

to woman the administration of the home and of those wider domesticities which are of kin to the home—the hospital, the school, and the like—has its reason in the eternal laws of God, and that no reform is for either her welfare or that of the community which, in its eagerness to affirm the equality of the sexes, confounds their social functions and endeavors to make them duplicate each other. Nor is this general law modified by the fact that in exceptional cases each has nobly assumed and fulfilled the duties which naturally would devolve upon the other.



Church Unity

Prophecy is hazardous; otherwise we should venture to prophesy that before long Professor Charles W. Shields, of Princeton University, will be a priest, if not a bishop, in the Episcopal Church. We can see no reason why he should not be one now, except for the incongruity of being simultaneously an Episcopal priest and a Princeton professor. Certainly the episcopate would not easily find an abler advocate of its claims than Professor Shields proves himself to be in his essay on "The Historic Episcopate as the Basis of Church Unity." He surrenders the entire Protestant position in the declaration that "the institutions of Christianity, its ministry and sacraments, are revealed in the Scriptures no less than its doctrines." Surely he must know that he is here assuming what the Protestant school, even in the Episcopal Church, deny; that, for example, Dean Alford, perhaps the ablest New Testament scholar in that communion, declares that the New Testament affords no authority for the doctrine of Apostolical Succession; that Professor Hatch, perhaps the ablest historian in that communion, affirms the post-Apostolical rise of the episcopacy; that Archbishop Whately denies emphatically that the priesthood of the Old Testament was continued under the New Testament, and affirms the priesthood of all believers; that Dr. Lightfoot traces the development by human growth of the episcopacy out of the presbyterate; that, in a word, ever since the days of Cranmer, a large body of scholars in the Anglican Church have held, with Professor Latham, of Cambridge, that "Christ gave no system for recasting society by positive law, no ecclesiastical polity, for men could make laws better when the circumstances which called for them arose."

Three theories of the Church confront us: the Papal, the Anglican, the Protestant. The Papal theory holds that Christ organized an ecclesiastical society, founding it on the primacy of Peter, who had authority to appoint his successors; the Anglican theory holds that he organized an ecclesiastical society, founding it on the twelve Apostles, who had authority to appoint their successors; the Protestant theory holds that Christ did not organize any ecclesiastical society, that he taught certain great truths and inspired and still inspires a divine life, and left those who hold that truth and possess that life to organize their own institutions. The first two hold that Christ formed a society which he intended should be the depository of his special grace and the revelation of his truth and life; and that, though men may be possessed of Christ's spirit, and in so far be Christians, and still live without this Church, by so doing they separate themselves from his divinely appointed historic society. The other holds that wherever two or three are gathered together in Christ's name he is in the midst of them, and that any such fellowship clustered about him and working in his name is a part of his Church. The one conception of the Church is ecclesi-

astical and organic; the other is spiritual and mystical. We call the first theory Anglican and the second Protestant, for convenience, though many eminent Anglican scholars hold the second theory and some eminent non-Anglican scholars—Dr. Shields, for example—hold the first. We do not wonder that such scholars are ready to adopt as a basis of Church union "the Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his Church." We rather wonder that they do not make haste to enter the Church which has this Historic Episcopate. They are really Anglicans, not Protestants.

But the issue between Anglicanism and Protestantism, between the ecclesiastical and mystical conception of Christ's Church, can never be settled by the adoption of any such "glittering generality" as that proposed by the Lambeth Conference. Great questions are never permanently settled by ambiguous phraseologies. The Episcopal bishops themselves are not agreed in the meaning which they attach to this now famous sentence. It means to Bishop Seymour one thing; it meant to the late Bishop Brooks something very different. To Dr. Knox-Little it means one thing; to Archdeacon Farrar it means another. But the very fact that it is proposed as a basis of Church union indicates that, in the opinion of those who proposed it, episcopacy, in some form, is essential to a Christian Church. And this is just the doctrine which Luther repudiated when, in 1525, he ordained his private secretary deacon in the Reformed Church; and all his followers have with him repudiated it ever since.

Dr. A. V. G. Allen, in an article in the "New World" for March, suggests that the doctrine of Apostolical Succession may be, when truly interpreted, but another form of the doctrine that the Christian consciousness of the ages is the highest ground of certitude for the Christian faith; that "in the doctrine of Apostolic Succession lies embedded the truth that a divine influence is propagated in the world, from man to man, not so much by books as by personal contact." Perhaps! So in the adoration of the Virgin Mary lies embedded the truth that woman is not man's upper servant, but is made with him in the likeness of God. But in neither case are those who disbelieve in the form justified in pretending to accept it, for the sake of the truth which it both reveals and obscures. We will reverence woman; but we will not adore the Virgin Mary. So we will look for the Spirit of God in all good men and true; but we will not seem to concede that he has appointed a special succession of men, whether popes or bishops, through whom he has sent a special stream of grace to bless the world. The most intense Independent might be willing to adopt some form of ecclesiastical oversight, as a convenience of method, in forming a united Church, or a federation of Churches; but no Protestant, if he is a Protestant on principle, and understands his Protestant principles, will accept a Historic Episcopate as essential to the Church of Christ, for he holds that the only thing essential to that Church is loyalty to Christ, who is a living and ever-present head, and therefore needs no vicar or series of vicars; and he holds that the true bond of Church unity is spiritual, not ecclesiastical.

To sum all up: Church unity cannot be promoted by shutting our eyes to a radical difference of opinion, and substituting for a real agreement an ambiguous phraseology. The consummation of Church unity must wait until either Protestant Christians are convinced that Christ instituted an ecclesiastical society, into which every follower of Christ should enter, or he in so far fails of perfect

loyalty to his Master; or until Anglican Christians are convinced that all who love the Lord Jesus Christ, and acknowledge him as their Lord and Master, do already constitute one Church of Christ, and that the visible unity of Christ's Church must grow out of that spiritual fellowship in Christ, and be conditioned on that and on nothing else.



An Unworthy Criticism

The "Sunday-School Times" has an editorial on the Blakeslee Bible Lessons which seems to us singularly out of keeping in a paper which is generally so Christian in its spirit. The gist of this article is that there is no essential difference in character between the Blakeslee and the International system, except that the International system has in it no profit for any one, while the Blakeslee system is carried on for the purpose of making money for its editor or publishers. In fact, more money is invested in and more profits are made out of the International system than out of the Blakeslee system, though in one case they are divided among a number of publishers and in the other case, at present, they are not. In both cases it is just to assume that the object of the organizers is not personal profit but the public good.

The difference between the Blakeslee and the International system is partly one of object and partly one of method. It cannot properly be said that the object of the International course is to give the student a comprehensive knowledge of the Bible. A series of fragments, occasionally in continuity, oftener without continuity, are selected for study. In some of the Lesson Helps an endeavor is made to connect the lesson of one week with the lesson which precedes or with that which follows; but the effort of the Lesson Help and of the teacher is concentrated on the immediate practical results to be accomplished by means of the Scripture lesson. The primary object is, not to give the pupils a comprehensive knowledge of the Bible by a graded course, but to give a basis for such lessons in the moral and spiritual life as the teachers, with or without aids, can gather from the selected Scripture and impart to their classes. The object of the Blakeslee Lessons, on the other hand, is distinctly to give the student, by a systematic course organized for that purpose, a comprehensive knowledge of the Bible as a collection of literature. The Scripture is not selected for the direct moral and spiritual lessons which it is supposed to convey. The theory of the editor, frankly avowed by him, is that, if the Bible itself be studied with unprejudiced mind, the moral and spiritual lessons will find their own way into the minds of the students. With these different objects in view, it naturally follows that different methods are pursued. The International course rarely prescribes more than a dozen or fifteen verses for a single lesson, while the Blakeslee course often recommends several chapters. It would be absurd to take the several chapters recommended by the Blakeslee system as the best practicable basis for direct practical religious instruction; and it is equally absurd to hope to get out of the fragments proposed by the International system a continuous, complete, and comprehensive knowledge of Bible history and literature.

There is something to be said in favor of each of these methods. In our judgment, some schools will do better with the one system, other schools with the other. But the two systems are not the same, and it is a mistake to confound them. Sunday-schools and churches, in choosing between the two systems, should clearly understand which object they have in view, and choose their system

accordingly. If they want in each lesson a basis for practical and spiritual teaching and exhortation, they would better select the International system; if they want in the course of lessons a basis for a complete and comprehensive study of the Bible as history and literature, they would better accept the Blakeslee system. That system, in our judgment, is not perfect. Mr. Blakeslee appears to us to be either unfamiliar with the best results of modern scholarship, or timid in accepting them and giving them to the churches. Moreover, he has sometimes given too large a subject for the half-hour's treatment allowed in most of our Sunday-schools. But, despite these defects, for classes which wish to make a comprehensive study of the Bible there is no comparison between the International and the Blakeslee system. To treat the latter as a simple money-making scheme is to impute unworthy motives to men and women engaged in a worthy service. There are journals in which we should not be surprised to find such a suggestion; we are surprised to find it in the "Sunday-School Times."



Editorial Notes

—It seems strange, both from individual and social conditions, that there should be more suicides in Germany than in other European countries, yet so it appears, the annual average being about 2.7 to every 10,000 persons. In France it is 1.87, in Austria 1.63, in England .76, and in Italy .46.

—It is sensibly advocated that a national memorial to Mr. Gladstone take the shape of a fund to establish village libraries. The ex-Premier himself has long striven to implant a taste for reading in the minds of his countrymen, and of that endeavor the new Hawarden Library is the most striking example.

—The proposal to build a new battle-ship, better than any existing, and to give it the name of the historic hulk now going to pieces on Roncador Reef, would have as precedents the Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, Concord, Yorktown, and Dolphin, all of which vessels have had predecessors bearing the same names.

—The literary progressive movement in the West continues bravely. A Chicago paper states that what was the "Tammany Athletic Club" of that city having come to an end through difficulties with the police, it is to be reorganized under the name of the Henrik Ibsen Club. It is firmly believed that even the Chicago police will respect the mighty name of Ibsen and allow the club a wide latitude in its conduct.

—Instruction in saving is quite as important as in any subject, and it is therefore a great gratification to note that the New York City Board of Education has just taken up the consideration of the Penny Provident Fund stamp system. Its object is simply to teach the principle of saving by the use of cards on which a stamp is pasted equal to the amount handed in, the deposit being subject to withdrawal at any time. The success of the system in more limited fields is an earnest of its success in greater ones.

—The "Northwestern Congregationalist" of Minneapolis, Minn., under the editorship of President Gates, of Iowa College, Professor George D. Herron, the Rev. Thomas C. Hall, and others, has made some notable contributions to theological literature and has stood for the best thought of the Congregationalism of the Northwest. It now becomes "The Kingdom," and will extend its scope and list of writers. It announces its field to be that of "applied Christianity," and its object to be to apply to social conditions everywhere the plain teachings of the Founder of Christianity.

—Who does not now know the humane meaning of the red Greek cross on a white ground, wherever displayed? This latter-day significance had its inception in 1864, when plenipotentiaries representing France, Prussia, Italy, Baden, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Portugal, Saxony, Württemberg, and Switzerland met in Geneva and agreed upon a treaty to mitigate the evils inseparable from war, particularly providing not only relief to the wounded but stipulating that they and all persons employed in hospitals be deemed neutral and entitled to protection. It was further settled that a distinctive flag for hospitals and ambulances and an arm-badge for the individuals thus neutralized should be adopted. This treaty was subsequently ratified by thirty-six governments, including our own, and it is a pleasure to record that, without a dissenting vote, the House of Representatives has now just passed a bill further to protect the insignia and name of the Red Cross Society so formed.