Testament Christianity. Moreover, practically all of the distinctive principles of the Baptists had their origin in connection with their experienced value or even necessity for the safeguarding of the spirituality of the church. The separation of church and state, complete religious liberty, the equality in right and privilege of all believers as members of the church, and the independence of the local church, as well as believers' baptism—all of these were advocated because they were felt to be indispensable to the maintaining of a spiritual church. Even the restriction of communion to members of the church, or at least to those who had been baptized as believers, was originally felt to be a necessary protective measure in the interests of the spirituality of the church. And perhaps most remarkable of all is the well-known fact that the Anabaptists of the Continent practiced pouring, sprinkling, or immersion as suited their convenience; none of them, so far as is known, insisted upon immersion as the only valid form; and the same is almost undoubtedly true of the early English Baptists. All of which goes to prove that the original Baptist interest was, and that the essential Baptist interest is, not in the setting up of a legalistic type of religion and church organization, but in the founding of a spiritual church for the promotion of spiritual religion—a church and a religion thoroughly Christian and evangelical, but at the same time inwardly free.

But in some measure that which was a means of strength, has become our weakness. By a not unnatural development, the appeal to the scriptural standard as a means to realizing the ideal of a spiritual church led in time to the ideal of a church patterned

rite of baptism has an absolutely essential place in the process of salvation and that there is no assurance of eternal life for the unbaptized, i.e., for those who have not been immersed in the name of Christ after faith, repentance, and confession? They did not teach that baptism necessarily regenerates, but that one cannot be sure of regeneration without it. It was what might be called a half-way sacramentalism with respect to baptism.

Thus, while the legalism of the Baptists made them ritualists, the legalism of the Disciples made them not only ritualists but also sacramentalists; and it is this sacramentalism which has been, up to the present, the chief hindrance to union between the two denominations. As in the case of the Baptists the original purpose of maintaining the spirituality of the church has been in danger of being frustrated through the ritualism to which their legalism has led, so the original aim of the Disciples to reunite all Christians was defeated by the very means by which it was hoped that it might be accomplished. The accentuated legalism, instead of opening the door of union, raised new barriers against it. The ritualism to which it led shut out all non-Immersionists, while the sacramentalism to which it also led shut out those with whom they agreed in their ritualism, viz., the Baptists.

It ought to be recognized by this time and might as well be frankly acknowledged that the prospect of union upon the old basis of a legalism of the letter of the New Testament is absolutely hopeless. As we have seen, it is agreement in the legalistic attitude that is the basis of the irreconcilable disagreement. For the Baptists to adopt a sacramentalist interpretation of immersion would be a calamity, and at this stage of their history and in the history of Christian thought it is really unthinkable. Whether it is implied in any of the New Testament writings or not, this sacramentalism does not belong to the essence, the undying germ, of the Christian religion. On the other hand the Disciples, so long as they remain legalists, are not likely to come over to the Baptist position, because of the tremendous advantage they have in argument upon a literalistic basis. It is scarcely possible to remain candid and deny that while there is lack of clearness on the point, some at least of the writings of the New Testament imply the idea of some sort of saving efficacy

attaching to baptism. If, finally, it be suggested that this difference may be ignored, and union consummated anyway, the teaching of experience is against it, *wherever the legalistic spirit still prevails*. Particular facts might be cited here, but let it suffice to say that under very favorable circumstances the experiment has been tried and has failed, the two elements being obliged to withdraw from each other on account of their irreconcilable difference upon this vital question.

And yet the writer is glad to testify that he knows scores if not hundreds of ministers of both denominations, zealous in the promotion of a spiritual Christianity, who are abundantly ready for union with each other—who are, in fact, almost indistinguishable from each other as religious groups, save that they bear different denominational names. Now what is it that has led to this remarkable unification? The answer is that one and the same cause has liberated both these Baptists and these Disciples from their legalism and their ritualism and the latter from their sacramentalism as well, and that that one main cause is the much-dreaded and much-decried application of critical methods to the study of the Scriptures. There is not time here to indicate in detail just how this effect has been produced, but it may be said that the combined effect of the textual, literary, and historical criticism of the New Testament has been to establish with practical certainty or high probability the following positions, viz., that in popular Judaism as well as in other religions of the time a somewhat magical efficacy was supposed to be connected with ceremonial immersion, and that the same idea was entertained with reference to Christian baptism by large numbers at least of the members of the early Christian communities, including several of the New Testament writers; that Jesus, however, in harmony with his spiritual conception of religion and his antagonism to the legalism and ritualism of the Pharisees, regarded John's baptism simply as a form of initiation in itself unimportant, but that he submitted to it to express his indorsement of the movement inaugurated by John, and his desire to co-operate therein, consecrating himself at the same time to his own public mission, but that he never regarded baptism as having sacramental efficacy and never imposed it as an external law and test of obedience.

With reference to Paul's attitude there is still difference of opinion, some regarding him as the founder of sacramentalism in the Christian church, while others claim that it is more reasonable, in view of his lofty spiritual teaching and his protests against Jewish and judaizing legalism, to think of him as having mitigated the sacramentalism he found already existing as a survival of primitive magical religion among the early Christians, by teaching that immersion is not the cause but the symbol of the mystical experience of union with Christ.

But while the critical study of the New Testament enables one to separate between the kernel and the husk in this matter of baptism, i.e., between the essentially Christian interpretation and the relics of a pre-Christian and sub-Christian superstition, it leads at the same time to such a view of revelation and inspiration as tends to eradicate, without injury to faith, the last vestiges of literalistic legalism, together with the ritualism and sacramentalism built upon it. The Scriptures come to be regarded as a human record of a progressive and culminating divine revelation, a record written under the inspiring influence of that revelation; sufficient, consequently, as a source of saving revelation and inspiration to humanity, although not in any external, literalistic sense infallible.

The giving up of a legalistic attitude toward the Scriptures while remaining responsive to their spiritual message—a change which is going on rapidly in both our denominations and is bound to do so increasingly—this is the most hopeful omen of the coming union. As we have seen, it will destroy the ritualism, but not the rite as a voluntary symbolic expression of Christian faith and purpose. In the second place, by removing the basis of sacramentalism it makes possible the agreement of Baptists and Disciples with reference to Christian experience. Baptists used to claim that repentance precedes faith, while Disciples insisted that faith comes before repentance. Now, as with the disappearance of baptismal sacramentalism Disciples are coming to regard faith and repentance as being the marks of an already accomplished regeneration, the old controversy as to the time-order of faith and repentance is beginning to be quite forgotten. Christian faith, as turning to God, and Christian repentance, as turning from sin,

are seen to be both essentially acts or attitudes of will; each involves the other; they are inseparable aspects of the same initial Christian experience of regeneration, which is manifested as conversion, that is, the turning from sin to God. Consequently the Baptist can freely admit that ordinarily there is an intellectual element in faith preceding this regenerate repentance, while the Disciple can as freely concede that commonly there is an emotional phase of repentance that comes before saving faith.

In the third place, this educational process will make the Baptists and the Disciples not only ready for union with each other, but at the same time almost ready for union with all other evangelical Christians—provided that the same educational process takes place among them. As soon as all are willing to put the Christian symbols, baptism and the Lord's supper, upon a somewhat more voluntary basis, not only making the mode of baptism optional either with the individual candidate or else with the local church, but also making it possible for the local church to allow individuals, in case of conscientious scruples about external rites, to become members of the church without baptism in any form, provided they have the spiritual qualifications for church membership, then there will be no insuperable obstacle to the external union of those who have already become one in spirit. And doubtless many will then voluntarily substitute a simple dedication service for infant baptism and adopt immersion as a symbolic expression of their faith and purpose, who have refused to do so when in pharisaic spirit we have said, "You must be immersed or be guilty of disobedience," or in pagan spirit, "You must be immersed or forfeit all assurance of eternal life." When we have cast the beam out of our own eye, then shall we see clearly to cast out the mote that is in our brother's eye.

And finally, when purified of our legalism as Baptists and Disciples we shall be more than ever able to make our own special and much-needed contribution to the united church of the future. As has been well said, the great question is not, What must we *give up* for the sake of union? but, What can we *give* to the united church of the future? The Disciples, who may be expected to contribute to that united body its name, can also give what is more important, viz., the idea of the union of Christians

through a return to essential Christianity, a faithful discipleship to Christ; while the Baptists can contribute their emphasis upon the ideal of a spiritual church for the preservation and propagation of a spiritual and evangelical religion.

VICE-PRESIDENT ANTHONY: Rev. J. I. Spencer, D.D. (Disciple), is detained at his home through sickness, and I make the announcement now so that the brethren may be prepared to discuss this subject through their voluntary utterances. I now have pleasure in introducing Professor W. J. McGlothlin, of Louisville, Ky.

PROFESSOR W. J. MCGLOTHLIN, D.D., Louisville, Ky.: *Mr. President:* As I interpret my duty on this occasion it is to set before this body what I believe to be the hindrances to a union between the Baptists and the Disciples at this time, that is, to diagnose the case, not to suggest or apply remedies for the disease. It must be remembered also that I am by appointment to deal only with the hindrances to union. In attempting to perform this task one must necessarily speak from his own standpoint and in some sense from the standpoint of the community from which he comes. He must undertake the difficult task of understanding and setting forth the views of his own denomination over against those of another communion with which he can be at best only partially acquainted. He attempts to speak in some degree in a representative capacity without being appointed by anybody to do so. In such a position one must speak with the utmost frankness and with unflinching kindness. I speak frankly from the Baptist standpoint in the expectation that the other speaker will present the position of the Disciples.

In undertaking to speak of the relations of the Baptists and Disciples one is at once confronted by the fact that both bodies, taken as a whole, vary greatly in spirit, beliefs, and practices in different sections of our country. At places they are so nearly alike in all important respects and the feeling between them is so fraternal as to make co-operation easy and even union seem to be possible. But that is by no means true everywhere. In places the differences are important and the feeling so sharp

as to render the consideration of union useless until the two bodies approach each other more nearly.

In considering the present hindrances to union it might be well to glance at the origin of the differences which caused the separation at the beginning. These had their rise in the peculiar views of the Campbells, Thomas and Alexander, father and son. Whatever is original and distinctive among the Disciples has been inherited from the Campbells, for the body as a whole is but the lengthened shadow of the founders. Whatever changes have marked the history of the body in recent years have been in the way of return toward the common Christianity from which the Campbells departed.

Their peculiar views are the outgrowth of their unusual experiences. To begin with, they were Scotch-Irish, intensely religious, persistent, and combative. The father of Thomas Campbell was reared a Roman Catholic and afterward joined the Episcopal church in whose communion he remained till death, I believe. Thomas Campbell left the Episcopal church on his conversion and joined the Seceders, one of the narrowest and most exclusive sects of the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians. On coming to America he soon offended his Seceder brethren by his catholic spirit, was disciplined, and united with the Presbyterians; from them he went to an independent position, then to the Baptists, and finally to an independent position again. Alexander started with the Seceders and traveled the same ecclesiastical road. These changes were due, not to any particular religious experience, but to a study of the Scriptures as the source of all religious faith and practice. It was an intellectual, rational process. Moreover, the friction and antagonisms generated by these constant changes developed an intense opposition to denominational distinctions and definite theological statement. Still further, both Campbells were school-teachers with a school-teacher's clear, analytical, literalistic, logical mind. Finally, Alexander Campbell married a wife with a competency, which made it possible for her husband to live in security and comparative comfort and at the same time denounce the "hireling preachers" who depended on their preaching for a living.

The net result of all these experiences was to make of Mr.

Alexander Campbell (with whom we shall henceforth deal as the leader of the movement) a very peculiar interpreter of the Bible. It must not be forgotten that he agreed with his Baptist brethren on most of the essential doctrines, such as the view of God, the person and work of Christ, the resurrection, immortality, the democracy and independence of the churches, the form and subject of baptism, and the sole and absolute authority of the Scriptures in all matters of faith and practice. But he differed widely from them in many points in the interpretation of the Bible. His religious and other experiences had made of him an interpreter who was rationalistic, agnostic, literalistic, and individualistic.

He was rationalistic. He had reached his position, as we have seen, through a process of reasoning, and he was therefore disposed to rationalize everything. He had no patience with the mysticism of the Baptists, and was indeed incapable of understanding their feelings. He made sport of it and waved it out of court. Faith was the plain, rational process of accepting evidence for a proposition, viz., Jesus Christ was the son of God. The Holy Spirit had no part in conversion, except that in the long ago he gave the Word whose testimony can and must be accepted in the same rational way that any other evidence is accepted. Mysticism had little or no place in his thought. Religious experience was carefully analyzed and its various component parts numbered one, two, three, like a proposition in mathematics. Faith, repentance, regeneration, baptism, remission—thus it must be in every case.

He was agnostic. He refused to accept many current theological definitions or to make any of his own. He attacked creeds and confessions savagely, and refused to state many of the most important articles of faith except in biblical language. He distinguished between faith and opinions. The latter term covered the greater portion of the Christian beliefs of the time, and about them he took an agnostic position, refusing to make any kind of statement a condition of communion.

He was literalistic. To him the Bible was authority in *all matters of faith and practice*. There was no place left for the exercise of Christian freedom and common sense. "Where the

Bible speaks we speak, where it is silent we hold our peace." "Clear precept or approved example" must settle everything. On this ground he opposed missionary and Bible societies in the earlier years, insisted on weekly communion, declined to vote on the reception of members, while some of his followers went farther and revived foot-washing, the kiss of peace, etc. It was probably this same literalistic tendency which led him to insist upon a biblical name for his followers.

He was individualistic. He insisted that he have the freedom to believe and advocate anything which he might think he found in the Scriptures, and at the same time remain in communion with the Baptists, no matter how far he might differ from them. Such a position is ecclesiastical anarchy. If every man should assert for himself the same freedom, harmony and co-operation would be impossible, and bedlam would reign where men held any cherished convictions. He asserted for himself the same freedom within a religious communion that the Baptists had claimed and suffered for in the state.

Moreover he attached his own peculiar meanings to such current religious terms as "faith," "regeneration," "remission"—meanings used by no other Christians whatsoever—making it well-nigh impossible for men of other communions to understand him. He was constantly and inevitably misunderstood, and had only himself to blame. Everett Gates goes so far as to say, "The whole controversy arose out of a change in the meaning of terms used" (*Early Relation and Separation*, p. 111). Even to this day it is almost impossible for a Baptist to understand a Disciple when discussing religious things, largely because of the peculiar vocabulary created by Mr. Campbell and perpetuated by his followers. Gates points out this fact as one of Mr. Campbell's greatest defects.

It is possible that the influence exerted by the Catholic and Episcopal churches over the Campbells through the father of Thomas explains the sacramental tendencies found among them. Thomas declared that no Christian worship was complete without the supper and insisted strenuously that it must be celebrated every Sunday. Alexander began to associate remission of sins with baptism as early as 1820, and by 1828 held that there was

no remission of sins, under ordinary circumstances, apart from baptism. He was conscious that his views were novel, lying midway between those of the Catholics and the Baptists, and regarded them as his greatest contribution to "the ancient order of things." In trying to stir between baptismal regeneration and the symbolical significance of baptism he essayed a very difficult task and was usually on the rocks, now on this side, now on that. Gates points out that he came gradually to his views, and that these views seemed to waver even to the end (*Early Relation*, p. 113). Passages can be found which alone could teach nothing but baptismal regeneration, while others deny that position.

These are some of the characteristics of Mr. Campbell as an interpreter, which led him into positions which differed from those of the Baptists so widely that harmony was impossible and separation the only Christian course. The most important of those differences of belief were his doctrine of baptismal remission of sins, his view of faith as the intellectual acceptance of a proposition, his denial of the action of the Holy Spirit in conversion except in giving the Word, and his silence about many important doctrines.

Differences in practice were weekly communion, requiring no religious experience but only the confession that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, acceptance of members without any vote of the church, and the administration of the ordinances by laymen.

During the eighty years of their separate existence both bodies have changed and they are now much nearer together in belief and practice than they were when they separated. What now hinders a union? They have changed, but many of the differences which originally caused the separation remain, at least in parts of the country, and hinder a union. If the two bodies could be forced into a union a speedy separation would inevitably follow as the only means of restoring some degree of peace. What are some of these hindrances to union at the present?

1. First of all there remains, in Kentucky and other sections where the Disciples existed before the separation, the memory of the bitterness of those early days. Mr. Campbell remained in communion with the Baptists when he knew himself to be out of harmony with them, and used their organization as the channel

of his propaganda. He felt himself justified in revolutionizing the Baptists in the interest of his "reformation." Baptist churches and associations were rent in twain and some were carried out of the Baptist fold altogether. The memory of such things does not soon die in those regions where they occurred.

2. The practical difficulty. Both bodies are congregational in church government, and hence, it would seem, could easily unite where the local churches found themselves in harmony. And so they could but for the fact that both bodies have extensive general tasks such as missions and education which must be supported. It would be difficult for the united church to determine what general benevolence it would support.

3. There seems to me to be a difference of spirit or atmosphere between the bodies as I know them in Kentucky, which is possibly the most important and fundamental of all the differences. It is elusive and difficult to define or describe and yet I think it exists. The Baptists still have a large element of the mystical or emotional in their preaching and worship which is almost wholly wanting among the Disciples. The Baptist feels himself in somewhat alien atmosphere when among the Disciples. The vocabulary of song and prayer and preaching is more or less strange to him. He recognizes the vigor, aggressiveness, and success of the Disciples and often wishes his own people could be stirred to a like activity. But their religious life, while intensely active, seems to him to lack depth and inwardness—in a word, spirituality. They still rationalize faith and religious experience, making them appear to him legalistic, logical, and external rather than vital; their assertions still stop short, in an agnostic way, where his own faith walks confidently in the midst of the unseen. It is an incontrovertible fact that there is in Kentucky usually less spiritual harmony between the Baptists and Disciples than between the Baptists and most other evangelical churches.

4. The great body of the Disciples in my section still holds to baptismal remission of sins, and this is the most obvious and objectionable peculiarity of the body from the Baptist standpoint. The essence of the Baptist contention has steadily been opposition to every form of sacramentalism, the advocacy of salvation by

faith in the Lord Jesus Christ alone, without the interposition of church or ordinance, and a purely spiritual church. They recognize the fact that the Disciples require repentance and faith before baptism, thus avoiding the worst evils of sacramentalism; but they feel assured that the doctrine of remission of sins only in baptism is both unscriptural and practically dangerous to the reality of a vital and living faith. Men are prone to rest their faith on ceremonies rather than upon the living Christ, as is evident from the fact that more than half the Christian world believe in baptismal regeneration. Such a statement as the following from McGarvey (*Tract on Baptism*, p. 19) seems to a Baptist to be a practical denial of evangelical Christianity and really to endanger the souls of men. He says, "As it [baptism] brings us into Christ, unto the forgiveness of our sins, it imparts to us the blessed hope that when we come to be laid in the grave, a strong arm will lift us out of it as we were lifted out of the burial in water." Garrison says in *The Story of a Century*, p. 211, "Baptism is the divinely ordained means by which the believing, penitent soul casts itself on the mercy of God, seeking salvation by grace." Now most Baptists feel that union with a body that holds such views would be a repudiation of our whole history and a blow at spiritual religion itself. Union would seem to be impossible until the Disciples modify their position on the design and place of baptism in the Christian system.

5. Strange to say, the attitude of the Disciples toward Christian union is one of the difficulties in the way of union. They are *the disciples*, Christians; all others are *sects*, upon whose poor heads the vials of wrath are poured out until the vocabulary of vituperation is exhausted. Careful distinction is made between "church union," which is advocated by "the sects," and "Christian union," which is advocated by themselves. The latter means the disintegration of "the sects" and their coming to be "simply Christians," that is, Disciples. For a century they have been advocating Christian union with vehemence, as the chief plank in their platform, and yet they have united with nobody except the followers of Barton W. Stone with whom they were in substantial agreement. Nobody takes them very seriously, for they have shown as little of the spirit of fraternity and conciliation as any of

the so-called sects. They have continued their predatory habits of proselytizing down to the present, and think of union on no other basis. They have rather divided and embittered than united and harmonized. Baptists could hardly accept the assumptions of the Disciples in this direction.

6. Their views of the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion and their conception of faith are unsatisfactory; likewise their insistence upon weekly communion, the character of the confession required of converts, the manner of receiving members into the church, and some other differences, but I have not time to speak of them now. I have touched upon the most important hindrances to union as they exist in my own state and section. I have spoken with the utmost kindness but with frankness. Union cannot be based upon sentiment, but must have a solid basis of large agreement in important matters. The agnosticism which holds important opinions in abeyance during the discussion of union becomes an aggressive gnosticism which destroys peace and fraternity after the union is consummated. Union must be preceded by a large measure of unity, else it is a calamity rather than a blessing. Union will come all the sooner, if it comes at all, by frankly looking the facts in the face, seeing things as they are. It is perilous to prophesy, but the signs of the times seem to me to indicate that union between the Baptists and the Disciples is a good way in the future in Kentucky and the South. And yet they both stand upon the bedrock of the sole authority of the Scriptures in matters of faith and practice, and it would seem that two bodies which are already so largely agreed and which maintain this fundamental basal principle ought ultimately to come into substantial agreement about all important matters. I sincerely hope and believe they will. The road to this as to all union is along the line of a careful exegesis of the Scriptures on broad and scientific principles. Where the two bodies find themselves in sufficient agreement let them unite if they so desire. Let the rest in both bodies seek more and more to know and put into practice the mind of Christ concerning his people, in the meantime endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, and the oneness for which Christ prayed will finally come. (*Applause.*)

VICE-PRESIDENT ANTHONY: Our next speaker, whose card is before me, is Professor E. B. Pollard, of Crozer Seminary, Penn.

PROFESSOR E. B. POLLARD, PH.D.: This is a subject in which we are all deeply interested, and one of great importance, as was discovered long ago. It has been nineteen years since this Congress first took up the question. Dr. B. B. Tyler, of the Church of the Disciples, and others then presented it very ably before this body in Philadelphia, in 1892, in one of the sanest discussions (except that of this afternoon, of course) to which I have ever listened. It is pertinent to ask whether it is not time we take the matter out of the realm of discussion and put it into the realm of action. I have had the pleasure of residing in that part of the country from which Dr. McGlothlin comes, and I am sure it would be impossible to accomplish there anything worth while in the way of union. It is often said that we ought to emphasize the things upon which we agree and try to forget the things upon which we differ. Ordinarily this is an excellent rule. The question of this afternoon forbids that because it asks, "What are the hindrances to union?" We do have to face situations as they are. As I diagnose the case the greatest hindrances are ignorance, and its sister, prejudice. If all Baptists and all Disciples were as intelligent as they ought to be in the interpretation of Scripture and in understanding the history of religion, and the course of the Divine Spirit as He has been at work in human life, there would be little difficulty in our getting together to overcome the unreasonable prejudice that exists in some parts of the country.

But impatience may become a serious hindrance to the union of these two bodies. It is a mistake to press the matter unduly, for it would certainly bring about the presence of three denominations instead of two: Baptists and Disciples who are willing to unite, and besides there would be the Baptists who would not *budge*, and the Disciples who would dissent. So we would have not an improvement of the situation, but one more denomination. It requires patience, the cultivation of the spirit of Christ, and the education of both bodies in the larger light that the spirit of God

ally uniting. This is as it should be. It is truly anomalous that two bodies of people so closely related in history and beliefs should remain divided. In fact the differences between Baptists and Disciples are not greater than those seen between different congregations in both Baptist and Disciple ranks. In fact when both bodies are taken at their best, on the high levels of Christian intelligence and devotion, there is little perceptible difference.

Among the steps which may be taken to promote unity of sentiment, leaving the question of ultimate and incorporating unity to be decided by time, the following at least are timely and practicable:

The two bodies should co-operate most earnestly in all places where they have common existence. The old rivalries ought to be forgotten and a spirit of comradeship cultivated that would lead to such active co-operation as to make the spirit of brotherhood apparent.

In those fields in which the Baptists are strong and the Disciples weak or have no church organization, they should unite on the basis of a Baptist church, thus lending all possible support to the one organization. Similarly in those places where the Disciples are strong and the Baptists weak or without a church, a union should be effected which will prevent rivalry and loss.

Wherever Baptists and Disciples have churches, and there is not room for both, a union should be effected upon terms which will compromise the convictions of neither group. And this ought not to be difficult where Baptists and Disciples are really aware of the historic testimony of the two denominations.

The exchange of ministers by the two denominations would be a step in the direction of ultimate unity. There is no reason why Disciples should not welcome to their pulpits ministers from the Baptist denomination, nor why Baptists should not call to their pulpits ministers from among the Disciples. Such a practice would increasingly obliterate the present lines of separation.

Common gatherings for exchange of opinions, like the present Congress, to which both Baptists and Disciples are invited,

of religious beliefs and customs which made the few outstanding points of divergence questions of bitter discussion. Baptists and Disciples hated each other in those days with a bitterness which was wholly absent from the thought of either denomination regarding the rest of the Protestant world or even the Roman Catholic.

But today the old controversies are dead. And it would be difficult to arouse in the intelligent representatives of either denomination in this generation the spirit of debate over doctrines and usages that were once the subject of eager rivalry. In fact it is doubtful if either Baptists or Disciples of average intelligence have any acquaintance with the subjects that were once the themes of antagonism. Such controversies as those regarding the priority of faith and repentance, the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion, the relation of baptism to the remission of sins, and the celebration of the Lord's Supper would be impossible today, chiefly because neither denomination has maintained its dogmatic and controversial position regarding these questions. And in most instances the debates grew out of a failure to properly define the terms employed.

Probably the most outstanding contrast between Baptists and Disciples grew out of the fact that the former did not share that flaming enthusiasm with which the Disciples of the first generation threw themselves against the romanticism of current religious teaching, and appealed to the Scriptures as the sole norm of faith and conduct. It was the rejection of so much of the current teaching of that time in behalf of a literal interpretation of the Word of God which caused the Disciples to be interpreted as literalists and legalists, as over against the more emotional and ardent Christian experience of the older denominations, including the Baptists. If this tendency has persisted among the Disciples it is perhaps because of the strong bent of their beginnings as Protestants against the sway of emotion in the process of entrance upon the Christian life.

At the present time the centrifugal forces are spending themselves, and a return to closer unity is both desirable and inevitable. Whether or not we may wish it, Disciples and Baptists are drawing closer together, and in many communities are actu-

his brother. But inasmuch as Baptists are not at one as to the way the Bible should be conceived, it is too much to expect Baptists and Disciples to agree. Ultimately, however, we shall come to common understanding on the question of authority in religion.

Another hindrance to union is that laymen from the two denominations do not mingle often enough. There is not so great a difference of opinion among the educated ministers of both denominations, because they meet more frequently in religious gatherings, or have points of contact by reading other than strictly denominational journals. If in some way, without seeming to persecute, we could have the Postal Department make a ruling to forbid the transmission by mail of certain publications of the stricter sect, an annoying obstacle to union would be removed. (*Laughter.*) The trouble is that these publications are for the most part taken by readers that live in the era of controversy, and are kept there, waterlogged by denominational journalism. (*Laughter.*)

THE VICE-PRESIDENT: Bearing in mind the announcement of the evening session, beginning at eight o'clock, the Congress will adjourn after prayer by Dr. Rosselle, of Philadelphia.

Prayer was offered, and the meeting adjourned.

SECOND DAY

Evening Session

Wednesday, November 15, 1911

8:00 P.M.

PRESIDENT MERRILL opened the evening session of the Congress by requesting Rev. Robert Hull, of Summit, N.J., to lead in prayer.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: The subject for discussion this evening is, "Immersionists and Church Union." The first paper will be presented by Rev. Dr. Salley, of Lewiston, Me.

REV. A. T. SALLEY, D.D. (Free Baptist), of Lewiston, Me., then read as follows:

IMMERSIONISTS AND CHURCH UNION

The Christian church was born a unity with inherent capacities and tendencies to diversity. At first the church was homogeneous, a brotherhood united by simple faith in Him whom the Father had sent, and by the spirit of the second great command. With expansion came diversity. National traits, individual peculiarities, and acquired tastes asserted themselves and created diverse forms of worship, church organization, and religious activity. Theology also became amenable to the same influences and fructified into differing creeds with emphasis differently placed. This was as it should be. It was doubtless the divine order of church development. For a time there was unity in diversity. The church was like a tree whose branches, though unlike in shape and appearance and direction of growth, all spring out of the same trunk and bear the same kind of leaves and flowers and fruit.

But a change came. The church parted company with the divine plan. Diversity became dissimilarity, and dissimilarity passed into contrariety, and contrariety deepened into distrust and open hostility. Lines of cleavage appeared, dividing the brotherhood into discordant and sometimes warring sects. The branches of the tree whose root and trunk was Jesus Christ, instead of yielding the peaceable fruits of righteousness, covered the earth with the apples of discord. For centuries Christians aspersed one another, and resorted to calumny and persecution and war. The sky grew red with flames and the earth crimson with blood. Not the Shekinah but a war-cloud accompanied the cross through the lands, and all this was under the pleasing delusion that men were doing God's service. The multiplicity and hostility of sects destroyed unity and efficiency and scandalized religion.

But a new and diviner change has come. A breath of heaven has passed over the differing sects, diminishing friction, assuaging jealousies, and developing fraternalism. The church is now reversing the order of the first centuries. The battle-axe has given place to the wand of peace. Brotherly love is asserting itself. We are now coming together faster than those of the first century separated. A mighty trend toward union is sweeping through Christendom whose primal source is the heart of God.

The last few years have witnessed three wondrous miracles of grace. (1) There has developed among the Protestant denominations a sweet Christian fraternalism. (2) Gigantic movements have arisen like the Men and Religion Forward Movement that have compelled extensive co-operation among sects independently organized. (3) But the movement toward union has not stopped at fraternalism or co-operation. The beginnings of organic union among the denominations are seen here and there. The trend is decidedly toward a diminution of sects and a closer fellowship of those that remain. I am sure that this is of God. We are leaving our childhood behind with its jealousies and fears and over-emphasis on minor points, and are coming to our young manhood which is characterized of sanity and charity. But have we gone far enough in this direction? To all human appearance the current toward union is stronger and deeper and swifter now than at any previous time. It is no fad of the day but has all the earmarks of a movement divinely originated, guided, and impelled.

There is no need and no adequate apology for the existence of more than a hundred independent Protestant sects in our country. Oh the loss of it; Oh the shame of it! God was not in this splitting up of Christendom. This state of things is contrary to the genius of the Christian religion. Protestantism is weakened and scandalized by it. Let this union movement go on unstayed by the hand of timid, jealous man, until it shall reach those natural boundaries set in the constitution of nations and in the divergent types of civilization; unstayed, let us hope, until it results in a great lessening of kindred sects and in a fuller fellowship between those that are left. A few leading types of polity and doctrine and ritual, sufficient to satisfy the reasonable demands of men for diversity, will doubtless persist.

On two points I think the Protestant churches of America are pretty well agreed. First, that this get-together movement is of God; and second, that it has not yet gone far enough. If this trend is quickly stayed it will be because it encounters policies and customs and principles hoary with age in behalf of which affrighted men will rise up and say to the rising tide, "Thus far shalt thou come but no farther."

We are known the world over as Baptists or Immersionists,

and appropriately so, according to the custom of naming sects after some one distinguishing doctrine or rite or form of church government on which they have laid particular stress.

We are Baptists because we have always insisted on immersion in water as the form of confession precedent to church membership. And the nature and degree of this insistence will determine our attitude toward this greatest movement of the ages, and it will also determine the progress of the movement. On the one side is the pressure of the movement in which most of us think we feel the might of God. On the other side is the grip of a conviction that runs back through many centuries. We have always believed in union, but in union based on an acceptance by the other party to the union of our interpretation of the rites. Confession, immersion, church-membership, the Lord's Supper, this is the road that has led up to full Baptist fellowship. We have been (I say it reverently) a close corporation. We have insisted on carrying the Ark. If others were willing to help us transport the tents and poles and bars, we graciously assented; but they must not enter the courts of our Baptist sanctuary except they have first gone down to the Jordan. We settled this policy long ago, and have adhered to it with commendable consistency. But now we are compelled to review our primal conviction and age-long policy in the light of present-day conditions. The tidal wave of unionism is rapidly pressing up the shores of our conservatism with mighty—shall I say Almighty—force. Shall we stay it with a rite, with an interpretation made by our fathers, or shall we reconsider? In the past reconsideration has meant progress and history likes to repeat itself. Once we were predestinarians with all the strength of conviction of which we were capable. But we were caught in the current of a more liberal interpretation of the divine decrees and revised our theology to our own great credit and to the lasting benefit of the Kingdom of God. As a result, Free-Willers and Calvinists pulled down their flags, spiked their guns, leveled their fortifications, and now constitute one harmonious division of the great army of God. But it is always more dangerous because it is more fundamental, to change a dogma than a rite, but we have done it righteously and successfully.

But we are doing another thing with equal credit and profit. Formerly we fenced in the Lord's Table and only those could go in through the gate who had come up out of the baptismal waters. Now the fence is disappearing, in some cases it has quite vanished, and if any of the unimmersed chance to sit down with us uninvited we enter no protest, but are inwardly pleased. God grant that the time may speedily come when proclamation shall be made at every communion, "This is our Lord's feast; come all ye saints." These changes of base have worked well. They mark positive gains. They are broadening the brotherhood and increasing the peace of the world.

And now how shall we hold our Immersionist theory with respect to church union? Shall we abandon it? God forbid. Shall we say of sprinkling as a form of Baptism that it bears the stamp of Christ's approval? Again I say no. The question at issue is not what was the original form? That has been settled in favor of immersion; or shall we cease to immerse? We shall doubtless continue to do this as we have done it in the past. We are simply to consider whether we will hold the rite in a divisive way so as to check union and frustrate the prayers of Jesus for unity among his followers. Grant, as we must, that immersion was the form of confession given by Christ to his followers, how shall we treat divergences from this form? Just as God does if we can discover his attitude. Does he make discriminations against those who practice other forms of baptism? A few weeks ago, several hundred missionaries sailed away from Boston, New York, and San Francisco to preach and teach the gospel in heathen lands. Those were glorious days and made glorious because the best that the churches could offer were offering themselves in the spirit of self-abandonment, yea, even martyrdom, for the world's redemption. Were they all Baptists? God pardon me for asking a question that smacks of sectarianism and bigotry. But I must ask it, for I am trying to find out how God views matters, and what he thinks is only known by what he does. The spirit of God brooded over the church—over what church?—over the church to call forth out of it capable men and women who should build up the kingdom in other lands. Baptist young men and women, Presbyterian young men and women,

Episcopalian young men and women, consecrated, divinely called and sealed, and humanly approved, responded. Did God discriminate? Here is a group who are to go out to establish ritualistic Pedobaptist churches. Who called, commissioned, and sent them? Primarily God; secondarily the church. When perplexity, sickness, persecution, and death shall befall them, who will smooth their pathway, assuage the fierceness of the flames, and place martyr crowns upon their heads?

We can only judge by appearances, but so judging, it looks as though he who originated the rite of immersion and gave it its significance interprets it far more liberally than we have been wont to do. He takes no account of that which we make a hindrance to fellowship. Whom the Master receives into the closest possible fellowship, greatly honoring them by entrusting them with great enterprises in the founding and guidance of churches, we ought not exclude from our denominational organization. To be sure we stand and reach out our hands in loving esteem to Episcopalian and Congregationalist and Methodist, and say brother, brother, and yet there is a fence between us through which he cannot come except he has first been to the Jordan and returned, the like of which I cannot discern between him and his God. There is very great danger that we fall into inconsistency. We have eliminated two-thirds of the rite—for I have no doubt that the original form of baptism as given by Christ was triune—and now we disfellowship these whose only crime is that they have *gone us one better* by modifying the other third. It is a confessedly complicated and delicate situation.

Loyalty to conviction has, and should have, a tremendous grip upon us. We cannot sacrifice principle. We must not fail to give forth our message with no uncertain sound. On the other hand a mighty God-ordained movement toward union has set in. How shall we do?

1. We must be true to our conviction and continue to administer immersion in water as believers in baptism. We may preach it and explain its beautiful symbolism and urge it as a duty upon all penitents seeking admission to our churches, refusing to administer it in any other fashion. This will amply honor and dignify the rite. Our concern with the consciences and judgment of men

will then be at an end. God can be entrusted with the rest. This policy will in no way prevent co-operation in the matter of union.

2. But we should go a step farther. What shall we do with persons coming to us with accredited letters from Pedobaptist churches? "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, yet not for decision of scruples." Whom God fully accepts and greatly honors let us not reject. This would involve no forsaking of our principles or curtailing of our message or sanctioning of divergent forms of baptism. By it we should simply say, "For Christ's sake whose you are and for conscience' sake, not our own but yours, we fellowship you. . . ."

This position, if once accepted by the great Baptist body would give scope to the union movement in four different directions:

(1) It would lead to the free interchange of members among Christian bodies on the basis of letters.

(2) It would open the Lord's table to all lovers of our Lord.

(3) It would prepare the way for the building up in foreign fields of national, rather than sectarian churches.

(4) On such a basis organic union with bodies differing from us in the administration of baptism would be possible.

This would be simply the application on a broad scale of that principle of individual liberty in interpretation and action which has been our boast and our glory hitherto. We must not deny to others that which we claim for ourselves, viz., the right of private judgment, much less penalize them for exercising that right. Paul was right when he cried: "Let each man be fully persuaded in his own mind." He was equally right when he added: "Why doest thou judge thy brother? or thou again, why doest thou set at naught thy brother? Judge this rather that no man put a stumbling-block in his brother's way." It will be a crying shame if the Protestant sects of England and America shall insist on perpetuating in every heathen land the sectarian differences of the home field. That is not Christianity: that is sectarianism. By it we confuse the heathen mind, limit co-operation and delay the establishment of the kingdom of God in the ends of the earth. But the like of this is seen in the home land, in those numberless over-churched rural and village communities where denominationalism is another name for disunion

and weakness, and we along with others are parties to it. I have grave fears that the insistent Immersionists on immersion as an unailing prerequisite to church membership and fellowship are frustrating the purpose of God to unify his church.

While urging upon the Baptist brotherhood a policy of inter-denominational comity that shall reach even to the point of organic church union, I would strongly condemn the practice of forcing it as a divisive measure upon churches and associations unprepared for it. For by so doing union would become the occasion of bitterness and disunion.

My contention may be expressed in two words: (1) This movement toward co-operation and union among the Protestant sects is of God and should, therefore, be welcomed and strengthened. (2) We can be Baptists, consistently and aggressively Baptists, with a living mission and a burning message, and yet take the leadership in this coming-together movement in the great Christian brotherhood, the place providentially offered us by our members and our strength. In the presence of this mighty, divine tide of unionism let us stop and consider what is the voice of God to us out of it. Dare we say to God's movement: Stop at fraternalism and co-operation; proceed not to church union? Rather let us go along with God.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: The Chair desires to announce a change in program. In place of the paper by President Frederick D. Kerchner, we are to have a paper read by Rev. Luther E. Sellers (Disciple), pastor of the First Christian Church, Philadelphia.

REV. LUTHER E. SELLERS (Disciple), pastor of the First Christian Church of Philadelphia, Pa., then read the following paper:

IMMERSIONISTS AND UNION

The subject of this paper lends itself to consideration along two lines:

First, Where is the meeting-point between Baptists and Disciples on immersion? What shall each need to yield in order that a practical unanimity of thought and belief may be realized?

Since both are agreed as to the form of baptism, how may they come to agree on the design?

Second, What shall be the explicit message of Baptists and Disciples, representing the Immersionists, to Pedobaptist bodies as to the place of baptism in the Christian union scheme? If baptism is an obstacle in the way of union, what can Immersionists do to remove the obstacle?

Taking up the consideration of the first division, namely, the differences between Baptists and Disciples, let it be said that in each body there are those who hold extreme views as to the design of baptism, which are not representative. Combative in temperament or drawn by sectarian bias it is but reasonable that some should hold such views. It is evidently not the belief of Baptists generally that baptism is merely a door into the visible church, or of Disciples generally that no one is saved who is not baptized. And yet, there are those in both bodies who hold to these respective views.

A truly representative definition of the position of each will show that after all the line of demarkation is not so broad and distinctive as we might suppose.

Disciples believe that the immersion in water of a penitent believer in Christ is a clear requirement of the Scriptures; that it is the consummating act in the process of conversion; that apart from faith it has no efficacy; that it is in fact an act of faith. In baptism, the believer assumes all the obligations of discipleship. The following terse quotation is adequate for our present purposes:

As an outward rite, baptism must be a type, or sign, of some religious truth, or spiritual fact, meant to be taught or enforced by its observance. And the form of the rite, the manner of its administration, must be such as properly to express its design and meaning. If the form be so changed that its symbolic force is lost, and its design no longer seen in its administration, then, manifestly, it is no longer baptism in form or fact; its teaching is not understood, and its chief purpose fails.

Now, it is not difficult to ascertain from the New Testament what was intended by baptism. It was clearly this: to show forth the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, who died for our sins, and rose again for our justification. And every candidate who receives the ordinance professes thereby faith in the merits of Christ's death as the ground of his own hope

and salvation, fellowship also with His sufferings, and a declaration of his own death to sin, and a rising to newness of life in Christ. It also typifies the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, and declares the candidate's hope of a resurrection from the dead, even as Christ, into the likeness of whose death he is buried, was raised up by the glory of the Father.

This statement embodies quite satisfactorily the belief of the Disciples. But the quotation is not from the pen of a Disciple at all, but is taken from Hiscox' *New Directory of Baptist Churches*, pp. 389, 425.

And it also exhibits the teaching of leading Baptists. Since the statement stands equally representative of both, it will be seen that there is substantial agreement upon the design of baptism between the two bodies.

Nor would a slight variation in terminology or diversity of opinion vitiate the vital unity of teaching as expressed above.

If Baptists, on the one side, shall here and there continue to regard baptism as simply an ordinance of induction into the visible church, and if Disciples here and there insist on making it the one distinctive note of their preaching, still advocates of unity will see beyond the apparent differences a vital and fundamental agreement. In the appeal to Scripture, the same proof texts are constantly used by both, and to both their great spiritual beauty and significance are alike apparent.

The recognition of this similarity offers an added possibility of union. It means the removal of one more rail from the fences that have separated us. Not only so, but it imposes the obligation upon Immersionists that they use the substantial agreement on this point to bring to pass harmony in other matters where division now exists. Quickened in the hearts of the two bodies the yearning for union and the task is well-nigh accomplished. They must minimize their differences and emphasize their agreements. From pulpit and press there should be silenced the note of sectarian bias and there should be sounded aloud the message that makes for peace. For union among Immersionists is not an end simply to be desired. It is something for which they must earnestly strive. Under God they are set to teach the Christian

world the possibility of a great host, once divided, coming to a working agreement looking to ultimate corporate unity.

This is the logical evolution of the unity program: first, comity among Immersionists; next, to the problems that relate to the other groups of the Protestant world. It would be rather embarrassing to turn to these with overtures so long as we do not make the most of every opportunity within our own ranks. The children of a common family should first be at peace among themselves before they can hope to be at peace with their neighbors.

If the whole question were one to be dealt with simply for its own sake, each party might fight its battle and retire reasonably certain of a decisive and ultimate victory.

But the baptismal question is not to be decided for its own sake. It is not an unrelated question. It is a question to be prayerfully considered by the molders of religious thought because it involves the larger problem of Christian Union. We cannot enjoy undisturbed doctrinal tranquillity and unity in Zion with a baptismal war in progress.

Granted now that the statement above is the common denominator between Immersionists, what should be their attitude toward Pedobaptist bodies on the question of immersion? If baptism is to be reckoned with in the union propaganda, what have the Immersionists to say, and what contribution shall they make to the final results? Here again are we met at the outset with expressions representing the whole range of sentiment and belief from entire repudiation of immersion by certain Pedobaptists to "no immersion, no salvation" by certain Immersionists. And as in the case of the latitude among Immersionists, the extreme views were not really vital to the question, so here it is not the extremists with whom we have to deal. As long as men think, there will be diversity of opinion. What we prize most is not so much opinion as germinal, vital truth; the deep soul-convictions for which men died and which live and abide forever. Not the remote territory, but the citadel, is the important thing. Ruskin's sweet reasonableness may be hard to discover in the baptismal controversy, but there is at center a fairly well-defined teaching of affusionist bodies on the subject. While holding to the validity of sprinkling and pouring, they also recognize the

validity of immersion. It constitutes one of the forms of baptism. It is true that it is sometimes discriminated against, disparaged, and reluctantly administered, still on the whole is respected and given equal rank with other forms. Voices are raised for immersion as a baptism divinely ordained and of a kind with sprinkling and pouring.

Such may be said to be the current and unofficial expression of the Pedobaptist world. But when the appeal is made to the church standards, the voice of councils and the declarations of authority, or to the venerable historic utterances of former militant days, it is found that uniformly the explicit and uncompromising voice of the church is and ever has been for immersion as the real and adequate baptism authorized in the New Testament. They all affirm that it answers admirably and beautifully every demand of the Scriptures and meets the exactions of etymology. And yet, just here is one of the most troublesome questions with which Unionists have to deal. The bequest of a trinity of baptismal forms from the remote past to the present, not only places the Pedobaptist world in a trying and delicate situation, but lays upon the whole Christian world one of the most stubborn of all the factors that enter into the Christian union situation. The unimportant procedure or the occasional practice of one age becomes the fixed law of the next.

We are creatures of custom. Tradition which, at first, is scarcely discernible in the heritage of a people, finally comes to be a well-nigh inviolable rule. We take much for granted as we take our places in human society.

We find many things in vogue in church and social life which we receive and about which we ask no questions, but for whose use or existence we could offer no real justification.

Such, may we charitably confess, is the Pedobaptist dilemma whose existence brings its share of embarrassment to Pedobaptist advocates of union as well as to all others.

Baptists and Pedobaptists alike believe in immersion. The consciousness of the church universal favors it.

It is accepted as valid wherever the name of Jesus is honored. Upon immersion as valid baptism there is no slightest shadow cast. It stands before no court asking justification nor at any

door seeking admission. And yet, strange paradox, it is one of the recognized barriers to Protestant unity.

Now how shall this barrier be removed, or at least overridden? How may the Immersionists go about the satisfactory solution of the matter? How may they assist in taking baptism entirely out of the union question?

And in passing it may be noted that not all the responsibility rests with the Immersionists. The difficulty was not created by them and theirs alone is not the task of adjusting it. Perhaps the time is at hand for Pedobaptists to come to the front and dispose of the whole matter either by convincing the conscience of Christendom of the validity of affusion or else by discontinuing its use everywhere.

But among Immersionists there are those who propose the following and which, if nothing more, suggest that faces are turned toward the dawn. They indicate the approach to unity and the influence that baptism exerts.

1. Let Immersionists adopt the practice of affusion. This would unify the forms of baptism the world over and would end the controversy. Baptism would with one stroke be eliminated from the unity problem. In reply to this, it is only necessary to say that the Immersionist conscience would regard it as a superb impossibility if not an unmatched absurdity.

2. Let Immersionist bodies establish an associate membership in their churches for such unimmersed as desire the blessings of congregational life. This might answer in certain and scattered individual cases, but really does not touch the question of union.

It is a personal convenience.

It is merely subtracting from one body to add to another, and contributes no distinct gain or advantage to the kingdom of God.

3. Stop debating it (baptism). We prolong bitterness between brethren by keeping alive the spirit of controversy. By unholy discussions and personal attacks, men otherwise cordial and fraternal are driven wide apart and co-operation and mutual helpfulness are made impossible.

We should discuss baptism as we do faith or hope or simply as the New Testament teaches with the personal element left out.

If we present a rose, let us first extract the thorn.

4. Let Immersionists encourage the spirit of co-operation and good fellowship with Pedobaptists in Christian work. There is so much that may be done today which not only challenges our faith, but fairly demands that we sink our personal bias and beliefs and join with our brethren of all faiths for its accomplishment. Baptism should not bulk too large and ominous when placed by the side of the all-challenging world problems. We are not called into the passion of our Lord to pour out our lives on the fields of verbal controversy, but for the purpose of joining with others of Christ's very own in the great tasks of human redemption. Neither baptism nor any other doctrines, however cherished, should prevent our doing this. If on anything on earth Jesus manifestly sets his seal of approval and promise, it is on such co-operative movements as seek the furtherance of the kingdom of God. And the world fairly shrieks into the ears of the church that her crushing woe, her piteous want, her tears and heartbreaks, and the bitterness of hopeless death must not continue while ecclesiastics sit in cloistered halls in soft raiment and discuss the merits of respective creeds.

By the blood tracks of the Son of God who supped with sinners and fellowshiped with traitors that he might aid God to get his work done, we are eternally challenged to suffer with him and to cease our bickerings as their crimson trail leads us to the fields of service and victory.

Such fraternal co-operation increases our appreciation of each other's views and is death to biased judgment, suspicion, and distrust.

Before the great naval battle of Trafalgar, Admiral Nelson called to his flagship Captain Collingwood and Captain Hardy who had been deadly enemies, and commanded them to shake hands as he pointed to the French fleet, and said: "Gentlemen, there's your enemy." In this battle-hour of the church we may see our Master with hands raised toward the hosts of Satan emboldened by the fact of a divided church, and hear him say with trumpet tones: "Brethren, there's your enemy." Yes, and we may see him point to the whitening harvest fields and hear him say: "There's your harvest. Together cast in your sickles,

for I have called you to labor together as brethren with me in its reaping." How aloofness chills the blood and paralyzes the sword arm! How changed is the whole sphere of service when we know that our brethren are not our enemies but are with us in the work of God!

Thus it is written in the Talmud: "Walking on the mountains one day I saw a form which I took to be a beast. Coming nearer I saw that it was a man. Approaching nearer still I found it was my brother."

5. Let Immersionist bodies receive the unimmersed without immersion, extending them the hand of fellowship and the full privileges of membership.

Those who urge full membership for the unimmersed tell us that the spiritual lives of the unimmersed not only certify their fellowship with God, being fruitful in every good work, but that they actually put to shame the professions of very many who have been immersed. If immersion, they say, is so vital and efficacious, there ought to be a distinctive sequence in the lives of the immersed. Why not at once recognize their fitness for fellowship and receive them as they are? And certainly no one would for a moment wish to discount the beauty and power in the lives of the godly unimmersed.

This spiritual enrichment, coupled with zeal for the interests of the kingdom of God, might easily cover a multitude of doctrinal shortcomings. But the fallacy of this reasoning lies in this: that any good man who has never been immersed becomes an argument against immersion. You cannot measure the efficacy of any ordinance by the spiritual attainment of its recipient, apart from other influences. Would sprinkling or pouring alone make a bad man spiritual? Baptism is not meant to make men spiritual, but to inaugurate the work of spiritual training in the lives of those who receive it, by placing them in the midst of great formative influences both human and divine.

To say that because some who have never been immersed are as spiritual as some who have, and, therefore, baptism is not essential to spiritual excellence, entirely perverts the purpose and import of the ordinance. Nor is this statement made without a measure of misgiving.

The writer's yearnings for union are among the most passionate that concern the kingdom. He would have union at whatever cost, were personal wishes alone to be considered. He would at once say: "Let us end our pitiful divisions and our jealous strife; let us unite and win the world for Christ; let us receive the unimmersed; let them receive us." In so far as baptism is a deterrent to union, let it be removed. Anything only that parties end and the glorious church, united and victorious, own her Lord. But up to this moment, the writer can do no other than declare for fidelity to conscience in the advocacy of even so sublime a theme as that of the union of the people of God.

For those who feel that the interests of Christian union warrant our extending fellowship and membership to the unimmersed, let it be said that there ought to be no incongruity between our earnest advocacy of baptism as we understand it and our plea for Christian union. Our teaching must be consistent with itself. The ordinance is involved in union and union is involved in the ordinance. We can no more teach the scriptural basis of union without baptism than we can teach the scriptural basis of baptism without union. The gospel is divine and it includes both. One is weakened without the other. We further the interests of union by faithfulness to New Testament teachings.

Nor does this mean in a spirit of *ex cathedra* assurance and bigotry. Rather, that union is to be the flower of New Testament teaching as applied to the conscience and the conduct of the universal church. Any program of Christian union that shall commend itself to the favor of God or the serious consideration of men must be not so much one of legislation, as interpretation, in church and individual life, of divine ideals. It must be well balanced. It must not run to sentiment on the one side, or to reckless compromise on the other.

The heart that pulsates in its yearning for union and in love for the furtherance of the kingdom, must pulsate also in its loyalty to Christ and fidelity to his divine word. Forever must there ring clear and true, and with compelling power, those final words of the Master: "All authority is mine. Go, make disciples, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of

the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you all the days." In these wonderful words, surcharged with regal power and containing the last will and testament of the Lord of the church is the *motif* of all procedure in advancing the cause of our blessed Redeemer.

Everything in Christianity stands upon these words. Certainly the authority of Jesus, as final and supreme, is there; the vision of the far-flung battle line of God, whose peaceful messages bring joy to the ends of the earth, is there; loving obedience by everyone who names the name of Christ is there; union is there; and there at its center and inspiration is the assurance of the divine presence. And it is only by loving conformity to the divine inclusiveness of this high note that unity today may be real and permanent.

With loyalty to Christ that esteems his will more precious than life, let us pray for a larger vision. Some things must wait on God. In faith unity, in opinions liberty, in all things charity, we must be keenly alert to interpret Christ as we understand him to the men of this day.

This may not be the ultimate attitude of the Immersionist hosts. In the ongoings of time, that shall bring to the church a larger interpretation of the genius of the kingdom and a finer appreciation of the spirit of the Lord of the kingdom, this attitude may seem narrow and inadequate. God has yet more truth to break forth from his word. And for the present our task is to apply to the healing of the factions of the church the sweetest, sanest, divinest message of our Lord as we understand him.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: We are to have a third paper presented by Rev. Robert T. Jones, D.D., of Ithaca, N.Y.

REV. ROBERT T. JONES, D.D., of Ithaca, N.Y., then presented the following paper:

IMMERSIONISTS AND CHURCH UNION

When we speak of church union it is understood, of course, that we mean by that term something more than merely sympathetic union. Such a union we have already to a larger degree than ever before.

But in this discussion, I take it, we mean by church union something more than this; not merely sympathetic union, in which, while we labor together in many important regards, we still maintain strong barriers against each other; but actual church union: union wherein we shall, each and all, share the church life and fellowship of the other, without consciousness of the sacrifice of anything essential to our faith.

When we achieve this, we shall have actual church union; for it is just the impossibility of sharing each other's church life and fellowship that now separates us. It is the barriers in belief and polity raised just here that create the divisions of which we are so conscious. Remove these, and the great Christian bodies will come together in a union both real and actual, and in which, as not before, the great prayer of the Master will be realized, "that they also may be one, as we are one." In other words, we shall have come to regard the great common ground of love for God and for his son Jesus Christ as a sufficient basis for fellowshiping all believers, and for receiving them into our individual communions, regardless of other differences; leaving such differences as questions of opinion, with liberty to differ. Such a union would not mean, necessarily, the giving up of all divergences between denominations; but that such divergences would not inherently become sources of division. There would be liberty to enjoy each other's fellowship upon the ground of common love for God and for Jesus Christ, and, best of all, in actual church organization and association.

But it will be objected, I know, that such a conception, while beautiful in spirit, loses sight of the fact that the divisions within the church have arisen because of unavoidable differences upon Christian doctrine; and that these differences are matters of principle, not lightly overcome. But I assure you I am not unmindful of this. On the contrary, I recognize fully how honestly the different branches of Christ's church have felt that the things for which they have stood were the things of God; and how sincerely they have believed many of the doctrines and practices of their brethren of other communions to be wrong. I am not contending that these differences can be arbitrarily abolished, but only that the great basic facts of our religious life—love for

God and for Jesus Christ—be regarded as sufficient ground for our union in every possible form of fellowship, and that all other matters be left to individual judgment. And we think it not improper to maintain this, seeing that so many differences once vigorously contested for are now contested for no longer. And if this is the case, have we not the right to hope that it may go on still farther, until at last no barrier will remain between the families of God's church that need not be there?

And so the duty comes, among others, to the bodies of Christians known as Immersionists, to see to it that, in emphasizing immersion as they do, they do not unnecessarily and unadvisedly foster occasion of division in the great Christian body, and by so much defer that deeper union of Christendom for which we all pray.

It is the belief of the writer (though himself an administrator of immersion throughout a ministry of thirty-six years) that too great emphasis has been laid upon this rite, and that it has been, and is now, unnecessarily a cause of separation in the churches. It does not seem to him that the fact that Jesus was himself immersed, and that he apparently recognized immersion, constitutes a ground for the rigid adherence to it which now marks, at least, American Immersionists. To assume that this absolutely settles the question is the veriest literalism; and it is upon this literalism that the present rigid adherence to immersion is based. If we are to be blind followers of just the outward circumstances of Jesus' life, then debate is at an end; and we have only to take our place among the most unyielding of Immersionists. But we do not believe this does settle it. We hold rather that such literalism is destructive of all true interpretation of the Master. We believe we have to interpret Jesus through the spirit of his life and the intent of his commands, and that to ignore these is to miss the meaning of both.

Now as regards the spirit of his life, it is evident that he laid emphasis not on formal acts of any sort; but upon motive and state of heart. He valued men for what they really were. He cared little for outward forms and shows of goodness, apart from this. He even ran the risk of misjudgment by the Pharisees, because he cared for it so little, and he often fellowshipped

men and women whom the Pharisees condemned, because he judged them in this way.

It is hard to think of such a man elevating any outward form to a place where specific and literal observance of it would become a test of loyalty to him. It is hard to believe that such a soul (valuing simply things that were vital) would establish any outward act in such a way that obedience or disobedience to him would be measured by the exactness with which it was executed.

It may be objected just here that Jesus' own baptism in the Jordan at the hands of John, and the statement that he was thus fulfilling all righteousness, is evidence that he attached significance to the form itself. We do not think so; we think it is entirely taken for granted that the form through which John registered the professions of his converts had any significance to Jesus at all. We believe he would have registered his faith with John by whatever method that rough prophet was employing. It was not immersion that he wished to honor in his baptism in the Jordan; but John's movement itself. He wished to ally himself with this, because John alone, in that day of empty form and ceremony, stood for real righteousness. John's movement was in the direction of spirit and life; and Jesus would have accepted at his hands any form or method of acknowledging it which John might have been using. That he would not have gone to John had he been sprinkling his converts, or doing something else than immersing them, is absurd on the face of it.

In view, then, of the general spirit of his life the interpretation of his own immersion is, that it was an accommodation to the situation in which he found himself. John's movement was in the same direction as his own—in the direction of spirit and life. It was really the opening word of his own message. It would have been strange, therefore, beyond measure, if he had not associated himself with it. It was becoming that he should honor the man and his method, just as he found it, and in this sense it was a real fulfilling of righteousness.

That this was actually the case, a detailed study of the gospels easily shows. As we read the earliest gospels, especially the Gospel of Mark, we are astounded to find so little reference to

immersion. The emphasis is everywhere, not on how a man should proclaim his faith; but that he should have faith, and, as a corollary, that he should proclaim it. Immersion is nowhere prominent. Indeed, if we had only the three Synoptics, we actually would not know that anyone connected with the life of Jesus had been immersed. It comes in more as a reverberation of the ministry of John than as a new and definite institution of Jesus.

In John's ministry, however, it is just the reverse. There, immersion is conspicuous; it was the sign-manual of the wilderness prophet; it was the outward stamp he put upon each of his converts, and that he publicly demanded of each. He was known as John the Baptizer. It was the method he publicly proclaimed and practiced, by which to seal the profession of his disciples. They were all obliged to submit to it, and thus come out into the company of repentant ones.

But nowhere does Jesus give immersion such prominence. His first public utterance was, "Repent and believe the gospel." He came to induce a new method of life. He came to change men's hearts; how such change should be registered, did not seem to concern him. The "Sermon on the Mount" has no reference to baptism. His talk with the woman of Samaria has nothing concerning it. None of the parables even suggest it. His immediate directions to those who believed on him, in no single instance, either command or imply it. There is no mention that the man with the unclean spirit in Capernaum was baptized; or that the leper whom he healed was; or that the man sick with the palsy was; or that the Twelve, when he sent them out to preach, were to administer it; or any statement in their report, when they returned, that they had done so. There is no account of the possessed man at Gadara being baptized; or that the Syro-Phoenician woman was; or that he told the rich young man to be; or that blind Bartimaeus was. And when the learned scribe asked him which was the greatest commandment, his answer made no reference to it. There is no mention of it in connection with the statement that "multitudes" here and there, in city and country, believed on him. In fact, in the entire earliest gospel, not a single mention is made of baptism, after the ac-

count of Jesus' own baptism, till the closing verses in the 16th chapter, which are bracketed in the Canterbury Version as of doubtful authority. In that earliest and most graphic account of his ministry of teaching, healing, and wonder working not a word is said of immersion till we get to this disputed conclusion in the last chapter.

In Matthew's Gospel, also, not a reference to the rite is to be found (after the account of Jesus' baptism) until we reach the last two verses of the book—not a single mention, directly or indirectly, in any way whatever. The whole wonderful story of Jesus' ministry is told, and of conversions to him on every hand, without immersion being mentioned—until we get to these last two verses; and these are admittedly open to serious question. They contain a distinctly theological reference, belonging undoubtedly to a later period of the church, most unlikely to have come from the pen of the simple narrator of the preceding chapters.

In the Gospel of Luke it is even more marked; for in that splendid story of the Master there is not a single word about baptism, or reference to it in any way, directly or indirectly, in the whole Gospel, as far as His own ministry is concerned, after the account of Jesus' own baptism at the hands of John.

The only reference to the employment of baptism by Jesus to be found in the gospels (apart from the instances already referred to) are to be found in the Gospel of John, where there are three passages; one, where it is said the Pharisees were representing that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, though (it is added) that Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples; the instance where it is said that Jesus and his disciples came into the land of Judea, and tarried there and baptized; and the instance of the conversation with Nicodemus, where he said that "except a man be born of water and the spirit, he could not enter into the kingdom of God." It is only just to say that these passages distinctly represent Jesus and his disciples as employing baptism; and furthermore, of many people (even more than came to John) receiving it at their hands. And the implication in these passages is undoubtedly that it was the custom of his ministry so to use it in all places, and at all times, and

that he associated it in a sort of necessary way with the inward spiritual change.

If we found such passages as these in the earlier gospels, we should not hesitate to say that Jesus gave to this rite especial emphasis, and attached to it even a very profound spiritual significance. But inasmuch as no references to it are found in the Synoptic Gospels (as we have shown), except those open to undoubted dispute; and inasmuch as the Gospel of John was admittedly written later than the other gospels, and certainly after the theological period began (as the very first chapter shows), we believe there is good ground for thinking that Jesus did not give immersion the prominence which these passages would imply. Unsupported by the Synoptics we believe that such a contention is valid.

That it had a place in his ministry, we do not doubt; but that it had the imperative place which Immersionists give it we think is incapable of proof. That it was an act designed in any way to test obedience or loyalty to him we think there is every reason to doubt. We should judge that it frequently followed profession of faith in him; but that it was thought absolutely necessary to administer it in all cases where people believed on him, we think there is no evidence. He was constantly moving from place to place, from town to town, and from village to village, and people believed on him in multitudes as he went along. He apparently did not attempt to organize them, or do more than give to them his great message. There are no baptismal scenes recorded along the way, or anything to imply that he or his disciples stopped in each case of belief in him to administer immersion as a necessary accompaniment of faith.

But after his death and resurrection a new situation appears. Immersion then got to have the prominence of an initiatory rite, and from that time on we see it occupying a prominent place in the apostolic program. The command then became definite and clear, "To believe and be baptized every one of you." The necessities of the organization now demanded the outward testimony. The apostolic company had become an *ecclesia*, a church, adding to itself daily of such as should be saved. Baptism now became customary as the necessary accompaniment of faith, and it was

but natural that Paul should see in it the beautiful symbolism contained in Rom. 6:4. But that Jesus saw in it any such symbolism, or gave it any such place in his ministry, is seriously open to question. He simply went about doing good, preaching and teaching and healing, regardless of numbers, and nowhere "adding" anybody to anything except to himself, as their spiritual guide and master.

Thus far we have tried to show from an examination of the baptism of Jesus by John, and from the gospels themselves, that immersion had no such imperative place in the thought and ministry of Jesus as Immersionists now give it; that it was employed by him, but in no necessary way; that if anything else had been in use for the same purpose, he would as readily have adopted it. There is no evidence that he laid emphasis on this particular way, or would have been disturbed if some other took its place. To make its exact observance, therefore, a test of loyalty to him, and a prohibitory condition of membership in his church, seems to us to be an elevation of it to a place never contemplated by him, and not justified by an examination of his ministry.

But this is not all. We believe that too unyielding an emphasis is laid upon this rite by Immersionists, not only because of what we have just shown concerning its place in Jesus' own ministry, but because of what we think he would do if he came among us now.

Would his attitude in this matter be the same as that of present-day Immersionists? Would he take up the insistent contention that the word *baptizo* means immersion, and nothing else? Would he say that only by so interpreting it do believers make proper confession of him—that, only then do they express what the ordainer of the ceremony meant it to express, and that when we take those into our fellowship who have not thus conformed to it (however pious or beloved they may be as Christians) we break our fealty to him?

Could we imagine such a great spiritual soul as Jesus taking such ground. Would he contend for any mechanical act in this way, reminding us that a certain word has a particular meaning, and has no other? Would he hinge our spiritual fealty to him upon the literalness and exactness with which we performed such

an act? Would he feel we were discrediting him if we took into our fellowship holy men and women (many of whom had sealed their faith in him with their blood) because, forsooth, they had acknowledged him in one mechanical way rather than in another?

To the writer, at least, any such conclusion is so impossible, so unlike the world's deepest conception of the Christ, that it seems like profanation to suggest it. Jesus would fall from his great place as the spiritual interpreter and deliverer of men's souls if we had to think of him defending the mechanism of a form, or qualifying his commendation of his most devout followers, because they were inexact in their observance of it. To the writer all this is pettifogging, and he is free to say that if he were obliged to think of Jesus in this way, it would be impossible for him to value him as he now does. The Divine Prophet would become a Priest; and the heart's most profound interpreter, an overseer of quantities and a critic of performances. If Jesus appeared among us now, we can only imagine him welcoming the confession of every loyal soul, absolutely indifferent to the way in which he made it.

And then, again, we think that too great emphasis is laid upon immersion for two other reasons: first, the difficulty which immersion presents to many sincere inquirers; and second, the losses which it brings to Immersionist churches.

We would not raise these questions if we felt that Jesus actually and imperatively commanded immersion as the only divine way of confessing him. If this were so, we should be obliged to insist upon it. The question of expediency could not be even mentioned. We should simply have to do as he said. But not believing this to be the case, we think the considerations just spoken of are valid ones for relaxing the emphasis now put upon it by Immersionists.

That immersion does present great difficulties to many sincere converts is well understood by all Immersionist pastors. While some converts receive it gladly, and see in it the symbolic significance spoken of by Paul, a great many others do not. They shrink from it with dread and fear, especially women, and go through it only because they think they must in order to obey

Christ, and with all the religious significance, for the time, utterly lost sight of because of fear. This occurs especially where people have a natural horror of water, or are exceedingly timid, or associate a feeling of indelicacy with it, or are not well, or where, at heart, they really question its necessity.

And the same is true with regard to the losses to Immersionist churches, by this method. Many persons, who become the truest followers of Christ, refuse to submit to the ceremony at all. Feeling that it is not demanded of them, and that the intention of Jesus can be met in some other way more consonant with the conditions of modern life, they refuse to sacrifice their feelings upon the altar of what they consider formalism and ecclesiasticism, and seek a home in other religious communions. And that an increasingly large number of persons are doing this (especially among the educated and refined classes) is known to us all. But this is only a part of the loss. Within Immersionist churches themselves, intelligent and valuable people are often found, upon one pretext or another, slipping away into other religious connections which do not require a rite which has ceased to be to them either an obligation or a joy. And even where the parents remain firm, the children upon going to college, or marrying, or settling in a different city, often make the change an opportunity to slip away into other religious fellowships. Every Immersionist pastor knows how very real is this "leak from the top."

On these accounts, then, first, that immersion does not hold the imperative place in the ministry of Jesus which Immersionists have assigned to it; second, that he would not give it such a place if he came among us today; and third, that such insistence upon it is a source of difficulty to many inquirers, and a cause of continual loss to Immersionist churches, we maintain, that the emphasis put upon immersion by Immersionists is uncalled for upon the ground of both scriptural demand and denominational expediency.

Now if this is the case, then this emphasis is manifestly an unnecessary hindrance to the unity and fellowship of the church at large, which brings us back to the topic of this paper.

Feeling that any fellowshiping of those whom they regard as

unimmersed believers is an act of disloyalty to Christ, and refusing to receive such persons into their churches (however undoubted their faith and character), they erect a barrier to the unity of the church at large, which is seriously obstructive of its work and spirit. Such a disfellowshipping of the entire Christian world, outside of Immersionists, is a painful hindrance to the "unity of spirit in the bond of peace," of which the apostle speaks. In many cases of course this is actually lost sight of (the hearts of men being always bigger than their creeds); but it comes up as a barrier when their association in churches is suggested, or when effort is called for with other Christians, which demands the overlooking of such differences.

Now let no one gather from this paper that the writer has had any thought or purpose in its preparation to discredit immersion. This has been farthest from his thought. He has tried simply to express his own view of the matter frankly and honestly, and with all possible courtesy to the opinion of noble men who may differ from him. He fully recognizes that many believers see in it the command of Christ and, as well, the symbolism suggested by St. Paul, and that they feel it obligatory upon them to confess their faith by this means and by no other. His contention is not that immersion should be discredited; but only that its observance should not be made an imperative demand. He believes it might well be taught as the method of confession especially honored in Christian history. But when this is done, the question should be left entirely to the option of each and every believer. To those who see in immersion an imperative command of Jesus, it should be administered in accordance with their convictions; and facilities for such administration should be provided in all churches. But for those who prefer some other of the recognized ways of making their Christian acknowledgment, such a way should be provided, and no insinuation should be cast upon their fealty to their Master, because they adopt it, or upon any minister of Christ because he becomes an administrator to such, be he Baptist or otherwise. And further, in the case of anyone giving undoubted evidence of faith, but who thinks it unnecessary to register his confession by the use of baptism in any form, such a one should be received into

the church on the same footing as the others, with the fullest honor, upon the simple declaration of his faith.

This then is the contention of this paper. The writer believes that such a program would be in harmony with the will of the great Head of the church; that it would better express the gospel he came to bring to mankind, and that it would conduce, in a larger way than any other, to the unity of his church on earth for which we all pray.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: There is only one appointed speaker for this topic, President Milton G. Evans, of Crozer Theological Seminary.

PRESIDENT M. G. EVANS, D.D., LL.D., then spoke as follows:

IMMERSIONISTS AND CHURCH UNION

Regular Baptists, both North and South, immerse. Mormons immerse. As far as I know, it has not been suggested that identity of baptismal rite is a sufficient reason for the union of these religious bodies.

The Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists immerse. The great constituency of the Regular Baptists, hitherto known as Freewill Baptists, immerse. Calculate the chances that these will form an organic union on the basis of identity in an external ceremony.

The Christadelphians immerse. Seventh-Day Baptists immerse. If by chance members of these two organizations should meet and compare views, what is the probability that they would consider likeness in a single ceremonial practice a rational basis for union?

Greek Catholics practice immersion. To be sure it is triune immersion, but immersion nevertheless, and the topic of discussion demands that they be included in the review. The River Brethren practice triune immersion also. But unless human action should become suddenly lawless, Greek Catholics and River Brethren will not vote for organic union, even though the identity of their baptismal ceremony is peculiarly marked. These instances prove that similarity of ordinances does not indicate

such an identity of religious philosophy as can guarantee permanent union. For example, all Baptists agree that (1) only those that profess personal faith in Christ as Savior are proper subjects of baptism; and that (2) the only scriptural mode of baptism is immersion; yet Baptists have not been held together by these beliefs. To illustrate: Some years ago a Congregationalist changed his views on the question of baptism and was immersed. He became a Baptist. As a Baptist, he saw fit to express his opinions of the generally accepted theological tenets held in his section of the country. The brethren with whom he was brought into fellowship by immersion disfellowshipped him. That is, in 1779, immersion did not guarantee fellowship of Christians that believed differently on such subjects as election, extent of atonement, and final perseverance of the saints. In 1911, the children of those that withdrew the hand of fellowship from Benjamin Randall repent of the mistaken judgment of their fathers and ask his children according to the faith to join them in fellowship and service. In the closing years of the eighteenth century immersion did not prevent Baptists from becoming two strong and independent organizations. In the opening years of the twentieth century the practice of immersion did not of itself bring them together. Lessening emphasis on purely speculative questions in theology, a more sympathetic view of human nature, and an increasing enthusiasm of all evangelical Christians in every denomination in missionary endeavor both at home and abroad effected the union. In this instance, identity of mode of baptism simply offered one less obstacle for these co-operating forces to overcome.

Permit another incident from ecclesiastical history as an illustration that immersion has relatively little value in effecting the formation of religious bodies. Early in the nineteenth century a Presbyterian changed his views on baptism, and became a Baptist. He was a man of striking personality and unsurpassed in *ad hominem* dialectics. He vigorously preached views that were out of harmony with the thoughts and feelings of many Christians in all denominations in his community. His newly found Baptist brethren obliged him to leave one association. He found fellowship with Baptists in another association. The new

alliance was not made because of identity of views on mode of baptism, but because of identity of views and feelings on other doctrines and practices. To be sure, identity of rite facilitated the new fellowship, but it neither caused it nor occasioned it. That other considerations than immersion were dominant motives may be inferred from the fact that when the Mahoning Baptist Association disbanded and its constituent churches formed the nucleus of the strong and influential denomination known as Disciples, not only Baptists, but Presbyterians and Methodists, in large numbers joined the new body. Alexander Campbell and his followers practiced immersion, but this was not a bond of union sufficiently strong to keep them within the Baptist body. Presbyterians and Methodists had been accustomed to another mode of baptism, but they abandoned this mode and accepted immersion, not for the sake of the rite, but for the sake of a wider body of beliefs of which the mode of baptism was but one, and no doubt to many relatively subordinate.

What it was that occasioned the rapid spread of Campbell's "reform" is tersely stated by the Baptist historian, A. H. Newman :

If the Baptists of the Southwest had been in the third decade of the century what Baptists are today, and if they had been more intelligent and had possessed an educated ministry, if they had laid as little stress on confessions of faith as Baptists do at present, if they had taught as evangelical a form of doctrine as that taught by the mass of the denomination of today, if the missionary spirit had been as active then as now, it would have been impossible for such a movement as that led by Campbell to have arisen or to have gained such a following as it did (*The American Church History Series*, Vol. II, pp. 491, 492).

In fact, the whole movement that resulted in the formation of the organizations known as the Christians and the Disciples of Christ was a protest against a conception of Christianity that issued in sects and in ecclesiastical tyranny in both polity and doctrine. It is not an accident that at about the same period of American history a Virginia Methodist presiding elder, dissatisfied with Episcopal authority, declared the Bible to be the sole and sufficient guide in faith and practice; that several Kentucky Presbyterian preachers, repudiating the Calvinistic doctrine of the

Westminster Confession, accepted the Bible as their only authority; and that a Vermont Baptist layman, already accepting the Bible as his only guide, became "disturbed 'in regard to sectarian names and human creeds.'" For these individuals represented three distinct movements that culminated in a Christian body that is congregational in polity, regards the Bible only as authority, allows every member to interpret it for himself, rejects infant baptism, and practices immersion, although it does not make immersion a condition of church membership.

Nor was it an accident that a Presbyterian "seceder," desiring to restore the unity of believers by returning to the religion of the New Testament, should seek fellowship in a denomination that had congregational church government, that held theoretically that the Bible is the sole authority in belief, and that therefore believers' immersion alone has scriptural warrant. Nor is it strange that this Presbyterian "seceder" and his followers, in accepting the New Testament as authority, rejected human creeds, and, as far as possible, limited necessary doctrinal statement to the language of the apostles. In 1827, then, the followers of O'Kelly and of Stone and of Campbell agreed with Baptists in their doctrine that the Bible, not man-made creeds, was the sole authority in faith. But Baptist associations repudiated the new doctrines because they were not in conformity with the Philadelphia Confession, the recognized standard of orthodoxy of the day. The motto of the Disciples was, "When the Scriptures speak, we speak; when they are silent, we are silent."

The controversy weakened the Baptist denomination numerically, but spread two of its vital doctrines, namely, the sole and sufficient authority of the New Testament, and believers' baptism by immersion, so that the Baptist position has really been strengthened by the disaffection.

The controversy showed also that the practice of immersion is not the essential fact in Baptist history, but only a concrete illustration of how a believer shows his attitude toward his accepted authority in religious life. In the progress of religious discussions in England, the insertion of the note, "The word *baptizo* signifies to dip or plunge," in the Confession of Faith of 1644, served to preserve what had been gained, and thus acted as

a ratchet to prevent Baptists from slipping back to the more or less amorphous position of the Anabaptists. The insistence upon an act in exact accordance with Scripture language guaranteed the perpetuity of the acceptance of the Bible, in contrast to Pope and tradition, as the only authority in matters of religion. But it may be asked, Is conformity to religious ceremony the only test of sincerity? May not the rejection of "man-made creeds" be such a test? In effect, Campbell and his followers so claimed; and today Baptists are not so exacting in credal statement as in 1827. In other words, now the Bible is more really an authority for believers than at any period in Christian history. This does not mean simply that Immersionists are gaining rapidly in numbers, and will continue to gain more rapidly in the future, although such is the fact, but that everywhere there is a growing disposition to insist that all who would see Jesus must be free, unhindered by any authority whatever, to seek him by way of the New Testament, and that all stand or fall to him whom it discloses, not to their fellow-seekers in the same open thoroughfare. Unity, then, cannot come on the basis of immersion merely, but on the narrower basis of conformity to the spiritual values of the New Testament. To seek union as an end is too low an ideal, and history shows that when this is the objective, separation and not union is the result. But to seek the mind of Christ, that is, "doing nothing through party spirit or vain glory, but in humility each esteeming others better than himself; regarding not each one his own things, but each one also the things of others," will result in a union that may fitly be described as the body of Christ. When all Immersionists will have learned "the gentle art of living together," there will be no need of discussing such a topic as "Immersionists and Church Union."

PRESIDENT MERRILL: I have before me the card of Rev. John R. Brown, of Bridgeport, Conn.

REV. JOHN R. BROWN, D.D., Bridgeport, Conn.: *Mr. Chairman and Brethren:* In a sense, I suppose we are all descendants of Roger Williams, but Roger Williams was a Baptist just one month in his stormy career, and after that experience called himself throughout the rest of his long life a "seeker." The

discussion tonight makes me think we will soon have to call ourselves by this same appellation. The fathers would not recognize some of the sentiments here expressed as baptistic. I believe that it is the custom out in California, when an artesian well is opened, to let the water run freely for a number of days, that the strength of the water may be tested and certain hollows on the lower levels may be filled. If we will allow certain tendencies among ourselves to follow their own courses for a while, perhaps this discussion will seem to be needless. There are tendencies which make the denominational problem a little more easy.

In Pedobaptist churches the complaint has come that children are not presented for baptism at the proper time, and oftentimes earnest appeals are made from the pulpit to bring children to the sanctuary for the ordinance. Strange to say, as we Baptists have come to victory, so far as the interpretation of the rite is concerned, we have found among ourselves a strange reticence with regard to its necessity. Having won our victory we are a little afraid of a triumph. Nevertheless, the entire discussion tonight has seemed to omit one important psychological fact—in every kind of sociological life there must be adequate symbolism. If the symbolism does not take a proper authoritative form it will take unusual, strange, and sometimes repulsive forms. As we lose the habit of symbolism in the Christian church it gains in other quarters. The men in the street are going into lodges and other institutions, where symbolism is growing apace. There is an exact psychology of symbolism which we must not overlook. If symbolism is a habit of man, why not think of immersion as the only form of the rite for the Christian church? If scholarship has granted that immersion is the only form of baptism, have we not reached the point where the symbolism of the rite ought to be insisted upon in its purity?

Confession of faith may mean something or it may mean nothing. The Baptists of England are a free body, so far as the particular form of the rite is concerned, because of the peculiar conditions of Nonconformist life in England. The Nonconformists have had to fight together or fall together, and if

the Baptists of England had come to some of the positions we occupy they would have been a decisive force in English Christian life.

Our different strata of population in years gone suffered from the difficulties of communication. Now with these difficulties of communication entirely ended, with a general level of intelligence that seems to be heightening all the time, we shall soon be in the same position as the Baptists of England—and that tendency has manifested itself in the papers which have been read to us tonight. It seems to me we are never going to lose the value of a symbol in the church of Jesus Christ, and whatever the authority for the symbol of baptism may be in the example and words of Jesus Christ, certainly the long tendency of the Christian church and the uses of the rite of baptism in days gone by will compel continuance of that rite. We are going to settle it, I believe, at the point of a believer's baptism, whether that baptism is one by immersion, by affusion, or by sprinkling. We are going to recognize in a modified form the English Baptist position largely because of the growth of the common intelligence in this country which deals with the more practical things. The denominations are being brought together in a union for service as they have never been brought together in a union for a creed. We cannot escape these inevitable conclusions for daily life and for ecclesiastical integrity. As I look at the matter, the time is very near at hand when this large liberty will be granted all on the basis of the confession of the believer; and then the further ideal that the symbol must represent something adequate, habitual, and true will compel the church more and more to recognize immersion as the only form of baptism. But as that form of baptism has to be based on the voluntary principle, and as it represents in the first place an adequate faith, we need not trouble ourselves over extensively with what the result will be. We need not help God very much in trying to bring about a result that is inevitable if we allow the tendency to take its own course. We find it will enter the deep stream of history and we will not have to make courses for it. We will wonder why we did not recognize the tendency and appreciate the fact of the large providence of God in this discussion. (*Applause.*)

PRESIDENT MERRILL: I have before me the card of Professor Pollard, of Crozer Seminary.

PROF. E. B. POLLARD, PH.D., Chester, Pa.: With me the question at last resolves itself into this: Are the Baptists, after all, worth while? But I hasten to explain that I am not a ritualist nor a sacramentarian, in my firm stand for immersion. Christian union is a good thing. The question is whether the world needs Christian union more than it needs what we Baptists can contribute to the religious welfare of men. If the world needs union more than it needs what we can give, we ought to fall in on behalf of Christian union at all hazards. I believe the Baptists have a contribution to make, a testimony to bear, to the world; and because of this, we ought to place ourselves in the very best position to give equivocally that testimony. There are influences still at work, even in the Christian world today, which ought to be overcome, and which can be conquered only by Baptists giving their testimony in an unmistakable way. The first of these influences came from Greek mysticism, producing a sacramentarian conception of the ordinances; the next from Roman imperialism, introducing spiritual tyranny, the hierarchy, and priest craft into the church. The third class of errors came through Judaism, which sent over into Christianity the fallacy that the family is the Christian unit, rather than the individual, resulting in religion by proxy, infant baptism, and the like. The errors that came from these sources still exist in the Christian world, and so long as they remain the Baptists will have a mission; and a vigorous denominational loyalty is essential to a successful witnessing to the truth as Baptists see it. Immersion is not the essential in the Baptist position, yet it is necessary for the most vigorous and manifest testimony to the truth that we have for the world. This in itself would be reason enough for being an Immersionist. We should hold to it for that for which it stands; that which it represents in the world of spirit. Just as the American flag, with its stars and stripes, portrays the genius of our nation, many states in one union, so immersion sets forth the genius of our denominational life, and assists in keeping our testimony before the world.

I should hold to immersion for the sake of the witness the Baptists can give to the backward races of the world. To a very large degree our contribution has been made to America. We have here won our fight in good measure, but we have a mission to the heathen world. They are today feeling after the spiritual democracy which characterizes Baptists. In proportion to the men and money employed Baptists have been the most successful workers in foreign fields. Our viewpoint appeals. Besides, even should Baptists cease to be Immersionists, if the Bible continues to be the guide to faith and life Baptists of the immersion type would sooner or later spring up again out of the ground in foreign lands. No people can have an open Bible without sometime finding immersion. True, as one speaker has said, "It is a shame for us to perpetuate our denominational differences in foreign countries," but an open Bible and a free mind will perpetuate immersion. The democratizing tendency in Continental Europe and in the Orient today is favorable to Baptist opportunity, and I think it would be a pity for us to weaken our denominational integrity by yielding in the matter of baptism, which is such a fine emblem of that for which we stand in spirit—a voluntary and complete submergence into the life and loyalty of Jesus Christ. (*Applause.*)

PRESIDENT MERRILL: I have the card of Professor J. P. Lichtenberger, of Philadelphia, who will now speak to you.

PROFESSOR J. P. LICHTENBERGER, PH.D.: *Mr. Chairman, Members of the Congress:* I understand that this platform of the Congress is a free one; an open parliament for the expression of one's personal convictions. It occurred to me therefore that perhaps it might not be amiss for a sociologist to speak on this subject since there were some things passing through my mind during the discussion that seemed pertinent, and which had not been given emphasis. I do not represent the Disciples of Christ in the opinions which I desire to express. They are simply my own.

It does not seem to me that the discussion of the form of baptism, or any technical point of doctrine that might be raised,

is really worthy of the place which in these discussions it has assumed.

The speakers have referred to the fact that when the missionary spirit has been dominant, when work for humanity has been the program, denominational differences have been relegated to a somewhat inferior position. It seems to me that the whole denominational controversy in the church has in a most unfortunate way diverted it, to a very great extent, from its real purpose, and aim, and mission. It was, perhaps, inevitable that Christianity should come to be expressed in credal form, when we understand the influence of the Greek mind upon its interpretation, or that it should become a new source of power and a new organization in the hand of the Roman, or that it should come to be a matter of faith, that is, a matter of thinking, in the mediaeval period. Perhaps these things were inevitable, but just to the extent that the attention of the church is centered in doing the will of God on earth as it is done in heaven, in doing the things which Jesus came to do in the world, these technical questions take a position that is not the one that they have occupied in the period of doctrinal controversy.

When different denominations come into the same community and friction arises because of denominational antagonisms, it is only inevitable from the fact that these different representatives of different churches go into the communities primarily to establish a church and preach doctrines which are not preached; to lay emphasis on principles sacred to the denomination which holds them. These are the things that cause friction, but in no instance where a representative of any denomination has gone into a community for the purpose of eliminating human distress, of doing away with child labor, of diminishing the causes of poverty, in other words, of going into a community for the purpose of bringing in the kingdom of God rather than establishing a church, is there any record of friction.

The most unfortunate thing that has happened to modern Christianity—the thing which has resulted in the divisions of Christendom—is that the church has been side-tracked from its main issue, that of doing the will of God on earth, of lowering

the death-rate, of making human life more sacred. It has been bent on establishing doctrines, upon establishing creeds, and these things have been elevated out of all proportion to their significance.

The paper which set forth especially tonight the position that Jesus did not come to establish a form of doctrine of any kind, but to render service to humanity, struck the keynote of the discussion. To the extent to which the church turns its attention to doing the things which Jesus came to do, not to the building up of a creed, but to the lifting up of the lives of men; to the extent which the church gives itself to a social mission and establishes his kingdom here by alleviating human distress, to that extent these doctrinal differences sink into insignificance. They are not worthy the place they have occupied in modern times.

If I might add a word to the discussion of the afternoon session I would suggest that if the Baptists and Disciples desire union, the thing by which it may be secured is to adopt social programs by which they may jointly enter upon the work of helping men and women, of doing something. I speak particularly of the alleviation of distress. If the church shall busy itself in the elimination of poverty as a program, these doctrinal differences will be so insignificant that they will not stand in the way at all. If the church shall set itself at the practical task for which I believe Jesus came, to lift up human life, to make it more sacred, to alleviate distress, to open the eyes of the blind, to heal the sick, to cleanse the unclean, to do all those acts of ministry to man, then these problems which have cost us bitter strife, all these things will be relegated to their proper position of relative unimportance, and we shall wonder why we have spent so much time in wrangling over these things, rather than in doing the things which Jesus came to do. (*Applause.*)

PRESIDENT MERRILL: Rev. William H. Bawden, of Perth Amboy, N.J., will now speak.

MR. BAWDEN: *Mr. President:* It seems to me that we are beating a little around the bush tonight. We have been reminded

that we have won the battle of exegesis, of etymology. Nobody today questions the meaning of *baptizo*. But if immersion stands in the way of union with other Christian bodies, why not meet them halfway? We all depend upon the Scriptures, taking our authority from them. Why not come out flat-footed, and say that sprinkling or affusion is just as truly scriptural baptism as immersion? We can hardly believe that Jesus would tie himself up to any specific form, and hold that the doing accordingly was necessary to be acceptable unto him. And we may profitably turn away from the letter that killeth to the spirit that maketh alive.

There is no need that we should give up our practice or teaching of immersion, for it truly symbolizes baptism. But apart from its symbolism, what is the meaning of baptism? Is it not that public act by which a man comes before the world and professes his faith in Jesus as Lord, and gives his allegiance to Him as such? If this is the meaning of baptism, then by whatsoever form or rite accompanied, or even by none at all, like the practice of the Quakers, the spirit of the teachings of Jesus are conserved, and one may be said to be scripturally baptized. As has been well said, we have discovered members of these other Christian bodies to be just as truly Christian as ourselves. If any man shall declare himself publicly to be a follower of the Lord Jesus Christ, no matter by what rite, shall we deny him a place in the army of the Lord with us?

Our Pedobaptist friends do not ask us to give up immersion; they acknowledge the literal interpretation of the Scriptures at that point. But they do ask for our recognition of what they believe to be baptism. The moment we admit the validity of sprinkling and affusion or any other form, provided the spirit and meaning of baptism is in it, the profession of faith in and the giving of allegiance to the Christ, we have gone a great way toward a greater union with these others. We shall then march together with them more unitedly for the salvation of the world. We shall not allow a mere matter of form to divide us, seeing we are at one in the spirit of the matter. Granting this, we may still continue teaching the beauty of the symbolism of immersion, according to the teachings of Paul. And we may

well believe that many will voluntarily wish, having been convinced that we are in the right, also to set forth in symbol what has already taken place in their lives. Let us grasp them by the hand as brothers until they are willing to do this, thus proclaiming to them and to the whole world that we are really one in the eyes of Christ, all having been baptized according to the spirit of the teachings of the Book to which we all subscribe. (*Applause.*)

PRESIDENT MERRILL: We will close this session of the congress by prayer from Rev. Dr. John Brown, of Bridgeport.

Adjourned

THIRD DAY

Morning Session

Thursday, November 16, 1911

10:00 A.M.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: We will open the morning session by prayer from Rev. Rivington D. Lord, D.D., Brooklyn.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: We have before us this morning a subject which is presenting a mighty challenge to the Christian church—"Pauperism, Its Causes and Cure." The first paper will be read by Rev. Dr. Addison Moore, of New York.

REV. ADDISON MOORE, D.D., of New York, then presented the following paper:

PAUPERISM, ITS CAUSES AND CURE

Rich and poor are relative terms usually used in regard to material possessions; but pauperism rightly defined is a condition of life which is relative, not to material considerations, but to character.

Briefly described, pauperism is best portrayed as a state of life in which efficiency is impossible because the means of nourishing life are insufficient.

It has been found by scientific investigation that a proportion approximating one-tenth of the population is existing in pauperism. In New York City the proportion has been ascertained to be about 14 per cent. It has become customary to write and speak of these unfortunates as "the submerged tenth."

The reason for the existence of this inefficient body of people of inadequate means has occasioned much study on the part of social investigators and reformers, as well as no little bewilderment on the part of legislative committees and well-meaning societies organized to discover and apply remedies that would really relieve existing distress.

It has been supposed that certain qualities of personal life, such as shiftlessness and ignorance and intemperance, have been to blame for pauperism, and only recently has it been seen that these qualities may be effects instead of causes.

It has been held that if employment could be found for the victims of pauperism their condition would be improved; but out of forty men taken from the "bread line" on a certain night thirty-nine of them proved to be unemployable. Lack of proper nourishment had so impoverished the physical, mental, and moral organism that the ability to take advantage of an opportunity to work was altogether wanting.

Attempts to better the condition of poverty-pinched people by seeking to reclaim them through the administration of good-intentioned but unwise charities have been about as effective as would be the efforts put forth to purify the water in a well by painting the shed that covers it.

The great difficulty in the way of providing a remedy for pauperism has been the ignorance in the minds of those who have not understood the difference between its causes and its effects. This ignorance and the cure for it was suggested by Mr. Robert Treat Paine, of Boston, when he said that what was needed was not alms but a friend. And his suggestion has had ample illustration of its wisdom in the recent declaration of earnest students of the problem who state that pauperism has but two causes.

The first cause is the exploitation of labor by the greed for gain at the expense of human life, and finds one of its effects in children deprived of the privilege of having a playtime and made prematurely old by the drudgery of mines and mills and factories where child-labor is employed. The result of child-labor is evidenced in undeveloped bodies and minds and in lives unfitted for the duties of maturity.

The second cause is the lack of proper governmental interest in the welfare of citizens. This does not mean paternalism, but refers to the duties of states as administrators of the rights of the people. It means that when men are incapacitated for work by conditions of life that render them unfit for labor, or that rob them of the desire to work, it is the business of the state

to investigate and remedy those conditions. For pauperism is a preventable disease which will yield to treatment when the disease is not only diagnosed, but attacked at its source.

To effect a cure has been the desire of all dreamers of a better day who, like Edward Bellamy in his *Looking Backward*, and More in his *Utopia*, have imagined a time when every individual would get his full share of good things; and have then busied themselves deciding whether it would be best to have the good things delivered by automobile or by airship.

The cure has been attempted by the Socialists. Their hopes have been fixed upon the good that would come to all from having the power to benefit the public proceed from a centralized authority strong enough to impose a desire for the good of all upon mankind. But it has been demonstrated that a continued imposition of power and direction from outside tends to reduce the creative strength of the individual. And the one thing necessary to remedy the conditions that produce pauperism is that such creative strength, which is only another name for the power of initiative, shall be not diminished, but intensified.

The cure proposed by the anarchist is also ineffective. For while the anarchist would destroy pauperism he would also destroy wealth and all things else besides. So that following the successful operation of the program of the anarchist, mankind would have to begin all over again, and could only reproduce a civilization which would again have to be overthrown. And while organizations have been busy fighting intemperance and idleness and immorality, and while doctrinaires have been contending over the value of their several remedies, they have one and all been encouraged in their ineffective assaults upon the manifestations of the disease by the attitude of the churches toward the disease itself.

A saying of Jesus has been taken from its context and made to sound as though he had declared that pauperism was a necessary condition of life for a portion of mankind. "The poor," said Jesus, "you have with you always; and whensoever you will you may do them good." But what he said in those words, and what it has been held that he said, are as opposite as the poles. He was not justifying the existence of pauperism; but

was rebuking his disciples with an irony which has seemingly been too subtle for the Christian centuries to feel.

The disciples of Jesus were murmuring because Mary had poured precious ointment upon him. Judas became their spokesman and said that the ointment could have been sold and the money given to the poor. "This he said not because he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief"; and as he carried the common purse he wanted to have whatever benefit he could get from controlling all the money on which he could lay his hands. Jesus, knowing his heart, rebuked him and all who are of his spirit.

What Jesus said was that criticism was uncalled for so far as the deed of Mary was concerned, because if there was any real desire to help the poor there was every opportunity to do so. The sudden awakening to their needs on the part of Judas was brought about by his cupidity, which Jesus sought to put to shame. But the words have been torn from their setting and made to serve as a dogmatic declaration that pauperism is ordained of God as a permanent, component part of society.

There have been times when the churches have openly encouraged pauperism as a condition peculiarly pleasing to God, and the poor have been told that pauperism was to develop faith and test loyalty. Today, however, we are becoming ashamed so to misrepresent the God and Father of Jesus Christ; for we have come to see that pauperism is not only not desirable and not inevitable, but that it is entirely unnatural and altogether intolerable. We have gone behind the external expressions of the disease and have learned its causes. And they are removable. The remedies for the disease are known and wherever they have been applied the results obtained in lives redeemed from unhappiness and uselessness have justified the utmost faith in their efficiency. Every man who is willing to give himself to the service of men may have a share in abolishing pauperism. He must remember that character is the foundation of prosperity and that the lack of it lets the building of life sink into the mire of pauperism.

The very poor believe that the world is against them and that no individual effort can change that apparent fact. They

lack proper food and suitable clothing. They are forced by their condition to congregate in congested districts and are not properly housed. The lack of these material necessities weakens the physical life and creates the desire for inhibitions produced by intoxicants and excitements. It weakens the ambition and makes sluggish the will to create better conditions.

The problem that confronted Booker Washington when he attempted to befriend the Negro is the problem that abides wherever pauperism abounds. It is the problem of awakening right desires in people whose desires are all wrong. Such wrong desires are latent in us all, as is evidenced by our childhood evasion of duty in the interest of what seems more agreeable at the moment; as when the boy proposes to help mother wipe the dishes by the kitchen stove, when he ought to be out in the cold woodshed splitting kindlings for the morning fire.

Even so the victim of pauperism prefers to spend the pennies he has begged for the drink that may help him to forget for the moment the hardships of the life he endures; while what he needs is to know that there is a lasting relief from misery, and that relief lies in having a desire to save his pennies. The trouble is that such a desire is beyond his will power. The pleasure of prudence has been denied him for so long a time that he has lost the power to desire it. He only desires pity and idleness, and sinks easily into the crimes for which his weakness makes him a willing tool.

The remedy lies in the hands of the more fortunate portions of the population as they speak through the state. For the state has long taught the three R's in the public schools, and more recently attempts have been made to train the hands as well as the heads of the pupils. But the state must also teach by means of Postal Saving Banks, and Provident Loan Banks, and Co-operative Building Associations.

Wherever organizations and institutions and churches have gone to work along these lines, as has the Salvation Army and as have several well-known churches in New York and other cities, the results have encouraged the workers to believe in the ability of proper educational methods to abolish pauperism.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: The second speaker or writer upon

the subject will be Professor J. P. Lichtenberger, Ph.D., of the University of Pennsylvania.

PROFESSOR J. P. LICHTENBERGER, PH.D. (Disciple), then presented the following paper :

PAUPERISM, ITS CAUSES AND CURE

CAUSES

Clear thinking requires that the terms used in any discussion should be defined accurately.

Pauperism is the state of dependence in which the individual who is either unable or unwilling to support himself receives aid either from public or from private sources.

Its immediate cause is the social and economic condition of persons who have not sufficient income to maintain the minimum standard of living necessary for health and efficiency.

Those who fall below this minimum standard are "the poor." Those who receive aid to maintain this standard are "paupers."

Poverty is, then, relatively much more extensive than pauperism, since multitudes who hover about the poverty line receive no assistance. Robert Hunter has estimated that the number of persons living below the poverty line in the United States in years of normal prosperity aggregates approximately 10,000,000. The Census Report of 1904 showed that 500,000 persons were receiving indoor relief, i.e., were dependents in institutions. While the number receiving outdoor relief, i.e., receiving aid from public and private sources outside of institutions, can only be estimated, it is assumed to be about 5 per cent of our total population, or approximately 4,000,000.

Any study of the causes of pauperism, therefore, must concern itself with an investigation of the causes of poverty which consigns the individual to the pauper class. At the very outset it will be of advantage to perceive clearly that we are dealing with a phenomenon of a free population. Poverty is one of the incidents or costs of social progress. It does not exist in a condition of slavery where the relation of master and slave is inclusive and no individual is unprovided for. Some slaves may be better provided for than others, but Negro poverty or

pauperism was not a problem before the Civil War. Poverty is not a problem of feudal society where lords and tenants comprise the group. It is only when the slave is freed, and where the tenant loses his status as a ward of his over-lord, where each man is independent and must provide for his own subsistence, that the unsuccessful group fails of self-support and the poverty class is created.

It is clear then that poverty is a product of the individual struggle for existence in a free competitive society, and without individual and social altruism the unsuccessful would simply be eliminated through disease incident to malnutrition, through degeneration and starvation. What now are the causes of this maladjustment which produces this unsuccessful group? Successful cure must rest upon accurate diagnosis.

It is an achievement of sociological science worthy to be classed with the greatest discoveries of mankind, that we have been led to perceive social causation in human society; that effects are attributable to causes adequate to produce them in the sphere of social life as they are in every other department of human experience.

The complexity of the phenomena does not permit of its organization in simple categories. It is not surprising, therefore, that students who have pursued inductive methods in the study of poverty have arranged their materials differently, but there is this essential unity, that cause and effect has been traced in every instance and light has broken upon this dark subject.

It is my purpose to present the outline analysis of several studies typical of the modern scientific method, which have revealed clearly the causes of poverty and pauperism and established the basis for its intelligent treatment.

Professor Edward T. Devine, of Columbia University, in his book entitled *Misery and Its Causes*, has made one of the finest contributions to the elucidation of the modern point of view to be found in the literature of the subject. Without attempting a classification of causes he proceeds simply to show that human misery, and especially such part of it as produces poverty,

is a product of natural causes. He attacks the "charitable tradition" that misery is moral rather than economic. He says:

In contrast with the idea that misery is moral, the inexorable visitation of punishment for immoral actions and the inevitable outcome of depraved character, I wish to present the idea that it is economic, the result of maladjustment, that defective personality is only a half-way explanation which itself results directly from conditions which society may largely control.

The question which I raise is whether the wretched poor, the poor who suffer in their poverty, are poor because they are shiftless, because they are undisciplined, because they drink, because they steal, because they have superfluous children, because of personal depravity, personal inclination, and natural preference; or whether they are shiftless and undisciplined and drink and steal and are unable to care for their too numerous children because our social institutions and economic arrangements are at fault. I hold that personal depravity is as foreign to any sound theory of the hardships of our modern poor as witchcraft or demoniacal possession; that these hardships are economic, social, transitional, measurable, manageable. Misery, as we say of tuberculosis, is communicable, curable, and preventable. It lies not in the unalterable nature of things, but in our particular institutions, our social arrangements, our tenements and streets and subways, our laws and courts and jails, our religion, our education, our philanthropy, our politics, our industry, and our business.¹

In order to obviate the criticism that Dr. Devine has not considered adequately the individual factor of wrongdoing, some further paragraphs are presented. He continues:

No doubt we do encounter instances in which, in this life, individuals who suffer are but paying penalties of their own misdeeds. Passion and indolence do have their consequences. I have no quarrel with those who seek through education in the family, in church, in school, or in neighborly relations, to instil in young and old a wholesome fear of consequences. Nature teaches us in lessons written large in human experience that certain habits will eventually prove injurious and other habits salutary. We are fully warranted in taking these lessons to heart and in passing them on to such as are not fools, and therefore do not insist on learning in the dearest of all schools, that of experience.

It is the reverse of this position that it is not tenable. Evil passions and indolence produce misery, but it does not follow that misery, all misery, or most misery, is to be attributed to indolence or evil passions. The position which I suggest for your consideration is merely that there is no presumption of wrongdoing in the misery of the poor, that it may not be

¹ *Misery and Its Causes*, pp. 11-12.

disciplinary, that it may not be punishment, that it may not be the working out of moral character. It may indeed be any of these things in a given instance, but the burden of proof is upon those who allege it, and no charitable society is justified, no public relief agency or institution is justified, in basing its policies upon the assumption that because these men before us are afflicted in mind or body, therefore either they or their parents have sinned.¹

Professor Charles A. Ellwood, of the University of Missouri, has given us a valuable classification on the basis of the objective and subjective causes of poverty.²

I. OBJECTIVE CAUSES

1. *Economic causes.*—Those due to defective industrial organization; to unemployment not due to the employee; to changes in methods of production which displace large numbers of workingmen; to systems of land tenure which deprive men of the use of land; to employment of women and children in factories; to unhealthful and dangerous occupation; to seasonal trades; to industrial injuries, etc. These and similar causes often in conjunction with physical or mental defects of the individual, Professor Ellwood believes, operate in from 50 to 80 per cent of all cases of poverty.

2. *Insanitary conditions of living.*—The causes here are: inadequate and insanitary housing of the poor; lack of light and ventilation; overcrowding. These are prolific causes of sickness and premature death which increase destitution.

3. *Defects in our educational system.*—Ignorance and illiteracy contribute directly or indirectly to poverty. Lack of industrial or vocational training in our public schools is a grave fault in adjusting children to our complex industrial organization.

4. *Defects in government.*—Corruption in politics vitiates governmental control of sanitary and other conditions. Failure to regulate properly the social and industrial order causes economic distress.

5. *Corruption in social customs and institutions.*—Social drinking; unwise and indiscriminate charity, etc., are contributory causes.

6. *Unrestricted immigration.*—This is especially true in our eastern cities and states where cheap labor crowds occupations and reduces wages.

II. SUBJECTIVE CAUSES

1. *Sickness* causing temporary or permanent disability; feeble-mindedness, insanity, epilepsy; deafness, blindness, etc. The physically or mentally handicapped are likely to be forced into poverty.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 13 and 14.

² *Sociology and Modern Social Problems*, chap. xii.

2. *Intemperance*.—Here again there may be collateral cause for inebriety, but the percentage of cases in which intemperance is a direct or indirect cause is large.

3. *Sexual vice*.—Immorality lessens vitality and when it is accompanied by venereal diseases, partial or complete incapacity for work may be the result. This is especially true in those forms of venereal disease which frequently culminate in locomotor ataxia and paresis.

4. *Shiftlessness and laziness*.—This may be due to inherent worthlessness or to undervitalized physical condition. In either event it is an efficient cause.

5. *Old age*.—The decline of physical and mental vitality due to old age is an unavoidable cause.

6. *Neglect and desertion by relatives*.—Deserted wives, abandoned children, and neglected old people may be put down as one of the important causes of dependence.

7. *Death of bread-winner*.—Widows and orphans constitute a large proportion of the poverty group.

8. *Crime, dishonesty, ignorance, etc.*

This is an admirable summary of the causes for poverty. It is, however, a question how far such a division of causes into objective and subjective is valuable, because subjective causes may have their roots in objective conditions. For example, physical and mental defects, intemperance, vice, shiftlessness, helpless old age, desertion, and premature death may severally or collectively be the direct result of bad economic and social conditions. There are aspects of these causes, however, as Professor Ellwood points out, which cannot be reduced to objective influences but lie imbedded in biological and psychological conditions. In the same economic environment one family is thrifty and another destitute. One man under the most adverse circumstances is still able to secure an adequate income, while another in the midst of favorable conditions remains poor. Subjective causes cannot, therefore, be wholly eliminated.

Another method of great value in the investigation of the causes of poverty is the case method. This consists in a classification of actual cases of pauperism dealt with by relief agencies on the basis of causes producing such dependency. An excellent example of such study is presented by Warner.¹ The survey covers the following cases: Baltimore, 1,385 (1890-92);

¹ *American Charities*, rev. ed., pp. 50 and 51.

Boston, 2,083 (1890-92); Buffalo, 8,235 (1878-92); Cincinnati, 4,844 (1891); New York, 1,412 (1891); Stepney, Eng., 634 (1892); St. Pancras, a London district, 736 (1892); 76 German cities, 95,845 (1886). The cases were taken from the records of the organized charities in the American cities, from the work of Booth in England, and of Böhmert in Germany.

The causes were classified as follows:

- I. THOSE DUE TO MISCONDUCT.....23.2 per cent
 Drink, 11.6 per cent.
 Immorality.
 Shiftlessness and inefficiency, 9.2 per cent.
 Crime and dishonesty.
 Roving disposition.
- II. THOSE DUE TO MISFORTUNE.....71 per cent
1. No normal support, 8.5 per cent.
 Imprisonment of breadwinner.
 Orphans and abandoned children.
 Neglect by relatives.
 No male support.
 2. Employment, 20.8 per cent.
 Lack of employment.
 Insufficient employment.
 Poorly paid employment.
 Unhealthful and dangerous employment.
 3. Personal incapacity, 43.1 per cent.
 Ignorance of English.
 Accident.
 Sickness or death in family, 24.4 per cent.
 Physical defects.
 Insanity.
 Old age.
- III. UNCLASSIFIED OR UNKNOWN..... 6.8
- Only the average for the principal groups are given here.

	Percentage
Total cases due to misconduct.....	23.2
Total cases due to misfortune.....	71.0

In the sub-groups under misfortune:

No normal support.....	8.5
Employment.....	20.8
Personal incapacity.....	43.1

Of causes classed under misconduct:

Drink is responsible for 11.6 per cent.

Shiftlessness and inefficiency for 9.2 per cent.

Of cases classed under misfortune, sickness and death is the largest item, 24.4 per cent.

Another valuable and illuminating classification of causes of poverty is presented by Professor Carl Kelsey, of the University of Pennsylvania.¹

CAUSES OF POVERTY

I. ENVIRONMENTAL.

- A. Adverse physical environment: polar regions, tropics, deserts, swamps.
- B. Disaster: flood, earthquake, fire, famine.

II. PERSONAL:

- A. Physical defects: feeble-mindedness, insanity, deafness, blindness, etc.
- B. Moral defects: dishonesty, laziness, shiftlessness, etc.
- C. Intemperance.
- D. Licentiousness.
- E. Sickness.
- F. Accident.

III. SOCIAL:

- A. Industrial changes affecting the worker: change of location, of trade, inventions, strikes, etc.
- B. Exploitation.
- C. Race prejudice.
- D. Sickness, death, desertion, crime of natural supporter.
- E. Defective sanitation.
- F. Defective educational system.
- G. Bad social environment.
- H. War.
- I. Unwise philanthropy.

The preceding analyses have been presented in order to demonstrate the modern scientific method of approach to the study of the the causes of poverty. Several propositions may now be made as legitimate deductions from this survey.

1. Poverty is a product; a necessary result from a group of causes.

¹ Unpublished lectures.

2. It is a complicated phenomenon and any attempt to attribute poverty in general to a single cause must be regarded as inadequate.

3. Any attempt at eradication must proceed upon the basis of elimination of its causes.

4. Since these causes are inherent in our social situation nothing less than a constructive social program can prove efficient.

CURE

We have now the point of view from which to consider the cure of this social disease we call poverty. It presents a problem precisely analogous to that of physical disease. Were it not for the fact that Poor Relief occupies so large a place in the popular mind as the most conspicuous method of dealing with poverty we might omit it altogether as having only a casual relation to our subject. It is nothing more than a social anaesthetic for the easing of the pain of poverty and bears the same relation to the cure of poverty that the anaesthetic does to the cure of disease. The Good Samaritan did the only thing to be done after the wayfarer had fallen among thieves, but his treatment of the case added absolutely nothing to the cure of robbery in Palestine. If enough Good Samaritans could have been found to have cared for all their victims, robbers could then have proceeded with their business with one less element of remorse for injury done. Relief of distress is no cure for the disease, and the indiscriminate giver of charity will hardly take comfort from the case of Dives who allowed Lazarus' distress to be relieved from the crumbs which fell from his table. Just so long as enough thoughtless though charitable people can be found to supply the crumbs necessary to feed the poor and keep them from starvation will the consciences of the rich be salved and the predatory classes feel free to pursue their programs of exploitation with no concern for their product. An awakened and intelligent social conscience must inevitably come to regard relief as an unfortunate necessity; a mere palliative, to be used simply to alleviate distress while the real cause of misery is being removed. Constructive programs of prevention then must be relied upon to effect the cure of poverty. The

causes must be attacked and eliminated. Robbery along the Jericho road must be stopped. If robbers cannot at once be eliminated, then the road must be policed and lighted and made safe. Lazarus must be cured of his disease and enabled to provide his own subsistence.

For the cure of poverty then we turn to preventive treatment. No disease is cured until its causes have been removed, and the victory is half attained when the causes are known with certainty.

On the clearly objective and environmental side the program seems clear. Childhood must be protected from exploitation. Working hours for men and especially women must be reduced. Over physical and nervous strain must be eliminated. A living wage must be secured. Dangerous machinery must be guarded and industrial injuries prevented. Working conditions must be made safe and sanitary. Waste and loss of men as well as material in economic production must be made a charge against the industry. Insurance against sickness, injury, old age, and death must be provided.

Home and family life must be protected. Overcrowding must be stopped. Sanitation, light, fresh air must be provided. All contagious and preventable diseases must be eliminated. Pure food and milk and pure water must be secured. Public health must be guarded as carefully as public property.

Illiteracy must be removed. Industrial and vocational training must be provided for children and trade schools for adults.

Policies of this sort will eliminate much poverty by removing its objective causes, but they will do more. They will diminish effectively the product of subjective factors; at least of such subjective factors as have their source in objective conditions. In order to deal adequately with such factors as inhere in physiology and psychological defects not due to environment but to heredity, segregation in celibate communities or sterilization must be employed in order to terminate with the present generation their degenerate type.

At the conclusion of a discussion like this it is hardly necessary to say that the problem of poverty and pauperism is a social problem; that individual methods are as inadequate to solve

as they are to create the problem; that church and state and school and all forms of voluntary associations for social amelioration and all relief agencies public and private should be coordinated in a comprehensive scheme of collective endeavor to solve the problem.

Such a procedure has already been entered upon. I have not suggested a single measure that is not somewhere being tried. Every community is being agitated by a new optimism. But the task is great. The forces opposed are indifference, ignorance, selfishness, and greed. It should be the clear duty of every minister, every student, every philanthropist, every humanitarian, to advertise, foster, encourage, and support to the extent of his ability such a comprehensive and constructive program in order that so much of poverty as is curable and preventable may speedily be done away with.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: The first of our appointed speakers is Mr. Mornay Williams, of New York, whom I take pleasure in introducing to you.

MORNAY WILLIAMS, ESQ., New York: *Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:* Speaking on this topic, one is reminded of that young student who took for his graduating essay, "The Past, the Present, and the Future," and also of the one who followed with "Finites, Infinites, and Infinitesimals." To treat in twenty minutes the causes and cure of pauperism would seem a task beyond the limits of the time that this whole conference lasted. It has been the subject for discussion for many years. Some of the causes have been recited in the papers we have listened to. To find any single cause is absolutely impossible; to find any single cure is merely to suggest a nostrum.

As I shall have to take issue with one or two of the propositions enunciated, I may be pardoned for a word or two as to my personal experience. I have been associated in an active manner with many of the attempts which have been made to touch only the fringe of pauperism, in New York City. I am chairman of the New York Child Labor Committee, a member of the Havens Relief Fund, and of the New York Prison Association, and have been from time to time associated both with Dr.

Devine and Dr. Kelsey, and yet with a good many of their propositions I do not agree at all.

The causes of pauperism can be grouped or divided as has been said, along several different lines, economic and moral; springing out of environment and out of heredity. I should hardly care to assent to the proposition that pauperism is entirely the disease of modern industrial civilization, because that does not seem to fit the facts in such states as the later Roman Empire, where there were slaves, and yet there was also pauperism in the sense that there was a large dependent class. Pauperism, the term, is itself a little vague. Strictly speaking it means those who receive aid from the public treasury, but it is now taken as including the class which receives aid from any source, public or private.

There is no doubt that our present competitive system largely contributes to present pauperism, but it is a grave doubt in my mind whether it is the sole cause; it is one cause, undoubtedly, a cause which must be kept constantly in mind in treating pauperism and riches. On the side of social and economic cause pauperism is the shadow cast by great accumulations of wealth, but that definition does not touch the moral cause. That cause is partly hereditary, partly environmental. I have made, for instance, a pretty considerable study of the question of childhood in relation to pauperism and crime. When I was on the Board of the Juvenile Asylum we had at one time 1,100 children; we have now over 500 boys. Some of these figures which have been quoted are from just such a tabulation as that we made with a thousand children. What did we find? We found this, that the children of criminals sent to an institution for reformation had been made criminals largely by environment and became themselves criminal. We found on the physical side (as touching the question of physical fitness to meet conditions) that if you took children under fourteen—largely of criminal parents, always of destitute parents—and gave them a thorough examination, including head measurements, development of the brain casket, facial characteristics, and so forth, 7 per cent were absolutely normal; that where more than five abnormalities were shown after this careful examination, including vital organs

and head measurements, in about 70 per cent of the cases the physical abnormalities arose from bad habits, malnutrition, overcrowding, and other preventable causes. All of which means that when you put (or leave) a child long enough in a bad environment you help the moral bent the wrong way, and you have to overcome a moral bent as well as the causes of pauperism existing merely because of bad physical conditions.

I took the pains while coming over here to look hurriedly through some of the reports of the Havens Relief Fund Society which distributes about \$40,000 a year. Here let me interrupt the discussion to say that the swing of the pendulum now is in favor of prevention as against relief, but you must have relief as long as you have poverty. Prevention if it is to be successful must strike just as much at the sources of wealth as at the increase of poverty. The gentlemen who support the theories of the Charity Organization Society do not believe in that and do not act on it. The reports of 176 cases which I have glanced over show \$1,900 expended; 39 were helped with rent; 23 with food; 4 with medicine; 23 with clothing; 1 with tuition (to a girl to enable her to learn stenography); 4 with coal; 25 loans were made to be returned; 4 were given fares to obtain work; 7 scholarships were awarded to children through a branch of the New York Child Labor Committee in families where the labor of children under school age was necessary to their support; 3 were given bedding; 4 vacations; 29 money relief; miscellaneous, 9. I have not had time further to analyze all the cases, but the three first almoners treated 39 cases; and of these 12 were widows, 10 single women, 5 deserted wives, 8 married couples, 1, a single man out of work and sick; 1, a widower, same causes; 2 were women where the details of the report are not sufficiently full to arrive at any classification. I want to point out to you first, in how many of these cases the loss of the bread-winner is evidently the cause of the distress, and second, the fact that these are all cases of the worthy poor. The funds of this particular society are supposed to be given only to worthy people, that being the provision of the testator in his will creating the fund.

You may be interested to hear the report of a well-known

woman, whose name if I were to mention it you would recognize as that of an earnest Christian woman, who reports the case of a minister, of another communion than ours, a gentleman and a scholar, who tried to get work in the Sanskrit section of the New York Public Library, who writes and speaks Bohemian, Hungarian, Spanish, and other languages, but who has for years been a recipient of relief. His wife is a brave, noble-hearted woman, and the man is a thoroughly good man, but as a child he had scarlet fever, which left him with serious physical infirmities. I know him; he is a queer genius who does not fit into the scheme of society, and yet he is an earnest Christian man, and a rather extraordinary scholar, but he cannot earn his own living, and his wife cannot earn it for him. From cases like these the first proposition to be deduced is that you cannot lay down one rule that will fit all cases. It cannot be done. As has been pointed out by the writers of both papers, the words of our Lord, "The poor ye have always with you," have been absolutely twisted from the context, in the ordinary use made of them. The words do not present our Lord's view of what society ought to be, but his view of what society is; they are the assertion of a social fact: the poor ye have with you.

What are you going to do about it? The necessity of the prevention of pauperism has been called to our attention, and there is much to be done. One of the things we must do is to lift the burden from childhood; another is to lift the burden from the wage earners. As long as you have wages at the scale of the department stores, you will find people pressed down to the level of crime, and as long as you have them pressed down to the level of crime, you are going to have their children criminal, or if not criminal, at least pressed into the pauper class. Will socialism cure that? I trow not.

I think there is hardly a plank in the socialistic platform for which I am not trying to work, but I am not a Socialist. Because, socialism omits the personal equation, and the wonder of the gospel of Jesus Christ is that his own incarnation is the testimony for individualism. When God wanted to save the world, he incarnated truth in a man, because most men follow principles illustrated in life by living men. If you would put

an end to pauperism, you must have a society consisting of men and women who have reached the level of thinking and living of Jesus Christ. Even in the case of economic causes of pauperism, economic remedies are not in themselves sufficient. Take one cause for instance, which has been very slightly alluded to, yet which in the judgment of so excellent an authority as Charles Booth, author of that wonderful work on the *Life and Labor of the People* in 17 volumes, is considered as affecting the earning power of the worker one of the chief causes of pauperism, the coming on of old age. Old age is bound to come to everyone, but unless society has been so constituted that we realize in advance the causes that are going to operate, and try to provide against them in advance, and when the need does come provide for the particular need—the need for human love and care as well as the need for support, unless we have this recognition of both sides of the problem, as in the gospel of Jesus Christ, we shall not have anything which adequately meets the situation. What can I say more? I know no better word to sum up the situation than this of Victor Hugo in touching on one phase of it, the degradation of womanhood, “The holy law of Jesus Christ governs our civilization, but does not yet permeate it.” That is perfectly true. Until we have made that law an atmosphere and not a rule, we shall have the poor with us, poor from various causes, and we shall not have eliminated the disease of pauperism. Work with every ounce of power you have for the reconstruction of society on lawful lines, and remember that you cannot attack the economic source of poverty without attacking the economic source of great wealth, and remember, too, that the men who contribute of their great wealth to the funds of your society will be found, like a man whose name I will not mention today, fighting in the halls of Congress against the measures of his own committee because his interest in the boys on the coal breakers cannot outweigh his larger interests in coal. The battle will carry us out of the range of poverty into the range of wealth. Remember that human nature, as well as human society, is so constituted that the impressionability to crime under the stress of physical necessity is such that in the

individual case you cannot always draw a clear line between the worthy poor and the unworthy poor. One of these societies (not the New York City Charity Organization Society) sent to me a letter, when I had referred to them a case, stating that the facts as to need were true, the man, just out of the hospital, needed relief and the woman, his wife, was anaemic and unable to make a living, but because the man had refused work at their hands a year before, they could not now give him relief. That sort of charity won't work. It produces a reaction.

If you go down among the people who need relief, you will find no more hated word than charity, because we have forgotten that for relief as well as prevention personality must enshrine the work. The great cause of pauperism is lack of brotherliness. When I am in need, and my brother gives me his hand and helps me out, it does not make me a pauper, but when I go for relief to an organized charity, I go with a sense of grievance that makes it easy for me to turn my real need and real sorrow into a bitter self-assertiveness, and an angry repetition of the saying that the world owes me a living, which it does not. Brotherliness is the only cure that I know of for the disease of pauperism, and brotherliness never becomes possible except through the religion of Jesus Christ. We much need to touch neighbor with neighbor before we begin to dream of our Finites, Infinites, and Infinitesimals. There is only one power that takes them all in, the power that—

Wields the world with never varying love,
Sustains it from beneath and blesses it above—

the power, that enshrined itself in the life of a poor man who emptied himself not only of glory but of riches, that by so doing he might give the example to all time of the life of the Son of God on earth, the life of the man who set a little child in the midst of his followers and said, Unless ye become as little children ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. That does not mean that little children are always docile and teachable, for as a matter of fact we know that they are not, but it does mean that little children learn by imagination fired by love—that

is why little children, boys as well as girls, love dolls and attribute the doings of those whom they love and respect but do not understand, to the imaginary little people they play with. That is why the little girl attributes marriage, sickness, baptism, and all the rest of it to her doll. "The Son can do nothing of himself but what he seeth the Father do"; and "Whatsoever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." When we have learned to imitate, through imagination fired by love, the Heavenly Father, revealed in the face of Jesus Christ, we will have found the solution for pauperism that Jesus Christ assured. (*Applause.*)

PRESIDENT MERRILL: We will now hear from Rev. W. Quay Rosselle, Ph.D., of Philadelphia.

DR. ROSSELLE: It is difficult to ascertain what are the ultimate causes of pauperism because each cause is the result of some other cause. We may say that intemperance is a cause, but what is the cause of intemperance? Holy Scripture says, "Be not drunk with wine wherein is excess, but be ye filled with the Spirit." I suspect if a man is filled with joy and hope and peace and courage and all the other elements which constitute spirituality, he will have no temptation to be intemperate. Intoxication is an attempt to produce by artificial means the condition of spirituality, for in its earlier stages intoxication is much like spirituality. Investigations have shown that intemperance is the direct cause of a much smaller proportion of pauperism than we have supposed. Some say laziness is a cause of pauperism. But what causes laziness? It is a disease and one that cannot always be cured by the infliction of punishment. In the South it was found that the hookworm is responsible for the laziness of the people. One of our millionaires has given a large sum of money for the purpose of hooking these worms out of the people. Disease is of course a cause of pauperism, but there are a good many things which cause disease. Pauperism itself is a prolific cause of disease. The two continually react upon each other, and it is indeed hard to tell which is the cause and which the effect in a multitude of cases.

I suppose that the immediate causes of pauperism may be

expressed in two words and its cure in one. The cause is defective personality and the cure is Christianity. Jesus, in the synagogue at Nazareth, announced the program of Christianity in a quotation from an old prophet which he appropriated to himself. This is the program: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath appointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord."

The first article in this program is that Christianity has a message of good news for the poor. Much of our preaching is not that. If I were preaching to a company of poor people and the burden of my sermon were to beware of the Disciples for maintaining that immersion is essential to salvation, I am afraid that there would be no good news in the address for my auditors. Surely the religion of Christ has a message for the poor that is really good news. The program of Christianity is so broad and so varied that no single human interest can lie outside its scope. There is no human problem, social, industrial, or personal, to which Christianity does not bring a sure solution. But we have not been adjusting our life to this program. Socially and industrially we have not been Christian at all. Our social and industrial conditions have been degrading humanity into a condition of animalism and thus opening the springs of human misery and pauperism. Do you wish a picture of humanity as it is perverted by the play upon it of the forces which spring out of materialistic conceptions of life? We have such a picture in Markham's celebrated poem:

Bowed by the weight of centuries he leans
 Upon his hoe and gazes on the ground,
 The emptiness of ages in his face,
 And on his back the burden of the world.
 Who made him dead to rapture and despair,
 A thing that grieves not and that never hopes,
 Stolid and stunned, a brother to the ox?
 Who loosened and let down this brutal jaw?
 Whose was the hand that slanted back this brow?
 Whose breath blew out the light within this brain?

Is this the thing the Lord God made and gave
 To have dominion over sea and land;
 To trace the stars and search the heavens for power;
 To feel the passion of eternity?
 Is this the dream He dreamed who shaped the suns
 And pillared the blue firmament with light?
 Down all the stretch of Hell to its last gulf
 There is no shape more terrible than this—
 More tongued with censure of the world's blind greed—
 More filled with signs and portents for the soul—
 More fraught with menace to the universe.

What gulfs between him and the seraphim!
 Slave of the wheel of labor, what to him
 Are Plato and the swing of Pleiades?
 What the long reaches of the peaks of song,
 The rift of dawn, the reddening of the rose?
 Through this dread shape the suffering ages look;
 Time's tragedy is in that aching stoop;
 Through this dread shape humanity betrayed,
 Plundered, profaned and disinherited,
 Cries protest to the Judges of the World,
 A protest that is also prophecy.

O masters, lords, and rulers in all lands,
 Is this the handiwork you give to God,
 This monstrous thing, distorted and soul quenched?
 How will you ever straighten up this shape;
 Touch it again with immortality;
 Give back the upward looking and the light;
 Rebuild in it the music and the dream;
 Make right the immemorial infamies,
 Perfidious wrongs, immedicable woes?

O masters, lords, and rulers in all lands,
 How will the future reckon with this man?
 How answer his brute question in that hour
 When whirlwinds of rebellion shake the world?
 How will it be with kingdoms and with kings—
 With those who shaped him to the thing he is—
 When this dumb Terror shall reply to God,
 After the silence of the centuries?

That is a composite picture made up by at least a couple of millions of the population of this land of wide extent, colossal resources, and comparatively small population.

There is a sickening thought in this, for the Savior said that moral judgment proceeds upon the principle of our attitude toward humanity. In the Judgment Day, the Son of God will point to The Man with the Hoe and say, "I was an hungered and ye fed me not, sick and in prison and ye came not unto me. . . . Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of the least of these ye did it not unto me; depart from me, ye cursed." Standing before our age the Master of men points to the brutalized millions and says, "Behold what ye have made of me." Lowell's parable pictures the coming again of Christ to the world. The people make ready to welcome him. They spread carpets of gold wherever his feet shall tread. In their churches they place his images high over all, and then call the Master's attention to their presence there.

Then Christ sought out an artisan,
A low-browed, stunted, haggard man,
And a motherless girl whose fingers thin
Brushed from her faintly, want and sin.

These he set in the midst of them,
And, as they drew back their garment hem
For fear of defilement, "Lo here," said He,
"The images ye have made of me."

We think the crucifixion of Christ on Calvary's cross was a monstrous crime, but if the Son of God has identified himself with the weakest of human kind, it may be that we are committing a greater crime. They took away his physical life; we destroy his soul as well. Jesus arose in triumph from the death to which they crucified him; whether he can rise from this brutalization or not God only knows.

What is the cause of these conditions which impair our manhood? Materialistic conceptions of life. Let me give you two pictures from the New Testament. The first picture: Jesus is surrounded by a group of men whom he had invited to go with him. He says to them, "I am going to reconstruct the social

fabric. I propose to reorganize society upon a new principle. This principle is a subtle thing. I cannot explain it to you; you must stay close by me and hear my words. Thus you will catch the spirit and apprehend my meaning." The deepest secrets of the Christian life can never be preached. Real religion cannot be taught, it must be caught.

The second picture: An old well and the Master sitting alone by it. A woman comes out of the adjacent city and he unfolds to her some of the deepest and richest truths of his whole revelation. But where are the Twelve whom he asked to stay close by him that they might not miss his marvelous words? They were in the city buying meat! If you bid me not to be hard upon these men upon the plea that the practical work of life must be done, the answer to your objection is twofold. It did not require all twelve of these men to buy the few groceries that the little group needed. In the second place, when they brought the meat to Jesus he did not want it. Unless we have become so absorbed in the interests of the spirit that we, at times at least, forget the claims of the flesh, I suspect that we have not even begun to live the truly human life, which is also the divine life.

Now then, what is the cause of pauperism? The meat market. And what is its cure? The Well and the Master. Jesus came into Gadara and found a poor fellow living in the caverns where they buried the dead, because he was thought to be full of devils and no one would give him a house to live in. Jesus healed him, but it cost the destruction of a herd of pigs. The owners of the swine gathered about Christ and vehemently besought him to depart out of their country. The Master said, "Why would you drive me away? See your old neighbor clothed and in his right mind. Are you not rejoiced to see him thus?" They said, "That is all very well, but look at the loss of meat!" Really the cause of pauperism is the putting of the pigs above the man, in being absorbed in the purchase of meat and forgetting the inspiration of the Well.

Christ is seeking now to drive the devils out of men. He inspires great movements for the amelioration of the conditions which make for poverty on a large scale, but immediately the

meat buyers get busy in the powerful lobby in the legislature, and in every other way open to them, so that every reform that looks to the relief of the distress of the people is hindered and blocked by the men who put the herd above humanity. Surely we live in Gadara!

Christianity works in two ways. It works first upon man for the improvement of his character and that automatically improves his environment. The Master working upon men according to the program announced at Nazareth is able to touch him again with immortality. He can straighten up his bent and battered shape. He can build again the music and the dream. This is good news. This is the work of the preacher. The social worker may have the most perfect machinery for his work, but it must be energized to be efficient. The preachers must furnish the energy. It is not gotten from the meat market, but from the Well. Only those who are in union with the Lord God Almighty can furnish the energy by which the machinery for the amelioration of social conditions can be made to move.

But at the same time Christianity works for the correction of environment. Corrupt character degrades environment and degraded environment corrupts character. The environment in which people are obliged to live is corrupting character faster than the Well is curing it. Pauperism is thus increasing faster than all the streams of inspiration and charity flowing in upon it can relieve it.

But Christ will find a way. He furnishes the energy, and science will discover the way. All over our land we have keen-minded men teaching in our universities, editing our journals, and preaching in our churches who are diligently seeking the way to success in this fight against poverty. Practical science has won some fairly notable victories already. Look what it is doing for disease. Many dreadful diseases have been banished. It is only a matter of time until they will all be conquered. The other day a Philadelphia surgeon planted another man's kidney in one of his patients. Other organs can be transplanted from one to another. We are going to stop burying sound organs with the dead. They will be taken out and saved for the living

who need them. Science is attacking successfully such enemies as industrial inefficiency and ignorance. In like manner science will solve the problems of pauperism. Such men as these who have brought these great utterances into this discussion are finding the ways to solve the problem and they will succeed. (*Applause.*)

PRESIDENT MERRILL: We will now be addressed by Rev. William C. Little, of Atlantic City, N. J.

REV. WILLIAM C. LITTLE: Some years ago while I was engaged in mission work in New York City we undertook to feed fifty to a hundred hungry men every night in our mission, giving them a substantial meal, and we received a remonstrance from the Society for Relieving the Condition of the Worthy Poor, informing us that we were making paupers. I don't believe that we were. We were not dealing with the worthy poor but with the unworthy. I believe that something we must take into account when we are handling this question of pauperism is that many are unworthy—the great bulk of them are unworthy—but that is often our blame, not theirs. I have observed several things that bring about this condition of unworthiness. One is a lack of opportunity. This is brought about by a crowded curriculum in our public schools, especially in the state of Pennsylvania. As soon as we come to the point where we can give industrial education in our schools, we shall largely solve the problem.

Another thing is the lack of tact by those who are administering to the unworthy. A few years ago I entered a home in New York City, and I found that everything that could be pawned had been pawned long before. There had been illness in the family and some drunkenness. I found that the woman regretted very much that she had been obliged to pawn a certain vase. The ticket was produced, and although the time had expired, over a year had gone by, I was able to redeem the vase and brought it to her. Later I purchased for her at a second-hand shop two very fair pictures at the ridiculous price of twenty-five cents apiece, and she hung them in her room. Later a worker

from a charitable organization told her that she had no right to have such ornaments; they should be pawned for food.

Another thing that is conducive to pauperism is the pawnshop. In not one, but in a score of instances in New York, I found that I could not effect any remedy of the condition of the family until I had gone to the pawnshop and had redeemed tools for the man to work with. If we could have a law passed in all the states prohibiting pawnbrokers from advancing money upon workmen's tools, we would go a long way toward enabling men who are down to regain what they have already lost. But after all the real cure is the cure given by the speakers who preceded me. David long ago said, "Once I was young and now I am old, yet have I never seen the righteous forsaken or his seed begging bread." (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: We will now be addressed by Rev. William H. Bawden, of Perth Amboy, N. J.

MR. BAWDEN: If at this late hour I may trespass once again upon your time, Mr. President, I should like to direct attention to a book published recently, *Social Solutions*, by Professor Thomas C. Hall, of Union Seminary. I have not seen this anywhere adequately reviewed, and even while here have sought in vain for an appreciation of it.

Professor Hall first analyzes our present social order, and then brings to the solution of the problem the various propositions offered by the socialists and others, such as Karl Marx. Then he gives what he believes to be the social program of the teachings of Jesus, as offering the only true and adequate solution. In his analysis of our present social order he finds that competition is its genius, the competition that means the exclusion of a competitor as a competitor, which is war; the goal to be obtained is the possession of all natural resources and also of the means of manufacturing them into articles of commerce; the stimulus is the hope of gain, of profits. Over against these Jesus gave unto the world the ideal of the family, wherein all are brothers; the goal that of stewardship, a regarding all that we have as belonging to God, to be used by us for the advance

of his kingdom; and the stimulus is service, every man willing to serve his fellow.

Now if I might give a little different twist to those words of Jesus several times quoted this morning, placing the emphasis on the pronoun, it would read: "The poor *ye* have always with you"—*ye* have them with you because of your social order. The problem is how to bring about that social order for which Christ pleaded, which he came to earth to establish under the name of the kinngdom, while we are living in a social order so at variance therewith. It seems to me that so long as we continue with our present order of things, with its genius of competition, its stimulus of profits, and its goal of possession, we shall continue to have pauperism with us also.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: We will hear from Professor Starratt.

PROFESSOR FRANK AUBREY STARRATT, Hamilton, N. Y.: I do not speak to you because I have something to say as an expert as to the causes and cure of pauperism. I accept the consensus of opinion that has been expressed on this platform, that fundamentally the cure of pauperism is Christianity. I wish to say just a word as to the application of this cure. Suppose this to be true, that Christianity is the cure for pauperism, what are we doing in the way of applying the cure? I believe the heart of man is open to religion. I believe the religion of Jesus Christ is adapted to man, that the two things have the same origin, and that they fit together as the hand fits the glove. We cannot get the hand into the glove—that is the trouble.

Two things, it seems to me, stand in the way of getting at men with religion. The first, is the vernacular of Christianity, the technical language that has attached itself to the gospel, that the world does not know and has to pass through a long training to acquire. One who has been reared in a Christian home, has had training in a Sunday school and church, may be able to appreciate to some extent the meaning that lies back of the phrases into which we have put the truths of Christianity. But the man on the street, who has not had that training, does not

get the message of the gospel because it is tied up in phrases that are strange to him.

Another thing that hinders the work of getting at men with the gospel is the institution in which it is embodied, the church. During the discussions of the various questions of Christian union, I have been impressed with the fact that the chief difficulty lies in the fact that Christianity has been too completely institutionalized. By what authority has this been done? Is there anything in Christianity itself that demands intellectual unanimity? By what authority do we connect baptism with church membership? Christianity and church are practically synonymous in the minds of the mass of people. Should it be so? Does the church as an institution truthfully express the gospel of Christ to one who looks at it from the outside? Is it not too rigid, too definite, too hard and fast, to express the rich, full life of Christianity which permits of so great variety of intellectual interpretation while pervaded by the same spirit?

It is well worth while to consider whether the church, as now organized, is not an obstacle in the way of reaching the outside masses with the gospel of Jesus Christ.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: We will close this session with prayer offered by Professor Anthony.

Adjourned

Close of Morning Session, November 16, 1911.

THIRD DAY

Afternoon Session

Thursday, November 16, 1911

2:30 P.M.

PRESIDENT MERRILL opened this session of the Congress by asking Professor Frank Aubrey Starratt, Hamilton, N. Y., to offer prayer.

PRESIDENT MERRILL: The subject for discussion this afternoon is "The Mystical Element in Christianity. What Is It

and What Is Its Value?" The first paper will be read by Rev. D. H. Clare, D.D., of East Orange, N. J.

REV. DR. D. H. CLARE then read as follows:

THE MYSTICAL ELEMENT IN CHRISTIANITY. WHAT IS IT? WHAT IS ITS VALUE?

It is well to ask at the beginning what the mystical element in Christianity is. The expression has been used to apply to every sort of sentimentality, hallucination, ecstasy, and abnormal psychic state. It has been regarded as the element which cannot be reconciled with reason, and which glories in its defiance of it. It is associated in many minds almost exclusively with its manifestations in the raptures of the mediaeval saints, the quietism of Madame Guyon, the rhapsodies of the early Methodist exhorter, or the type of piety cultivated by the followers of the Keswick movement. A truth which does not appeal at once to the practical common-sense is called mystical. As to its value the man in the street is inclined to think that the mystical element as he understands it is the one element of Christianity which can be most easily dispensed with. There are good men who feel that it has had its day, and is now a sort of "vestigial survival."

The mystical element of Christianity is that element which deals with the soul's consciousness of God, not as an object of knowledge, but as an experience through immediate awareness of union with him. Without this element there would be no religion in any true sense. For as an inspiration it is religion's source, because it is the panting of the soul for God, and as an achievement it is religion's goal, for it is the assurance of having found him. In Christianity we test the reality of the experience by Christ. It is genuine if the God with whom the soul feels joined is the Father he has revealed. We know the root by the quality of the fruit. The mystical element is therefore the heart and core of our religion. It is personal religion in its most intense form. It is not contrary to reason; it furnishes reason with a new fact which reason needs, to secure the unity it craves. If it is rejected it will still persist while the

system of thought which rejects it will "have its day, and cease to be," for this element is the life of the spirit, indestructible, eternal. When accepted, as accepted it must be, then "mind and soul, according well, will make one music as before, but vaster."

In the early church it was the presence of their invisible Lord, the consciousness of their fellowship with him, which united the hearts of the believers. The joyous assurance that he had vanished from their faces that he might return unto their hearts to abide forever, unloosed the floodgates of spiritual energy, filled them with a vivid consciousness of God, took the sting from death, and brought eternal life into the midst of time. It was a mystical fellowship. It ceased to be mystical when the bond changed from the vital invisible one of sharing the same consciousness of the unseen presence, and became an external union through assent to doctrines which had no reality in experience.

For the mystical element in the New Testament our thoughts turn to the Fourth Gospel and to the letters of John. Here we find the Christian experience interpreted in terms of union. Religion is not a system handed down, it is God in the soul; the divine spirit imparting himself to the human spirit, bearing his own witness. God is light, he is life and love. This must be experienced in order to know the significance of the symbols used to convey the suggestion of the reality. But while the simple language and tender spirit of this gospel have led us to feel that this is the treasure-house of the mystical element, when we turn to Paul we find it in what is perhaps a purer form. For while John turns to one who was made flesh, whose words were words of life, Paul's gospel came to him through an overwhelming inner experience. "It pleased God to reveal his son in me." God in Christ was, therefore, the one great fact of his life. He was surer of it than of any other fact in all the world. Possessed by the Spirit, filled by the Spirit, indwelt by the Spirit, are terms he loves to use. There is no doubt in him, no fear. He knows. The Spirit itself beareth witness with his spirit that he is a son of God. His hunger for union was so great that he counted all things but loss that he

might win Christ; and the experience of union was so vivid that he would cry, "For me to live is Christ." The experience was so precious that for his loved Galatians he yearned as with birth pangs for them until Christ be formed in them. The bliss of it all, the glorious reality of it all made music in his heart like angel's songs. Rejoice! rejoice! and again I say rejoice. If this is the mystical experience it is worth going round the wide world to obtain. The intellectual framework in the terms of which he was compelled to interpret his experience may perish with the centuries, for it was the creation of his age; but the mystical element in his faith is eternal.

The search for this experience has been a perilous one in the course of human history. It has led men into pitfalls of pantheism and antinomianism. They have tried by self-delusion and morbid introspection to secure that which is possible only by moral effort. They have followed the vagaries of their own minds, and have called their own imaginings communion with the highest. They have ascribed objective existence to the subjective creations of their own faculties. The type of piety produced by it has often shown a lack of virility, and to many has seemed stamped with artificiality so that the odor of sanctity has been an offense in the nostrils. But those who have approached religion through its mystical element have been the great pioneers in the spiritual world. They are the prophets. When truth has hardened into dogma, and the Christian life has been interpreted in terms of intellectual propositions, when ecclesiasticism has held the hearts of men in bondage, these men have cried out for the living God; they have swept past book and creed and priest and church; with hunger-bitten spirits they have torn away every barrier with a divine frenzy, and have satisfied their souls at the very heart of God. They have been despised and rejected of men, their testimony has often been marred by the superstitions and aberrations and intellectual conceptions of their age, but they said they knew God, not by the hearing of the ear, but by evidence stronger than any evidence the bodily senses can furnish, and they have been willing to hold that truth against the world. "They all speak the same language," one of them has said, "and all come from the same country."

With our knowledge of psychology we can understand as never before many of the visions and ecstasies and abnormal mental states which many of them misinterpreted, for they were children of their age. But they represent in its most acute and dramatic form the hunger of the soul for God. And when we question the reality of their highest and purest communion they all join hands across the centuries, and with eternity in their hearts, stand up like men in wrath, and answer, "We have felt."

The mystical element may be joined with material from every man's faith. Each generation has its own emphasis, and each man has his own spiritual constitution. The great prophets and seers are the spiritual geniuses of the race. They are the flaming torches by whose light we see light; we, the religiously ungifted with our dimmer vision and our sluggish hearts. But each must see with the eyes of his own spirit. Here is his certitude, without which his speech will be an echo, not a voice. The mystical element in our faith is not a citadel in which we take refuge when driven by the merciless assaults of reason; where we sink we shrink with trembling lest faith be slain. It is our fortress out of which we march with flying banners, shouting in triumph as we go, "This is the victory that overcomes the world—our faith."

The mystical element may be joined with material from philosophies and theologies far from Christian as men have sought after God, but for the Christian heart it is safeguarded from individual caprice by the consciousness of Jesus. This is to be a Christian mystic. Men are crying, "Back to Christ," and they think they have reached him when they hear him preach the Sermon on the Mount, and see him perform his deeds of mercy and love. They have only touched the hem of his garment. We speak of sinners as being "out of Christ," and we call them to "come to Christ," and even while we call, we ourselves are out of Christ if we think we have come to him when we accept at his hands certain ethical principles. A man is "in Christ" when he shares his spiritual consciousness. This is eternal life. We must have the certitude in the soul of his Father's presence, we must open our hearts to receive him, we must live in the

strength and peace and joy of that communion. This is to abide in Christ. "Abide in me, and I in you." "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me." The secret of our fruitlessness is our second-hand religion—the absence of the mystical element from our faith.

This is the need of men. "We want," says an English writer, "we want neither edifying lessons drawn from the wanderings of Israel, or the book of Joshua; no brilliant word painting of some of the scenes of the Bible with a more up-to-date eloquence, nor the exposition of the machinery of schemes of salvation once real, from which the life has departed, but some message concerning the things of the spirit, delivered in simplicity and humility and sincerity to men who would fain be simple, humble, and sincere."

We need to catch the vision of the mystical aspect of the kingdom of God to complete our thought of it or we shall miss the reality of it. In our churches we are talking all the time about efficiency. We are trying to point out to men the mind of Christ in the realm of social service. We are putting Christian activities in terms of modern industry. But the response is not the spontaneous answer of the soul. We use the driving power of organization, and by external compulsion we arouse temporary enthusiasm. But we do not impart spiritual passion. We try to interest men in the kingdom, and alas! neither we nor they are living in the invisible country we so eloquently describe. We teach them to sing:

Where cross the crowded ways of life,
Where sound the cries of race and clan,
Above the noise of selfish strife
We hear thy voice, O Son of Man.

In haunts of wretchedness and need,
On shadowed thresholds dark with fears,
In paths where lurk the lures of greed,
We catch the vision of thy tears.

They catch the vision of his tears, but they do not catch the vision of his soul. In order to see that they must be able to sing this:

O Love that wilt not let me go,
I rest my weary soul on Thee;
I give Thee back the life I owe
That in thine ocean depths its flow
May richer, fuller be.

O cross that liftest up my head,
I dare not ask to fly from thee;
I lay in dust life's glory dead,
And from the ground there blossoms red
Life that shall endless be.

For let men engage in the task of social betterment, tear down rotting tenements, seek for the toiler in factory and mine shorter hours of labor, demand for them a living wage, insist upon social justice, seek to banish poverty and alleviate pain—in short apply the social principles of Jesus. Blessed, holy ministry! But suppose all these things were realized. The evolution of society under economic necessity would ultimately produce many of the external changes for which we strive. Suppose in ten thousand years it were all realized to such an extent that there was scarcely a sphere for the manifestation of the spirit of sacrifice which we regard as the essence of the Christ spirit, and that opportunity for the development of character were largely closed. Suppose that state of society lasted a million years. The end must come at last. In the process of time geologic or astronomic changes will come, making the struggle for existence hard and stern once more. It is all over at last and everyone has gone to heaven! No! these things are not the kingdom; they are part of the external expression of the will of God being done on earth. Men might have all these and have no sense of eternal life in the midst of time. The enjoyment of them would make death all the more terrible. This ideal state of society would be but the shadow of the substance, an inevitable expression and symbol of the reality. The thought of Jesus is such a consciousness of God in the human soul in all stages of the development of human society that for the soul, even amid pain and tears, heaven would be on the earth—a life over which death would have no power. This is the holy city coming down out of heaven from God, wherein

dwellleth righteousness, where there is no temple because the Lord God is the temple thereof.

It will be the mystical element in our faith which will lead to its triumph in that great Eastern world. Where those teeming millions dwell the very atmosphere palpitates with mystical feeling which with our dim vision we have ignored, treating it as if it were the idle wind instead of the evidence of that brooding spirit in which we all live and move and have our being. Animated by the ideals of Jesus we build hospitals and schools and churches. But unless we make it clear that these are the concrete and visible symbols of the presence of the reality they are groping for if haply they might find him, they will take these gifts gratefully from our hands, and use them to sharpen their intellects and to heal their bodies while they themselves sink deeper into sin. If we approach them with our theological formulas, they will be to them as an unknown tongue. But when we speak the language of the soul, and interpret that mystical feeling in terms of the consciousness of Jesus, the people who now sit in darkness and the shadow of death will see a great light.

We need the mystical element in our faith to restore our joy. It is vain to attempt to restore the past. The new day must have a glory of its own. But what mean these triumphant strains of holy joy sounding from the upper room, and ringing through the pages of the New Testament—now hushed, now breaking forth again, now dying away, and once again pealing forth? Was the world fairer then? Were there no such things as care and pain and tears? These notes come forth from dungeon and arena, from abodes of poverty, and from beds of pain. "It is not fitting, when one is in God's service, to have a gloomy face or a chilling look," said Francis of Assisi to a novice. "Before me and before my brothers here, always show a face shining with holy joy." Where is our joy? We have laughter and jest, but where is our joy burning like an altar flame, not in sudden leaps of ecstasy, but steadily and bright—joy not in ignoring the world's suffering, but in the vicarious sharing of its woes. We have done violence to a sacred part of our nature, and have starved our souls. When we know how easily we

may be led astray by our emotional life we need to be on our guard. But we have grown so afraid of being self-deceived that we cannot have our hearts stirred without talking of "social contagion," "suggestion," and "sentimentalism." There is no longer any danger of thinking that pious feeling will take the place of service. Full well we know that obedience is the true test of discipleship, not in feeling happy. We have learned by sad experience that we shall miss our joy if we spend our time in searching for it. But the fruit of the Spirit is joy. What can be more inconceivable than that the spirit of the living God and the spirit of his child should meet without joy? The things our Master was speaking about when he said, "These things have I spoken to you that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full," were the truths concerning abiding in him. If Paul were to come into our Christian assemblies today, the absence of joy would betray us. He would find us oppressed with care, doing the daily duty with a grim determination, no light in our faces, but pervaded with a vague restlessness and dissatisfaction. He would find it in the man in the pulpit as well as in the man in the pew. With a tone of mingled rebuke and pity and pained surprise he would say, "Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?" And looking up with yearning and trembling hope we should have to say with faltering lips, "Nay, we did not so much as hear whether the Holy Ghost was given."

What power lies slumbering in the timeless truths! Men handle them reverently, they take them upon their lips without dreaming of the transforming energy stored within them. "God is Love." "God is a spirit." We release their power by realizing them in our consciousness. I speak not lightly of creeds and formulas. When recognized as external things, they render essential service. They have been through the centuries the lamps wrought by trembling human hands to keep the sacred flame of personal religion from being extinguished amid the blasts of a sinful world. It is only when they are mistaken for the flame itself that they work harm in the soul. But in the realm of the spirit they melt away. If one enters that realm with his faith bound up with creed his soul cannot breath. When

one's lungs receive its air, that moment he is free; he enters that country and his fetters fall. Here is the unity of the spirit, deeper than co-operation, richer than a common purpose. It applies to the stern Puritan in his mystical mood and the theologian of the twentieth century, and all who have caught the vision. Every barrier is down. While they use their intellects over their theologies they misunderstand, and their conflicting opinions divide. But when they speak the language of the soul their eyes shine with the same holy light, and their lives are all hid with Christ in God.

Need I say in closing that we need the mystical element in our faith for prayer? Without it there can be no prayer. Now we enter the holy of holies, filled with the glory of the Lord. Our petitions are not wafted to the throne, the King is within.

Speak to Him thou, for He hears, and Spirit with Spirit can meet.
Closer is He than breathing, nearer than hands and feet.

This now shall be our prayer that he would grant us, according to the riches of his glory, that we may be strengthened with power through his spirit in the inward man; that Christ may dwell in our hearts through faith; to the end that we, being rooted and grounded in love, may be strong to apprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that we may be filled unto all the fulness of God.

"Mysticism," it has been said, "is the love of God."

PRESIDENT MERRILL: The second paper on this subject will be presented by Professor Alfred W. Anthony, D.D., Lewiston, Me.

PROFESSOR ALFRED W. ANTHONY, D.D. (Professor Anthony spoke without notes.): We have heard of the man who for the first time listened to a definition and description of prose, and then awakened to the realization that he had been speaking prose all his life. If I were not confident that mysticism has a deeper hold upon the church of Jesus Christ and upon you, my hearers, than most of us realize, I should approach this subject with a hesitancy that would scarcely allow me to touch it.

Let us take for its atmosphere a quotation from one of our poets (our poets are nearly all mystics) this single stanza from that simple New England Quaker poet, Whittier, in his "Prayer of Agassiz":

As, in life's best hours, we hear
 With the spirit's finer ear
 His low voice within us, thus
 The All-Father heareth us;
 And His holy ear we pain
 With our noisy words and vain.
 Not for Him our violence
 Storming at the gates of sense,
 His the primal language, His
 The eternal silences.

In this brief stanza are four definitions of mysticism—poetic definitions: "the Spirit's finer ear," "his low voice within us," "the primal language," "the eternal silences."

It is easy to find other definitions. Professor Adam Seth, in speaking of mysticism, characterized it as passive, effeminate, sensuous, over against masculine, independent, virile. In another place he says, "when religions begin to ossify into formulas and ceremonies, then their vitalization and rejuvenation come through the introduction of the mystical element, giving them heart again."

There are those who have spoken of mysticism as that power of self, the conscious self, to "apprehend the beyond"; that power of the conscious self "to push its outer fringe into the unknown." It has been spoken of, also, as that inherent, dormant faculty, like unto the sixth sense, belonging to the evolutionary process about to unfold into fuller function; it has been called "the voice of God within us."

My own definition of mysticism is this: the direct cognition of spiritual verities without the intervention of the senses on the one hand and without the ordinary processes of intellectual reasoning on the other hand—a direct, immediate contact of the soul with spiritual verity. Is this possible?

On the side of science there is a vindication—perchance we had better call it a quasi-vindication; or it may be directions in which

vindication later will be found. Here are the four directions: (1) In the direction of the understanding of the sub-conscious self, that larger, that fuller, richer self, which, while so little understood, really so fully contains and expresses us. (2) There may be scientific vindication of mysticism in the direction of that functioning power of the soul by which, through immediate intuitions, it grasps axiomatic truth. (3) There may be scientific vindication in the direction of psychic waves, or telepathic influences, some as yet unknown power (recognized even by the populace) of spirit to touch and influence and even control spirit. (4) There may be scientific vindication in the direction, which modern philosophy seems so generously and generally to have taken, toward a form of universal monism, a philosophy which accounts for all manifestations in the terms of one universal mind.

But we are not busied primarily this afternoon with this scientific vindication. While we recognize that such vindication may be possible, and later may be demonstrated, let us turn to Scripture for the Biblical vindication of the mystical element in Christianity. One cannot read Scripture without realizing that it is not merely shot through with mysticism, but is in essence mystical. What were the teachings of Jesus Christ? Mystical. Hear him when he speaks to his disciples relative to conduct. What cares he for the outer act? He is no casuist. Rules of life with him have little or no value. It is the condition of the heart at which he looks; it is the motive, rather than motion; it is the intent, more than action. Thus he judges, thus he seeks to have his followers follow him—in spirit. See him when he speaks of revelation of truth. Is it by physical demonstration or by the ordinary rational process? "Father, I thank thee that thou has concealed, hid these things from the wise and prudent—those who by ordinary processes of reasoning accept and understand and apprehend truth; and hast revealed them unto babes—those who by direct cognition apprehend and assent, if at all."

See him when he tests, illustrates, and judges discipleship. Two sisters are before him, one busied in the household cares, busied with those things of matter and sense, essential, indis-

putably praiseworthy, yet those things which tend to transform unto themselves the persons who are busied with them. And there sat at his feet a sister in holy contemplation, her soul going forth unto him, her heart receiving the impress of his spirit's image; and, "Mary," he said, "hath chosen the better part."

See him, when he speaks of his own undisturbed perpetual presence in the midst of his disciples; still in the church though crucifixion is before him and his final, physical departure. "Where two or three are met together in my name, there am I in the midst," "I will be with you as ye go forth preaching my gospel, to all men, through all the days." He means a mystical union, mystical relations, mystical fellowship.

In these few illustrations of our Master's teachings I have not turned once to the Fourth Gospel, characterized as the great mystical gospel. I have taken these few incidents only from the first three gospels, and yet these are typical of all the Master's teachings.

All great reformers have been mystics. I need not name them. Let me turn to but one, that one, who, of all others, has been trusted by the divine spirit as a channel of divine grace for humanity, unto the spread of the gospel, to teach the right of private judgment, to emancipate the church and the disciples of Christ from the bondage of ritualism and form—Martin Luther. Look at his picture and you say at once, there are no characteristics of the mystic about those broad shoulders, that thick neck, that mighty, bulky frame; he has the characteristic of the beast, the bull, with his fearless, indomitable energy. It took courage in Martin Luther to stand as he did and say, "Here I stand, though every tile upon the roof were a devil, here stand I, God help me, I can naught else." But Martin Luther was essentially a mystic.

Test him in the direction of his critical canons, for he was a critic, a biblical, and historical, and higher critic. Of the Epistle of James he said, "A right strawey epistle." He had examined all the external evidences, but the internal were to him convincing. The epistle spoke not to his soul of his Christ, and he put it aside.

Test him in the direction of his fellowship. Word was brought to him once that one of his associates had donned the cassock, a mark of papal subserviency. We can hear Luther snorting, "Let him wear two cassocks!" The man's heart, he knew, was with him; and the external form, two or three or any number of cassocks, mattered not.

Test him in prayer, his soul's communion with God. Martin Luther, when the whole church seemed to hang upon his neck, and he claimed that the chairs and desks and stools and settees and mantels were all piled with letters needing his attention, yet spent two and three hours a day in prayer, communing with God. This was his motto: *Fleissig gebetet ist über die Hälfte studieret*—"To have prayed industriously is to have studied more than half." One man once said to him that the great elector, Frederick of Saxony, would be his protector. "No! I will protect him rather than he me, by prayer," was the reply.

Look at him in his great fundamental teaching, that the just shall live, by no external act, no penance done by the body, no pilgrimages to Rome, no offerings or sacrifices, no ceremonies or rituals, no sacramentarian creeds or deeds, but the just shall live by that inner conformity, by spiritual fellowship, by *faith*. By "faith" he meant mystical union.

Martin Luther, great bulky, fleshy man, unlike the pale mystic of our imagination, was, from crown to foot, a mystic.

Mysticism has its perils. We have seen the perils exemplified, and, therefore, some of us draw back. It runs into vagaries, idiosyncrasies; it verges upon, it plunges into hallucinations. But these need not discredit mysticism. Every virtue has its corresponding vice. The remedy for this peril is for the individual mystic to socialize his mysticism. In the foreign field, the man who oftentimes is the hardest to work with and the most dangerous for missionary enterprise is the individual who is listening only to the guidance of the Spirit. Such a one needs to realize that the Spirit speaks also through his associates, and his fellows; and a mystic, while tending toward extreme individualism, must remember that the same God, who speaks in his soul, speaks also in the souls of his brethren; and then if he will listen not alone to the voice of God, but also to the

voice of God interpreted through the lips and lives of others, his own mystical individualism may be brought in harmony with the spiritual intent of the great Father through his communications to all his children.

There is the peril of mysticism that it deny fact, and insist upon purely subjective convictions rather than external, demonstrated, scientific conclusions. Then must we say that mysticism should never be regarded as an authority by itself; it is not the only prophet. Mysticism should never be substituted for any other kind of teacher, for experience, science, or philosophy—not substituted for, but used supplementary to, as a complement and addition. There is need today that science itself be transformed by the infused illumination of the mystic. Henry Drummond at one time seemed to have undertaken this task, writing that book *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. Now one should come and write a book entitled *Spiritual Law in the Natural World*. It may be that even before the church, or any of the members, turn to this task, the great scientists themselves will have given us a definition of the universe and of matter in the terms of spirit. They are getting very close to it in their talk about electrons, ions, as the ultimate form of matter, back of molecules and atoms—centers of force, of power, subject to law. They are getting very near it, very near to interpreting all matter by the terms of Spirit.

Mysticism has its danger also—that its devotee shall deny experience, think only of internal conceptions, and fail to realize, by processes of self-hypnotizing, external fact of which he is a part and to which he is subject. The remedy is to cultivate volitional poise, to weigh, to test, to judge.

We plead this afternoon, if we plead at all, not for the mystic element to exclude the rational, to supersede the volitional, but to accompany the intellect and the volition and go with them hand in hand. This is a day of materialism. Matter holds sway. Men talk and think of things and stuff. The church is dealing too much with matter and external form. This mystical element needs to come back into our lives, into the church. We should be mystics to recognize with "the spirit's finer ear" "his low voice," "the primal language," "the eternal silences." Where

my brother who preceded me paused, there come I. How can we pray unless it be in communion with God? "With our noisy words and vain," "his holy ear we pain." How can we talk with him unless we know him?

Need I ask where is God? St. Paul was a great mystic on Mars Hill, when he said, "God is not far from every one of you; in him we live, and move, and have our being." Has inspiration ceased? Do we speak of it in the past tense? Yes, if we have lost out of our lives this mystical element and no longer have fellowship with a living, present God and Savior who speaks to us in the day's experiences with a message for the day's life and task; unless we have a holy fellowship in this mystical sense. Are things becoming secular? The Jew thought of one place as holy, and one day as holy, and one-tenth of his possessions as consecrated. Are we even Jewish when we should be Christian? The secular will rise to the holy plane when we realize the holy presence and have fellowship and mystical union with Him whose we are; and all days and all tasks will then be holy and all places become holy. The church today, submerged in the commercial and materialistic spirit, is thinking of matter. Oh, for vision! Oh, for sight to see Him who is invisible, and the inner experience, to entertain him in fellowship!

PRESIDENT MERRILL: We have now come to the time when we are to say the closing words of this Congress.

When the occupant of this position was informed that he was to preside here, he was also told that he was the first of his profession to occupy this position. The chairman is not only grateful for the honor which has come to him, but to the Young Men's Christian Association which he represents. He was also informed that he is the only president who has not had a varied string of letters and titles after his name. It is quite true that we do not expect association secretaries to be great scholars. They have been trained for the position of executives and have little time for the study of books. They are dealing with young life and they are consecrated to the problems and temptations of the living boys. So we cannot take our position as

great scholars, but those of us who occupy positions like the one in which I have tried to serve you do our best to look both learned and wise.

My attention has been called to the fact that probably I am the youngest man to preside at a Baptist Congress. If I could venture an opinion on some of the discussions, it would be that undoubtedly some of these questions are of greater concern to your generation than they will be to my generation. I wish I could look forward and believe that when my generation comes to the front and takes command of affairs, there will be no more difficult problems before them than that of theology and church government, but we are confronted by the fact that your generation and generations before have so skilfully practiced the art of social injustice, that we are to have great economic problems to solve and not theological problems. We are to be concerned about church government tomorrow, it is true, but more profoundly concerned about municipal government, and the demand tomorrow will be for the theologian who is also the social engineer. It is these problems which are concerning our young men and will be the feature of debate in your future congresses.

Undoubtedly church union will come about, as proposed by some of the previous speakers, but through a co-operative promotion of social programs. Perhaps the only reason why there should be church union is that thereby social programs might more effectively be carried out and economic justice reign and the kingdom brought about.

Many problems will be solved only by the liberal use of time. Today, about an hour ago, we looked up in the heavens and saw the sun shining; in another direction the moon was seen and, apparently, not far from the moon, a bright star was shining. That was an unusual order of things. How it came about we do not know, and so it will be with many of these problems, you have discussed; things which baffle you in your generation, the next generation will look at and find them solved.

I remember not long ago attending a conference of Young Men's Christian Association secretaries. When we had spent

two or three days together considering some of the vital problems relating to our work, the presiding officer called on one or two men who had been there during the entire session to summarize what had gone before. He asked them to speak on "What It All Means." The chairman is now going to call on one or two men to summarize what has gone before and give to you the final impressions of the Congress. The first speaker to be called on is one who will represent the General Committee, Dr. Russell H. Conwell. (*Applause.*)

RUSSELL H. CONWELL, LL.D., Philadelphia, Pa.: *Mr. Chairman, Members of the Congress:* Feeling myself unfit for any task of this kind, both by my physical weakness and by my inability to attend all the debates of this Congress, I nevertheless feel as though I would like to leave one parting thought with the brethren who have been interested in these wonderful discussions.

It is a study in sociology to account to one's own satisfaction for the production of such excellent literature, and the aggregation of so much information and the presence of such distinguished men and so few people to hear them. For never, in this Congress, in the years past when it was my privilege to attend, did I ever hear anything more convincing, and more carefully guarded essays than those that have been presented here. But it is not for me, but for the chairman, to review these, further than to give the reason why I make this suggestion.

You stood upon the shore yesterday and the waves came to your feet and you saw one drop of water glistening on a grain of sand, and you realized that a man could spend a lifetime with his microscope and with chemistry examining that one drop, and still find that volumes are unwritten.

You look out and see a few acres of the ocean; it is full of interest, vital with some mysterious power. Where the wide-spreading oceans go, you cannot go and your mind cannot go, but you believe there is something else somewhere beyond what you can see.

Once I used to travel as a newspaper man over the face of the earth, and often in later years have prided myself, unconsciously, it is true, on the fact that I had seen many countries,

many cities, and many peoples, and then I woke up in my age, at the end of life, to find there are a hundred and twenty languages I never spoke and more than a thousand tribes I never saw, and mountains higher, that there are rivers deeper than any on which my boat did go, and there are shores rolling on islands and continents I have never seen, but I believe they are there.

I have gathered books through years, and I go in my library and look down my shelves and I see hundreds of books, the titles of which I had forgotten, which I had purchased on some sudden impulse, thinking some day I would read them, but there they are. When they shall take my form away to the cemetery from my library, there are thousands of volumes probably gathered through the house I have never opened, I shall never read, but the information is there. Some man may read some part of that and someone may, perhaps, have read them all, but I shall not know it in this life, not until I awake in His likeness.

I have heard discussions here in this Congress that were very wise, but they dealt with the least things, they dealt with the drop upon the grain of sand, they dealt with a single book in an immense library of information, they dealt with the near things, with the microscope more than with the telescope, and consequently, when they ask of me my impression of the Congress it is not one of dissatisfaction, but one of great admiration for the genius, for the science, for the metaphysical dissertations presented to us in a most unique and forceful manner in the last few years. It seems, however, that in these last hours we are getting nearer to the vital things about which we need to study most.

We are all mystics; of course we are, we must be, cannot be otherwise. We stand on the shore, we see but a little. There is much beyond, which we must believe, and consequently we must have faith; and if I were to be asked what I considered the most important thing in life to teach, I would say faith. We live by faith. No business can be transacted without faith; no railroads run, nor steamers ply the ocean without faith. No man reads a book without faith. No man purchases

a garment without faith. No man takes a mouthful without faith, or if he does he has the dyspepsia as a certain consequence of it. Faith is our vital breath—faith. We are all the time doing things and saying things, as I undertook this speech, without knowing what will be its result. It is all faith. I thought I should have something to say, I trust myself in the pulpit in this way hundreds of times—I must do it; every preacher must do it. Usually the best things that come are spontaneous through faith.

The reputation this Congress has obtained among the lesser lights of this denomination is that it juggles more with the gospel verities rather than in assurance. We wish to find some new light and we wish to venture on untried ways. It has had somewhat of this tendency. But I thought in the discussion last night about our denominational baptism, that the Baptist faith is the Christian faith. If I did not I would not be a Baptist. If this is the doctrine of Christ I cannot abandon it for nominal, outward union with others. If Christ be not in my belief I should change it immediately, but I do believe that the Baptists are right. I have faith that there will be Baptists in all the world in the time to come. I do not think we will need to forsake any essential truth to find union by and by, and that union will be in the Baptist creed, if we call it such. If I did not believe it I would be a Catholic, or anything else that appeared to be nearer the truth than what I find this to be. Because the more true we are to the Baptist denomination, the more true we are to the Catholic, the Episcopalian, the Presbyterian. Show me a man untrue to his wife and I will show you one that will be untrue to all womanhood. I am afraid that the great union that we talk so much about, and which is so desirable, and which we ought to pray for and work for, is not to be secured along the lines we are traveling.

You find a man that drifts around to all kinds of churches and gives nothing to anyone. He is in favor of union. It is the man who has friends and shows himself friendly, the man who hath convictions and is a Baptist while he is a Baptist, that will respect and honor any other man for belief in any community where his conscience is concerned. He will be the

strongest and most trusted friend of the Methodist or the Jew. Be true to something and then we know you will be true anywhere. A man not true anywhere cannot be trusted.

As the church seems to be losing its hold on the masses of the people for the time, it is a day of great danger when this talk of union shall release people from their obligations who are in a critical transitional relation to the church.

Those essays of last evening were excellent, they will do good. We need to think and we need to think carefully, and examine the basis of our faith, and these discussions are excellent; but they never should drive us from our belief in one thing until we are convinced that there is something better beyond. Do not take away our faith. I am near the end of life's journey, I am conscious of it every day, and I want faith. I want to know that when the summons comes I am believing something that is sure. I want faith more than anything else. Faith! I want to go to my dying bed with a sense of peace and rest and with a trust grounded on something everlastingly true. When you close your congresses in the future, never close them without leaving an impression of stronger faith on the things you know are so. Don't disturb the eternal verities in the minds of people by anything that is of lesser use. Christ and God and heaven are all true. They are real. I know it in my soul. You know it in yours. Don't doubt it, and don't encourage other people to doubt it. Let every congress close with prayer, with humble confession and feeling that God is God, and right is right, that after all our faith is sure, that one thing remains eternal—that "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin." (*Applause.*)

PRESIDENT MERRILL: The next speaker representing the local church and local committee, will be the pastor of this church, Dr. Hudson.

REV. BIRNEY S. HUDSON, D.D., Atlantic City, N.J.: *Mr. Chairman, Members of the Congress:* There are times when it is well for students of affairs to separate themselves from the daily and close contact with the things which must necessarily occupy their minds, and devote themselves to a discussion and

conference that will give them a new outlook, lend them comfort, and reveal to them a hope that will make it possible for them to have courage and vision when they return again to their fields of operation.

When one has spent several days on the wide sea and has made his acquaintances with that small group of people traveling with him, he almost feels that that body, so isolated and insulated from the rest of the world, are sole occupants of our planet. Unless we meet each other occasionally and come into contact with different tides of thought, there is danger that we will be isolated from things in the larger sense. Our gathering suggests a council of physicians, perhaps, who have examined a very critical case and have retired to an apartment by themselves, that they may deliberate upon the conditions they find.

I am not sure but that it is well that our numbers are not large in these gatherings. The larger audience awaits the printed proceedings. Here we seek to clear the air, we calm ourselves for deliberate study, we take time to think. It seems to me that this is a place where we can profitably take account of the progress of thought historically, where we can take into consideration present problems in the technical realm, in critical affairs, and in the sociological life of men, reach some conclusion, at least tentatively, as to what we must do to handle the stupendous problems before us. If there are any changes necessary, if any progressive steps are possible, we can turn the kaleidoscope of reality for a new view of our world, we shall be profited by such contemplation. This is a clearing-house in which the truth may possibly be illumined, or movements started which will eliminate unnecessary things in our social and religious institutions. We may find it good to cling to some things old. Our purpose is not to be destructive. But elimination of unnecessary impediments is always desirable. To discover and state essential truth is always pertinent. To clarify the ideals of the church and unify her practices, is to clear the way for the church's part in the work of the social and spiritual kingdom. We seek that we may be able to attack successfully, scientifically, feelingly, the things which hinder the well-being of men physically and spiritually.

As pastor of this church I rejoice that we have had opportunity to hear specialists in certain lines of human endeavor, to come into contact with their thinking, to discover the mental processes of those who are serious and intent upon knowing the truth, and as intent upon declaring the truth. I believe we shall think more clearly, more accurately. We shall be more accurate. We shall be able to shift ourselves a little more easily in the shell in which we have been living, and conscientiously close it again if we think best, or entirely emerge from it if necessary, that we may dwell in still larger habitation.

It has been a privilege to meet those who feel the impact of great problems, but who also believe in a possible solution of them; that in their solution we shall find a social order and a united church in which God's sufficiency and man's willingness have been fully demonstrated. (*Applause.*)

PRESIDENT MERRILL: The next speaker representing the Executive Committee will be Dr. Gessler.

THEODORE A. K. GESSLER, D.D., Landing, N.J.: *Mr. President:* The hour is late and I must be brief.

On yonder table at the rear end of this room are some red-edged books. They are the Revised Version of the Bible, corrected according to the suggestions of the American revisers. At the time of the beginning of my ministry there were deacons of Baptist churches who would have secured the exclusion of any member proposing to introduce a book like that into a Baptist church, and who would certainly have sought the decapitation of any minister who would have dared to preach from a text in its language. Now we accept this change without a moment's question. That is all right. What we are still afraid of is the higher critics, whoever they are, and the higher criticism, whatever that may be.

When I was down in the island of Jamaica last winter I listened to an address by a colored brother, who was not always grammatical in his speech, and who was not remarkably profound in scholarship, who warned the brethren that he was speaking against the perils of the higher criticism. I presume he knew

what he was talking about as much as many of our brethren in our own country know who are thus warning their brethren.

The world moves. Religious truth is being approached from an entirely different angle from that from which men saw it when I was a young man. I am sure Dr. Conwell has heard in this Congress this year a line of expression which is entirely different from the old approaches to theological thought. Let us not forget that the denomination that is in the line of progress, ready to receive the truth that is ready to fall to it, is most in the line of God's blessing. For behind all this progress is He who is moving the world and the stars. It is from his hand that we have this revised Bible and possibly—probably, his hand may also strike out from that same version of the Bible some things we today still revere.

We are learning, we are moving on. The Baptist denomination is fortunate in not being tied down by any procrustean creeds, so that it lacks facilities of adaptation to whatever truth God may give to it in the coming days. You know there are great denominations which will have to abandon all of the rights they possess on this mundane sphere if they dare to move away from the creed written by men who perished ages ago, and in some of these churches, the people believe a creed that is absolutely contrary to the written formularies on which their existence hangs. They are tied to a lying declaration in order to hold their earthly possessions.

We are exceedingly fortunate in the liberty we enjoy. We ought to turn our faces to the light. I do not want to believe anything I am afraid to discuss, and all the highest and best things the world holds today are things that have come to it by a process of struggle and pain and strife. The best things we get, we obtain because we have to climb after them. They do not fall like ripe apples at our feet.

I am glad we have come to Atlantic City. We have had a good quiet time here among ourselves. We are thankful, if I may speak for the Executive Committee, to this church for its hospitality; and to its excellent pastor for his painstaking kindness and his earnest effort to contribute to the success of this Congress. We are thankful to the managers of the Hotel

Chalfonte for their generous and kind reception of us all. We shall go away with pleasant recollections of these fraternal sessions and anticipate with hopeful yearning the probable meeting at Ithaca next year. (*Applause.*)

PRESIDENT MERRILL: Before we arise and are dismissed with the closing prayer, may the president, on behalf of the citizens of the city, wish you a safe and pleasant journey to your homes and also an early return to our city.

Will President Evans close with prayer?

PRAYER

Lord and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ whose we are and whom we serve, we thank thee for our existence in the world. Accept thou the offerings of our hands, the praises of our lips, and the aspirations of our hearts. Lead thou us in the paths of righteousness for thy name's sake. Accompany each to his home. Grant length of days for service and grant that the service be rendered unto thee and our fellow-men in great joy. In Christ's name we ask it. Amen.

Baptist Congress

Report of Treasurer, William B. Matteson, October 1,
1910, to September 30, 1911

Receipts

Balance from last year.....	\$ 86.15	
From General Committee.....	\$650.10	
From Annual Members.....	256.50	906.60
Sales of Proceedings.....		94.09
Personal Donations.....		176.00
Churches.....		25.00
		<u>\$1,287.84</u>

Expenses

Traveling Expenses.....	661.46	
Stationery and Printing.....	64.90	
Proceedings.....	401.30	
Miscellaneous.....	132.19	1,259.85
		<u>\$ 27.99</u>

Balance

\$ 27.99

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BAPTIST CONGRESS

FOR 1909

Topics:

Can Pragmatism Furnish a Philosophical Basis for Theology?
Is the Present Tendency toward a Co-operative Social Order
Desirable?

How Is Salvation Mediated to Us through Christ?

Recent Tendencies to Change Denominational Practice. Are
They Desirable?

How Can Ethics Be Taught in the Public Schools?

Realizing the Presence of God

Price 58 cents, postpaid

FOR 1910

Topics:

The Place of Prayer in the Modern World-View

How Shall We Interpret the Holy Spirit to the Life of Today?

The Christian Principle in Criminology

The Relation of the Baptist Denomination to the Universal
Church

Can the Distinction between the Canonical and Non-Canonical
Writings Be Maintained?

Christian Experience as Testimony to Truth

Price 58 cents, postpaid

Address Orders to the Publishing Agent

The University of Chicago Press

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Digitized by Google