

THE
AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW

EDITED BY THE
 REV. HENRY MASON BAUM

APRIL, 1882

Number 137

FOUNDED 1848

PUBLISHED IN THE MONTHS OF
 JANUARY, APRIL, JULY AND OCTOBER

NEW YORK:
 AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW PRESS
 TRIBUNE BUILDING
 1882

APRIL.	CONTENTS.	1882.
I.	THE PROBLEM OF EVIL, By the Rt. Rev. T. M. CLARKE, D.D., LL.D.	1
II.	REVISION OF THE COMMON PRAYER, By the Hon. JOHN W. ANDREWS.	19
III.	REASON AND AUTHORITY IN MAT- TERS OF RELIGION, By the Rev. Prof. W. D. WILSON, D.D., LL.D.	37
IV.	THE FINANCIAL QUESTION IN THE CHURCH, By the Rev. JAMES CRAIK, D.D., LL.D.	57
V.	THE REVISED VERSION, By the Rt. Rev. G. T. BEDELL, D.D.	67
VI.	A LAST WORD ON THE REVISION, By the Rt. Rev. W. C. DOANE, D.D., LL.D.	87
VII.	CHURCH MUSIC AND ITS FUTURE IN AMERICA, By the Rev. Prof. E. N. POTTER, D.D., LL.D.	93
VIII.	"O HOLY CHURCH." A POEM, By Prof. HENRY COPPEE, LL.D.	116
IX.	OF DIVORCE, By the Rev. A. ST. JOHN CHAMBRÉ, D.D.	117
X.	THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMA- TION IN SWEDEN, By the Rev. C. M. BUTLER, D.D.	131
XI.	THE COMPREHENSIVENESS OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION, By the Rev. GEORGE WOOLSEY HODGE, M.A.	173
XII.	CHRISTIANITY PROVED BY THE RES- URRECTION OF CHRIST—SECOND AR- TICLE, By the Rev. Prof. HENRY A. YARDLEY, M.A.	193
XIII.	THE CENTENNIAL JUBILEE OF GER- MAN LITERATURE, By the Rev. J. I. MOMBERT, D.D.	225
	LITERARY NOTICES,	257
	<i>I. Philosophy and Sociology.</i>	
	1. Suicide. An Essay in Comparative Moral Sta- tistics,	257
	2. Divorce and Divorce Legislation,	262
	<i>II. Biblical and Religious Literature.</i>	
	1. The New Testament in the Original Greek,	264
	2. The Holy Bible, with an Explanatory and Criti- cal Commentary,	267

REVISION OF THE COMMON PRAYER.

THE work of the Committee on the Prayer Book is quite limited in its scope. The resolution under which it acts is as follows :

“ Resolved, That a Joint Committee, to consist of seven Bishops, seven Presbyters, and seven laymen, be appointed to consider and report to the next General Convention, whether, in view of the fact that this Church is soon to enter upon the second century of its organized existence in this country, the changed conditions of the national life do not demand certain alterations in the Book of Common Prayer, in the direction of liturgical enrichment and increased flexibility of use.”

The term “ liturgical enrichment ” refers to the established forms of public worship of the Church, and the committee is to inquire and report as to the propriety of enriching these forms with new materials, and of giving greater flexibility in the use of them, whether so enriched or not. It does not seem to be a fair construction of the resolution that, under the head either of enrichment or flexibility,

anything can be taken away from any one of the offices of the Prayer Book as it now is. The Church has not entrusted to the Committee the subject of *remodelling* the Book or any part of it. Its contents, as it now stands, and has stood in the American Church since its organization, and in the English Church substantially for more than three hundred years, are not involved in the action of the Committee, but, on the contrary, the continuity of the book is to be maintained unbroken, and no radical change is to be attempted, either in the doctrine, discipline or worship of the Church. The Committee is simply to inquire and report as to improvements in the use of the Prayer Book, and as to the possibility of making some valuable contributions to its rich provisions for public worship and devotion.

And first, as to flexibility of use.

If we can trust to the judgment of Bishops, who may be fairly considered representative men in the Church, and to the official action of the General Convention, a good deal of liberty in the use of the Prayer Book is accorded to ministers under the law as it now stands. A committee of the House of Bishops, consisting of Bishops Otey, Doane, A. Potter, Burgess and Williams, to which was referred a memorial upon this subject, having first consulted with a large number of the clergy, in a report made to the General Convention of 1853, among other things recommended for adoption the following resolution :

“That in the opinion of the Bishops (a) the order of Morning Prayer, the Litany and the Communion Service, being separate offices, may, as in former times, be used separately, under the advice of the Bishop of the Diocese. (b) That on special occasions, or at extraordinary services not otherwise provided for, ministers may, at their discretion, use such parts of the Book of Common Prayer, and such lesson or lessons, as shall, in their judgment, tend most to edification. (c) That the Bishops of the several dioceses shall provide such special services as in their judgment shall be required by the peculiar spiritual necessities of any class

or portion of the population within the diocese, provided that such services shall not take the place of services or offices of the Book of Common Prayer in congregations capable of its use.”

Of these resolutions Bishop A. Potter, who edited the “Memorial Papers,” gave the following explanation: “The resolutions respecting the use of the Prayer Book express simply the opinion of the Bishops as to what, under existing laws, is allowable. They do not recommend that such liberty should everywhere be taken; they merely recognize the right to take it where there is sufficient occasion, and where the right is exercised under proper limitations.”

Bishop Burgess, as a sub-committee to whom was especially referred the subject of liturgical services, reports in reference to the abridgment of the service as proposed, among other things, as follows: “If it should be doubted whether the universal usage which had so long prevailed might not have taken away the right to separate these services, which nevertheless our Bishops, in 1826, termed a reasonable and godly practice, yet now, that it has been asserted and carried into effect in particular instances, it must be held to be quite re-established.” In reference to assemblies that cannot be viewed as congregations of our Church, he writes that this is a case which the compilers of our Prayer Book were not called to anticipate. “It has now become real and frequent, and the ministers of the Church must often preach the Gospel where the attempt to perform the entire service of an established worship would be incongruous, unsuccessful and injurious. It appears that such of the clergy as have been engaged in missionary labors, at home or in foreign lands, have generally felt themselves at liberty to yield, in such circumstances, to the law of manifest necessity and propriety, and so far to abridge as seemed meet for edification.” The right to use the Morning Prayer, the Litany and the Communion Service separately and independently was subsequently more fully recognized in a joint resolution of the General Convention of 1874, which is as follows:

“Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, That it is the sense of this Convention that nothing in the present order of the Common Prayer prohibits the separation, when desirable, of the Morning Prayer, the Litany and the order of the administration of the Lord’s Supper into distinct services, which may be used independently of each other, and either of them without the others: provided, that when used together they be used in the same order in which they have commonly been used, and in which they stand in the Book of Common Prayer.”

The report of the five Bishops from which I have quoted, and the foregoing resolution of the General Convention, both recognize as legal the right of a minister in the morning service to use any or either of the three offices referred to, separately and independently; and the report also expresses the opinion that on special occasions, or at extraordinary services not otherwise provided for—that is, on all occasions not contemplated by the Prayer Book as belonging to the regular public worship of the Church—ministers may, at their discretion, use such parts of the book, and such lesson or lessons, as shall, in their judgment, tend most to edification.

Looking further at those clauses of the report that refer to cases “where the attempt to perform the entire service of an established worship would be incongruous, unsuccessful and injurious,” the report would seem substantially to cover the ground embraced in the proposed amendment of the Ratification of the Book of Common Prayer, providing for shortened services, and with a very slight addition as to Morning and Evening Prayer on days other than Sunday, and certain specified days, to answer the same purpose.

It is somewhat extraordinary that these Bishops, representative men as they were of the Church, should, as early as 1853, have taken a position as to the rights and liberty of ministers in the use of the Prayer Book which the General Convention is hardly willing to accord to them even now. But it is to be remembered that a Bishop is brought in con-

tact with the best thought of his diocese, and has extraordinary means of learning the public sentiment of the Church at large, while, until recently, the clergy and laity were more under the influence of their respective localities; and this may, to some extent, account for the fact that must be admitted, that in the past a somewhat bolder and more outspoken policy of reform has characterized the action of the Bishops, and timidity and hesitation that of the House of Deputies. The means of communication are now such, between all parts of a diocese, and between all the dioceses, together with the influence of the press, Church Congresses, meetings of the clergy, committees, etc., as to place the Bishops, Clergy and Laity upon the same footing as to a knowledge of the needs and demands of the Church; and the action of the last General Convention shows that the two Houses are very much in accord upon such subjects. Had the General Convention of 1853, or any subsequent Convention, by a declaratory act, recognized the report of the Bishops referred to as a fair statement of the law of the Church as to flexibility in the use of the Prayer Book, such action would probably have quieted all agitation upon the subject.

In addition to the liberty in the use of the Prayer Book thus recognized by the Bishops and the General Convention, there is also the prescriptive right to use extemporaneous prayer *after* a sermon or lecture; a right, however, that, as is believed, is seldom exercised in any of our dioceses.

There is also, as there should be, an almost unlimited range for devotional music, under the absolute control of the rector. The Bishop of the diocese has also the right, for any reason satisfactory to him, to prepare forms of prayer for extraordinary occasions, and require the use of them by his clergy. There has been some discussion recently as to the right of a minister to meet by extemporaneous prayer, or appropriate devotional forms, unexpected emergencies that are wholly unprovided for in our established forms of prayer; such, for instance, as the assassination of the President, or the Chicago fire. This, it will be

observed, is *exclusively a matter between the minister and his Bishop*, to whom the Church has entrusted the duty of providing forms of prayer for extraordinary occasions; and if, not having time to consult his Bishop, a minister, under such circumstances, should adopt such devotional forms or exercises as he shall deem most appropriate, and such as he shall suppose will meet the approval of his superior, he would manifest, in so doing, a higher sense of duty and a truer loyalty than by refusing to act at all, simply for the reason that he could not consult his Bishop, who, having full authority in the premises, may always be presumed to approve of an honest effort to anticipate his wishes and instructions. It will thus be seen that, in the judgment of some of our wisest leaders, there is already a wide liberty in the use of the Prayer Book, and that its forms may legally and properly be adapted to peculiar circumstances as they arise. If in addition the minister were to have authority, when the evening congregation is substantially the same as in the morning, in order to avoid repetition, to begin the evening service with the Lord's Prayer preceded by music, at his discretion; and if he were also accorded a much larger liberty than at present in making selections from the Psalter, all reasonable demand for flexibility of use of the Prayer Book would seem to be satisfied.

The action of the General Convention of 1880 in relation to shortened services was unsatisfactory to a majority of the body, but was accepted on the ground that it would be better, after so long a delay, to adopt the proposed plan of relief at once and remedy its defects hereafter, than to reject it and postpone to an indefinite period the whole subject of shortened services. The House of Deputies, by a decisive majority, expressed its judgment that there should be in this action no restriction whatever upon the right of a minister to use extemporaneous prayer *after* a sermon or lecture, and so amended the proposed enactment, but, in deference to the House of Bishops, yielded the point for the time being, rather than postpone all action indefinitely. The

fact that the Committee on the Prayer Book would necessarily have cognizance of the matter, with ample time for deliberation and for perfecting the necessary legislation, was not probably, in the haste and confusion of the final action, properly appreciated; but, at all events, it seems clear, on fuller consideration, that the Committee ought to be able to present a satisfactory solution of the problem of shortened services without disturbing the Ratification of 1789, or curtailing the rights of the clergy while professing to enlarge them.

By usage, both in England and this country, extemporaneous prayer is deemed admissible *after* a sermon or lecture, for the purpose of meeting the demands of any special occasion, or of the sermon or lecture, and such liberty, however rarely exercised, should undoubtedly remain intact. But extemporaneous prayer in public worship is not, as a general rule, either in whole or in part, acceptable to the Church. She demands that her worship shall be strictly liturgical; that her prayer shall be common prayer; that the congregation shall pray, rather than listen to a person who is praying; and that the Church shall not be at the mercy of men who may attempt to improve upon her services. Our Common Prayer is not an intellectual product merely, but a growth. It has grown out of the experience, needs, sufferings, devotions of more than fifty generations of believers, and it must continue thus to grow. Congregations of worshipers are never weary of it; and the only demand that comes up from the Church at large is, that, with greater flexibility of use, we shall seek to make richer and more beautiful that which is wonderfully rich and beautiful as it is. We believe that liturgical worship, while less sensational, is more practical than other modes, goes down deeper into the life, is more thoroughly educational, and tends more to build up and consolidate Christian character. As a Church, we distrust the emotional, the metaphysical, the technical, the sensational in worship, and rely very much upon the practical. We believe that we owe to our

Liturgy the fact that, as a general rule, families remain in the Church permanently, from generation to generation; which can hardly be said of any Church without a liturgy.

As to the enrichment of the Prayer Book, there seems to be a general demand for the restoration to the evening service of the Magnificat and the Nunc Dimittis, the use of which, in the worship of the Church, reaches back almost to Apostolic times. The beautiful third collect, for aid against all perils, which is found in the Evening Service of the English Prayer Book, but was strangely omitted from our own, should also be restored to us as an alternate.

Occasional prayers are also needed for Missions, for State Legislatures and Governments, as was recommended by Bishop Seabury, for the dependent classes who are under public care, of whom the Church is bound to take special oversight, both for her own sake as well as theirs, and for other special objects that experience may have indicated.

Additional collects are also desirable, of which it is believed a considerable number may be found, suited to the character of the Prayer Book, and adding to its resources, without in the slightest degree lowering the dignity and solemnity of its devotional forms. What, for instance, can be finer or more impressive than the following, taken from the Accession Service of the English Prayer Book, with a slight modification?

“O God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, our only Saviour, the Prince of Peace; take away all hatred and prejudice and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly union and concord; that, as there is but one body, and one spirit, and one hope of our calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all, so we may henceforth be all of one heart, and of one soul, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify Thee; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.”

Taking then the suggestions of the Bishops in the report referred to as a basis, with a few additional changes speci-

fied, we shall have by way of increased flexibility in the use of the Prayer Book and its enrichment as follows:

1. The right of the minister, at all times, to treat the Morning Prayer, Litany and Communion Service as distinct and independent offices; and to use one or more of them at his discretion.

2. For special and extraordinary services, and for Morning and Evening Prayer on all other days than Sunday and days specified, the right of the minister to use such Scripture lessons, and such collects and prayers from the Prayer Book, and before sermon or lecture, if there be one, as may be deemed by him for edification.

3. The right, at his discretion, to begin the Evening Service with the Lord's Prayer.

4. The Magnificat and the Nunc Dimittis, and the third collect against all perils in the Evening Service of the English Prayer Book, as alternates.

5. Larger liberty in the use of the Psalter.

6. Special prayers for Missions, and for other interests and objects that experience may have indicated.

7. Additional collects to be provided.

8. The right to use extemporaneous prayer after sermon or lecture, as far as it now exists, to remain unchanged.

9. The control of the music to remain with the rector, with the largest liberty so far as matters of mere taste are concerned.

10. The right of the minister in emergencies to use appropriate devotional exercises or forms, in the absence of instructions from the Bishop.

11. These, with the authority of the Bishop to furnish from time to time, for extraordinary occasions, such forms of devotion as he may deem appropriate, would seem to meet present demands in relation to flexibility of use and enrichment of the Prayer Book; and this power in the Bishops, if wisely exercised, may perhaps be ample for meeting all the necessities of the future for new devotional forms.

An alternate Marriage Service may be desirable, for the

reasons given by Dr. Dix, and manifest errors, such as Dr. Huntington refers to, should be corrected, and the size of the book kept within due limits; as to which there need be no difficulty. In order to quiet all doubts, the changes to be made should be sanctioned by appropriate legislation, and should be merely tentative, until the mind of the Church shall have been clearly indicated in regard to them; and not until then should they be bound up with and become a part of the Prayer Book.

If, in addition to what has been suggested, the Lectionary and Hymnal shall be somewhat improved, we may reasonably hope that the public worship of the Church will be made more attractive, while losing none of its dignity, beauty or force. As a mere educational process, the training which that worship gives in an ordinary lifetime is of priceless value. It makes the worshiper familiar with the scriptures both of the Old and New Testaments, and especially with the Psalms, which are so constantly read and sung by the congregation, while the key-note of the Prayer Book is found in the first lesson which it teaches our children to remember, "that Baptism doth represent unto us our profession; which is, to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and to be made like unto him."

Several points have been discussed by gentlemen who have preceded me in this friendly conference that, while not, perhaps, strictly pertinent, may fairly be regarded as incidentally involved in the work of the Committee on the Prayer Book, and seem to call for some notice.

A difference of opinion has been expressed as to the attitude of the Church towards dogma, outside of the authorized creeds. That there are such dogmas there is no doubt, and that they are found in the Prayer Book; but I do not understand that the scope and meaning of them are arbitrarily fixed by the Church, or that her mode of teaching them is by menace. In reference to the meaning of dogmatic statements, I know of no such relation as that of submission on the part of the people, and authority on the part

of the Bishops and clergy, whose judgment is undoubtedly entitled to great weight, but whose mission is to instruct and aid men in the search after truth, and not, by dictation, to forbid such search. The Church follows the method of her Lord, in appealing to the enlightened judgment of men, and to their intuitive perception of truth when presented. He never demanded of any man "the surrender of his intellect," but, on the contrary, the consecration of all its powers to His service, in active duty, is what the intellect is made for. Were this not so, we should indeed be in an evil case, with high and low churchmen, and many intervening grades of churchmanship, differing widely in doctrine, and yet each and all historically entitled to their places in the Church. The doctrine of infallibility and passive obedience is, with us, impracticable as well as inadmissible.

The Bishop of Long Island, in a very able article entitled "Christian Dogma Essential," published in the January number of this Review for 1882, speaking of the historic creeds, says:

"They reflect now, as they did ages ago, the immutable needs of man, in the deepest realm of his being. If they ever held sway over the human mind, it was because of the divine and eternal truths which they embodied, and not because of their verbal form or technical structure."

He says further, "The doing of God's will is the only key to His doctrine of salvation. As through the intelligence this doctrine passes down into the heart, so back through the crucible of the will and the affections it must go, if it is to be securely seated in the heights of intelligence."

"Doctrine and duty, truth and action, faith and morals, what we believe and what we do as members of Christ's body, are but different sides of the same divine message, the same divine life."

"The intrinsic power and dignity of Christian dogma, as well as its practical grasp of the human mind, lie in the fact that it speaks definitely and positively, and with due regard for all the elements involved, on questions which reason can

discuss, but can never settle. These questions have an intellectual as well as a moral and spiritual side. On the former side, dogma must conform its explanations and apologies to the shifting requirements of each generation; on the latter, it need not, it cannot change. Thus it is possible for Christian dogma to be ever the same in its continuous witness, and yet to be ever intellectually fresh, ever abreast of the crises arising either from the mere fluctuations or from the actual progress of human thought."

"And sad indeed will it be for the Church if she do not find herself fully armed for such a crisis, both by her firm grasp of the dogmatic verities of Revelation, and by the disciplined intellectual vigor needed for their rational treatment and luminous exposition."

The fact that the Church, in explaining her dogmas, must appeal to the intellect and consciences of men, and not to their fears, is fully recognized in the article referred to, as well as in the history of the American Church. The Athanasian Creed was wisely omitted from our Prayer Book, for the reason that it sought to *drive* men into certain curiously framed logical and metaphysical definitions, instead of *leading* them into the simple truths of the Apostles' Creed.

Such is the teaching of the Church, that the spiritual is always the practical, the way, the truth, and the life are one, and Christian truth is Christian life. The horizon of truth is widened and the spiritual vision wonderfully clarified by a holy life; but each man must, at last, come to his own conclusions, untrammelled by dictation, and relying on all the helps within his reach; and it is difficult to see how a faith that lacks this quality of freedom, and is a matter of compulsion, can have any moral significance. In the Baptismal Service, the question "Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works," etc., comes first; and then the question "Dost thou believe," etc.; and this is the order in which genuine Christian faith always manifests itself; this is the method which the Church adopts, as that of the spirit of truth, leading men into all truth. It is a very

different thing from a theology of proof-texts, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men; and the Church seems to regard accurate and well-defined theological views as valuable, just in proportion as they are practical, and show as their fruits holy and useful lives.

The main object of our liturgy, aside from the creeds, is devotion; and its doctrinal teaching is usually incidental, and therefore lacks the distinctness of definition and clearness of statement that a dogma of faith for the Universal Church demands. The definitions referred to by Mr. McCrady of South Carolina, in the last General Convention, that are found in the invocations in the Litany to God, the Holy Ghost, as "proceeding from the Father and the Son," and to the Trinity as "three persons and one God," constituted no part of the ancient Litany of the Church, as known down to a comparatively recent period. The petitions before the change were, "Spiritus Sancte Deus, miserere nobis," and "Sancta Trinitas unus Deus, miserere nobis;" the exact doctrinal definitions were left to the creeds, as being somewhat out of place when addressing the Deity in prayer.

Bishop Hobart saw the danger of stating in the liturgy outside of the creeds, propositions about which Christian men differ and have a right to differ; and for this reason proposed as early as 1826, by a prayer framed for the Confirmation office, to relieve the term "regeneration" in the Baptismal office from the suspicion of confounding the distinction between the Baptism of Regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost; and there can be little doubt that, had he accomplished this object, the secession of the Reformed Episcopal Church, so called, which we all regret, would have been avoided.

The Committee on the Prayer Book has, however, nothing to do with these questions of doctrine further than to see that in its recommendation no special views are emphasized, in devotional forms designed for the use of the whole Church.

The true principle of our public worship seems to be, that prayer and praise and preaching, and the Lord's Supper, are all of divine command, and all essential to true Christian worship, and that neither can safely be dispensed with, and neither is central, in the sense of superiority, throwing the others or either of them into the background.

In relation to dress and mere ceremonial and ornamentation there should be a wide discretion, in order to meet the reasonable wishes and diversity of tastes of congregations and ministers, simply maintaining substantial uniformity, and protecting the Church from follies and excesses. If on the ground of comfort, convenience, or even taste, the clergy shall generally desire a change in the law regulating the dress of ministers in public worship, there would, I presume, be no serious objection to such change. If, however, it is asked for simply on the ground of reverence for mediæval usage, the suggestion will be as unintelligible to the American Church, and as unsatisfactory, as would be to the country at large a proposition to go back to the ruffles, dress and etiquette of the court of Henry VIII. in the President's receptions at Washington.

We claim that we are a branch of the Universal Church, but we differ somewhat as to the precise test of membership in that body. We admit that the historic churches, the Church of Rome, the Greek Church, the Anglo-American Church, belong to it; but how is it with these religious organizations that date their origin at or since the reformation? It is said by high authority, in reference to the distinction between the two Prayer Books of Edward VI., that "the great doctrinal alteration" made by the second book "referred to the presence of Christ in the consecrated elements of the Eucharist. In the book of 1549, the Communion Service had been so constructed as to be consistent with the belief of a real, and perhaps a substantial and corporal, presence. But the alterations in 1552 were such as to authorize and foster the belief that the consecrated elements had no new virtues imparted to them, and that Christ was

present in the Eucharist in no other manner than as He is ever present to the prayers of the faithful. The pale of Church communion was thus enlarged for the more earnest reformers, but closed against the slightest leaning to mediæval doctrine."*

There can be no doubt that, so far as doctrinal standards and the philosophy of the Christian life are concerned, we are more closely in sympathy with the great Protestant Churches about us than with the Church of Rome; and if substance is to govern rather than form, theological and spiritual relations rather than ecclesiastical, it would seem that we might well broaden our views, and treat them all as within the wide dominion of the Universal Church, visible and invisible. In the Father's house on earth, as in heaven, there must be mansions for good men of every name who believe in their hearts, and openly profess, their faith in the great facts of Christianity embodied in our creeds, and earnestly endeavor, by God's help, to live the Christian life. The differences that separate us from them are melting away, and must soon substantially disappear if we shall prove true to the Protestant character of our Prayer Book. This Book is already universally adopted in the Army and Navy; and the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, Te Deum, Gloria in Excelsis, Burial Service, Marriage Service, selections from the collects and responsive services are not infrequently used by our neighbors; while the fasts and festivals of the Church, Christmas, Easter, Good Friday and Lent, are generally more or less observed by these brethren, who are beginning to understand that historically the Prayer Book is theirs as well as ours. The fact that the American Church is the only Church on the face of the earth that, resting upon the one admitted ancient creed, as the Faith once delivered to the *Saints*, unites law and order with perfect freedom of opinion, is gradually doing its work.

Bishop Harris has wisely said that "this country, if not

*Procter, On the Book of Common Prayer, pp. 33. 34.

this age, is intensely intolerant of mediævalism." I cannot agree with Dr. Dix that "religion has nothing to do with secular progress or political change;" and that "lucifer matches, express trains, telegraphs, electric lights, telephones, world's fairs, congresses of the nations, war-drums of the world, trades-unions, socialism, scientific discoveries, cannot possibly be brought in as elements of the old Gospel." There is and can be no stage of progress and civilization to which Christianity is not precisely adapted, thus showing conclusively its divine origin, and it is adequate to the work of transmuting all these worldly energies and influences into divine instrumentalities for the benefit of mankind; the main business of the Church in this country, and its bounden duty, is to accomplish this work; but it is a very different matter from the monastic worship of mediævalism, and cannot be done by machinery. Whatever the sins and dangers of this age may be, and whatever its lack of reverence, it is the age in which we live, and with which we have to do; and if the Church was made for man, and not man for the Church, she must grapple with these difficulties and overcome them; and she cannot shirk the responsibility, and is not seeking to do so.

This Church is beginning to be felt as a power in the land. Indirectly she acts upon politics, the legislation and administration of the government, upon official, professional and business life. But her direct influence is still greater. She fixes and maintains in her creeds the standards of doctrine towards which the religious mind of the country is all tending, sustains the dignity and solemnity of public worship, teaches the true training of children, makes herself felt for good in literature and the press, and in forming public sentiment, inculcates neatness, order, moderation, obedience to law, temperance and pure morals, and in our large cities is a standing rebuke to vice and lawlessness, and the friend of the poor. She teaches the true uses and meaning of wealth, sustains the cause of education, encourages honesty and integrity public and private, and elevates social

life. Her Missionary Bishops are dealing with vast problems: the consecration of gigantic "godless wealth," and the religious teaching of all classes, business men, miners, railroad men, and the immense agricultural and manufacturing populations that are covering the face of the land, from the Mississippi to the Pacific Ocean. She is showing that she is not, as has been said, exclusively the Church of the rich and poor, but that her principal work is and is to be among the great middle class that holds in its hands the destinies of the nation: not a proselytizing Church, estimating her value by her numbers; but a standing witness of divine truth, a leavening influence that gives tone and character to the national life, lifts men up towards Him who is King of Nations as well as King of Saints.

To weaken the confidence of the people of the United States in this Church would be a great calamity. But it can be done, and in order to do it thoroughly we have only to show that we are ashamed of Protestantism, identified as it is, in the national convictions, with political, civil and religious liberty; ashamed of our name, the Protestant Episcopal Church; ashamed of our martyrs, who died in defence of those principles of perfect freedom, freedom of mind, freedom of conscience, that are embodied in our Protestant Prayer Book.

In these confidential talks with friends, we speak our minds freely, knowing that the object we all have in view is simply the truth, and that each is doing his best to find it. Let us be thankful that, much as we may differ in opinion, the Church is large enough to give us all a home; and that we can discuss the things that pertain to her interests not only with mutual respect and courtesy, but as brethren; conscious that we are in a world of shadows that perplex and sometimes blind us,

"And waiting for the golden morn to rise."

JOHN W. ANDREWS