

The Church, the School, and the Saloon

By James F. Dailey



WHEN I made my brief address¹ before the distinguished body of churchmen gathered at Temple Grove, Saratoga, on July 23, it was beyond my expectation that such wide publicity would be given to it, and that the interest in the facts there set forth should increase rather than diminish. The paper under discussion at the meeting was "The Masses and the Classes," by the Rev. Byington Smith, one of Saratoga's resident ministers. It was an interesting study of the state of affairs now existing between labor and capital; and as the eminent speakers present proceeded to consider the propositions set forth by Mr. Smith, reference was frequently made to the saloon as a factor in the struggle, but only in an indirect manner, the subject, to my mind, not being given the commanding place it deserves in our social and political economy. In presenting my side of the case, I unhesitatingly declared that the saloon was not, as had been said by the Rev. Dr. J. R. Wilson, a gentleman from the South, "the perspiration of a bad civilization," but it was the very muscle and arterial blood of the serious troubles we were then witnessing in the labor world. I further said that it was my belief that, while the employer ought to pay his workman a fair day's wages for a fair day's work, it was also the duty of the workman to be as careful of his wages, which were his capital, as the employer was of his capital, and it was only by this care on the wage-earner's part that he would be enabled to resist the unjust encroachments of the selfish employer. It was no idle theory I was advancing when I declared at Temple Grove that it was the consuming jaws of the saloon that had devoured the substance of the workingmen in all our great industrial centers, but an actual account of affairs that had come under my own observation in Philadelphia, where, as a workingman, I had discovered that the licensed saloon was receiving too large a share of the toiler's hard-earned dollars.

At this point Bishop W. R. Nicholson, of the Reformed Episcopal Church, requested me to state what I knew concerning the relationship of the Church with the liquor business in Philadelphia. The request brought out the statement, briefly made to the audience, which has since attracted such widespread attention, and which I now more fully place before the great reading public through the columns of *The Outlook*. At the close of my remarks in Temple Grove, the Rev. Dr. Wilson arose and asked me if this was a history of Tammany Hall; to which I answered, "No, sir. This is a history of the Republican party in Philadelphia, supposed to be the most pious institution on the face of the earth." The following day I was met by the Rev. Dr. William Durant, pastor of Saratoga's First Presbyterian Church, a Christian man and scholar, who thanked me for my utterances, and said I had got down to the very root and source of the social disorders.

It is the theory of our Constitution that this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people; but the government *de facto* in Philadelphia is a government of saloon politicians, by saloon politicians, and for saloon politicians. The irrefragable proofs of this are herein presented, through necessity, only partially. When, on the first day of last February, I began this exhaustive research, it was only with the purpose of discovering who the officeholders and politicians were who were engaged in binding on our shoulders the burdens and crimes of our saloons. It was not expected that the Church, the Protestant Church—and I speak on this point without any religious bias—would be found so conspicuously in the liquor busi-

ness; but as the investigation advanced day by day, names familiar in church work became unpleasantly numerous, until they began to make quite a show in numbers.

The only Church into which a methodical examination was made was the Protestant Episcopal Church. This branch of Christianity held its vestry elections on Easter Monday, the day on which the last License Court opened, and as the names of the newly elected vestries were published in the daily papers, a comparison of them with the names of the signers on saloon license petitions easily revealed the apparent connection between the two institutions—namely, the church and the saloon. Conspicuous among the vestries was that of the Church of the Redemption, Twenty-second and Callowhill Streets. Of the eight vestrymen, six signed for ten saloons in that vicinity, a neighborhood that has always been well supplied with drinking facilities. Here politics also made their appearance. Alexander Crowe, Jr., one of the vestrymen, the Republican leader in the ward, the Fifteenth, appended his signature, or rather his name appears, on the applications of five different aspirants for saloon privileges.

The Church of the Mediator, Nineteenth and Lombard Streets, is also prominent in this respect, one vestryman signing for a saloon directly opposite the church. Among the vestrymen signing here is the Hon. Alexander Colesberry, United States Marshal, who also appeared as counsel for several saloons in various parts of the city. In looking over the newspaper files of the time (last March) I find that a city missionary testified against one of the places for which Mr. Colesberry was counsel. The witness said that "a great many young women, old women, poor and abandoned women, some with hardly any clothes on, go there with kettles and come out with beer and ale." In one case where a church was a remonstrant against a saloon, Mr. Colesberry is reported as saying: "Your honors, the churches mean well, but they make mistakes. Why, I am a vestryman." The other Protestant Episcopal churches, the names of some of the vestry of which appear on license applications, are St. Andrew's, Eighth and Spruce; All Saints', St. John the Evangelist, St. John's, Church of the Transfiguration (where Councilman Patton is a signer), St. Mary's, St. Stephen's, St. David's, St. Timothy's, Manayunk; St. James's, West Philadelphia; Emmanuel, Holmesburg; Emmanuel, Richmond; and Grace Church, Twenty-second Ward. These are all city churches, and the vestrymen signers number between thirty and forty.

The names of the church officials and members of other Protestant churches not being accessible without an immense deal of labor, a clear declaration cannot be made concerning their connection with the liquor traffic; but in four special cases where clergymen were shown the list of names of license-signers in their particular wards each one was able to point out members of his or other churches among the names—an almost sure indication that the iniquitous Brooks high-license law has struck its poisonous fangs deep into the body of the Church. The very names, in many cases, make one feel the proximity of the Church, more particularly in the aristocratic wards. Information on the subject came to me from various quarters. In one instance a young man, a Sunday-school scholar, pointed out the names of two Methodist Sunday-school teachers; but these records were lost. There were no religious differences in the matter of signing the license petitions, for, while the majority of applicants were Catholics, their Protestant brethren cheerfully loaned them the use of their names. One United Presbyterian clergyman, interested in a mission, was disgusted to find that a member of his denomination had signed the license of a man who wanted to start a saloon in the mission building, with only a board partition between.

On the last day of the License Court, at the request of the Judges, Clarence D. Gibbonny, Secretary of the Law

¹ The address to which Mr. Dailey refers was widely quoted in brief by the daily newspapers. In order to present in an authoritative form the remarkable facts which he has brought to light, he has written this article at our request. Mr. Dailey is assistant foreman of the composing-room of the Philadelphia "Public Ledger," and has made so thorough an investigation of his subject that we confidently advise our readers that his statements may be relied upon.—THE EDITORS.

and Order Society, read out a list of names of men in the Sixth and Ninth Wards who had signed more than one license petition. In this list was included the name of Sheriff Samuel Clement, who signs two licenses. The appearance of his name in the newspapers excited some passing comment in Bethany Presbyterian Church (Wanamaker's), where one or two other signers were found, and where Mr. Clement is an elder. Personally Mr. Clement is a very agreeable person, and it is difficult to understand his strange position. Among the other Presbyterian churches where the saloon has apparently entered are the Harper Memorial, Olivet, the Gaston, the Wylie Memorial—the former through a member of City Council. In two cases in the Methodist Church two former class-leaders recently got into the saloon politics of their wards and then out of the Church, and finally appear on the license-signing list. Is it for this that we license the saloon? In Kensington Methodist Church two leading members had their names forged in the interest of a saloon-keeper, and the Spring Garden Methodist Church has one, if not two, members who appear on the list of license-signers, both of them being members of City Council. This was discovered by the late pastor, the Rev. Dr. Hurlburt. Union Methodist Church, Broad Street Methodist Church, and three English Lutheran churches were also among the delinquents. In the Baptist churches two official members are among the signers, the most prominent of whom is Richard G. Oellers, the President of the Board of Trustees of the Baptist Temple, whose name appears on the petition of a saloon, one of the most profitable in the city, at Broad and Susquehanna Avenue, in company with State Senator Porter. Mr. Oellers wants the Republican nomination for City Treasurer.

On Thursday, August 9, the Republican City Campaign Committee met and decided that a nomination should be made in the Third Congressional District, and directed the district committee to take action. This district committee includes one court official, William L. Smith, who signed thirty licenses; one Republican member of Council, Joseph H. Klemmer, who signs and bonds for fourteen; State Senator Elwood Becker, who signs and bonds for eight; the whole committee, eight in number, representing some seventy license applications before the last Court. On Monday, August 13, it was agreed to nominate a man named Frederick Halterman, who is connected with several clubs where beer is disposed of, it is said, Sunday and week-day. It is also stated that his nomination was made in order to secure the German vote in the German wards. Mr. Crow, though a Republican leader, will not, therefore, be nominated.

Leaving, without nearly exhausting, the Church phase of the liquor business, the political side is the last to be considered, but not the least in importance. It is at the ballot-box that the saloon evil is fastened upon the State of Pennsylvania, and the union of the saloon traffic and the Church is cemented. In March last the annual term of our City Councils expired, and on the first Monday of April the new Councils took their places. The lower branch of Councils includes 123 members, and a careful investigation of the license records shows, with one ward left out, that 81 of them were signers, bondsmen, and counsel—one, both, or all three—for from one to twenty-six licenses apiece, the latter number belonging to Councilman Van Osten, of the Sixth Ward, President of the Liquor-Dealers' Association, one of the few Democrats in the body. In fifteen wards every member appears on the list, and in five instances they are saloon-keepers. In Select Council twenty-seven out of thirty-seven members also appeared before the last License Court in the same capacities of signers and bondsmen as did the members of the lower branch. Their figures range from one to twenty-five, the latter number belonging to Councilman Bringhurst, of the Ninth Ward.

This political interest in the saloon by our city fathers ramifies through the whole city government, from the precinct officer, who counts the vote, up. Of the twenty-eight Police Magistrates, twenty-three are signers or bondsmen for from one to five saloons each, and seven of the clerks

in the Court of Quarter Sessions sign from one to thirty licenses each, and seven clerks in the Sheriff's office sign for from one to fifteen petitions. Add to these the names of fifty or more other city officials of different degrees of responsibility who were interested in saloon licenses before the last Court, a rather large total of Philadelphia saloon statesmen is reached. The State lawmakers make no better showing. Of the eight State Senators whose term of office expires with the election of their successors in November, six appeared as signers, counsel, and bondsmen, among them being the Hon. Boies Penrose, who will probably be the next Republican nominee for Mayor. The Pennsylvania House of Representatives includes thirty-eight members from Philadelphia, and of this number twenty-seven had a signatory interest in license petitions. Their term of office expires in November, and most of them will be up for re-election.

Now, I have no harmful word to say of any of these office-holders. They represent the license policy of the State of Pennsylvania. It is the policy upon which they are elected; it is the policy of the Republican party and the policy of every voter who votes that ticket, making no difference whether he stands behind the bar or behind the altar. As a voter I discovered that in the summer of 1889, and since that time have not voted a license ticket; not so much because I practice individual temperance—many saloon-keepers do that much—as because I believe that we can have no effectual reform in municipal, State, or National Government while office-seekers are compelled to bend to the saloon.

But this is not all. I have shown how the saloon and the church agree together; it now remains to be shown how the saloons and the public schools of Philadelphia are brought into inharmonious harmony. Here is the story in tabulated form:

Ward.	School Directors in Ward.	Signing School Directors.	No. of Licenses Signed.
First.....	13	6	10
Second.....	13	4	10
*Third.....	13	7	16
Fourth.....	13	7	17
*Fifth.....	13	6	25
*Sixth.....	13	12	88
Seventh.....	13	2	4
*Eighth.....	13	7	12
Ninth.....	13	7	28
*Tenth.....	13	1	1
*Eleventh.....	13	10	27
Twelfth.....	13	5	14
Thirteenth.....	13	4	9
*Fourteenth.....	13	1	8
Fifteenth.....	13	5	9
Sixteenth.....	13	3	11
Seventeenth.....	13	9	22
*Eighteenth.....	13	1	2
Twentieth.....	13	2	2
*Twenty-first.....	13	3	9
*Twenty-second.....	15	3	4
Twenty-third.....	13	0	0
*Twenty-fourth.....	17	0	0
*Twenty-fifth.....	13	4	8
Twenty-sixth.....	13	2	3
Twenty-seventh.....	19	5	12
Twenty-eighth.....	13	1	2
Twenty-ninth.....	13	1	2
Thirtieth.....	13	5	10
Thirty-first.....	13	3	4
Thirty-second.....	13	0	0
Thirty-third.....	14	6	13
Thirty-fourth.....	15	1	1
Thirty-fifth.....	13	6	10
Thirty-sixth.....	13	2	6
Thirty-seventh.....	13	4	6
Total.....	496	145	405

By this we see that 145 school directors, men in whose hands rests the education of the children, signed 405 licenses. In those wards marked thus (*) from one to four members of the sectional board are saloon-keepers. And these men were elected by church members and saloon-keepers in unison! Is this a right sort of school directorship?

The strangest part of the whole investigation was the insight given about the delegation which left Philadelphia to nominate the Republican candidate for Governor on May 28 last. There were sixty-three delegates. Of this number two were saloon-keepers, two were directors in a brewery which increased its sales 74 per cent. the last six months of 1893, one had been a saloon-keeper for twenty-five years, and thirty-eight were signers, bondsmen, counsel—one, both, or all three—for from one to thirteen saloon licenses each. And this delegation handed the nomination to a Methodist church trustee! As the two brewery

directors among the delegates directly represented every licensed or unlicensed place selling this particular beer, it can be safely set down that the whole delegation represented 400 and more legal and illegal places for the sale of liquor. In this delegation was one District Attorney, the Hon. George S. Graham. In my Saratoga address he was made to appear as a license-signer. This was an error of the types, and not of mine. He was only interested in a transfer of a license, and had written strong letters in one or two instances for "reputable" applicants. He is a Presbyterian elder.

I leave this recital to the consideration of Christian voters.



Anglo-American Mementos

By Ellen Painter Cunningham

The tourist's conventional bouquet of reminiscence, gathered in foreign lands, is never so attractive as when brightened by historical mementos of his native land. Under certain conditions the Jerusalem rose resumes its freshness. In like manner, pleasant recollections have been revived by two passing events—namely, the observance of the anniversary of the adoption of the National flag, and the pilgrimage of University Extension students to places historically associated with General Washington.

In 1889 Mr. H. F. Waters, the distinguished genealogist, published his discovery of a clue to the English ancestry of George Washington, thereby indicating where the most innately American associations in England are to be found, and the following quotation from Mr. Waters's article specifies the man who proved to be the father of the American emigrants: "Lawrence Washington, son of Lawrence Washington of Sulgrave . . . Fellow, Lector, and in 1631 Proctor of the University of Oxford." The most weary-winged bird of passage flutters ever joyfully to Oxford, but the above-quoted statement especially allured one to Lawrence Washington's college, where, leisure sanctioning, several crumbling bits of information were picked up. Brasenose, with its "foundation" of 1509, was the last of the pre-Reformation colleges to be founded, and is the eleventh in order of the twenty-two now existing. In a charter of Henry VIII. it is spoken of as "King's Hall and College of Brasenose." The curious name is said to have been derived from a "brea-ernhus" or "brasenus"—that is, brewery. In any case, a huge gilded nose, in playful allusion to the title of the College, is conspicuous over the entrance gate. This gate is one of the handsomest towers in Oxford, being ornamented with statues of Saints Chad and Hugh, also the Virgin and Child. Entering the first quadrangle formed by the College buildings, an antique but gayly decorated sun-dial, high on the wall, attracts attention. The Hall in which the members of a college dine, and where some lectures are given, the Chapel, and the Library form the three architectural Graces usually inspected by visitors at Oxford. The Chapel was not built in Lawrence Washington's day, but the Hall may have been used then. Persistent conservatism is suggested by the two facts that until 1780 the fire continued to be kindled in the middle of this room, and that in the Library books remained chained to their shelves till the end of the last century.

The records of the past scantily supply straws for the bricks of descriptive environment, but, fortunately, material for the patchwork of information covering public and university life between 1620 and 1631 is more liberally furnished. It is interesting to note that, owing to a plague in London, Charles I. and his Parliament adjourned to Oxford in 1625, where they interrupted the university routine by routing professors and pupils from some of their buildings. The plague pursued its way to Oxford in 1628. William Laud, subsequently Archbishop, was Proctor in 1603, and, being elected Chancellor in 1630, was in that office while Lawrence Washington held a proctorship. Laud gave careful attention to the minutiae of the University, even regu-

lating the length of the students' hair. The position of Proctor was one of the oldest in the University, existing in the same century (the thirteenth) with that of the first college foundation. As early as the fourteenth century Proctors were the "chief executives of the University," of such important rank as to be empowered to impeach the Chancellor himself. Their duties were manifold: to superintend the finances, to arrange the lectures and disputations, and, first, last, and all the time, to maintain peace, not only between the quarrelsome factions of the colleges, but between them and the townspeople.

A picturesque peep at the lighter side of the past is afforded by a quaint volume of the eighteenth century, which mentions an obligatory but cordial custom formerly practiced at Brasenose. Bachelors of Art, with the undergraduates, appeared before the Principal of the College on or before New Year's Day, each presenting him with an epistle of good wishes.

Now to Sulgrave, which is about forty-five miles by rail, or about thirty-five miles across country from Oxford, in a northerly direction. The torpid little village of four or five hundred inhabitants, in which the Washington Manor-House stands, is three miles from Morten Pinkney, the nearest railway station. Arrived at Sulgrave, the house was found to be for sale. A watchful custodian hastened across the road and unlocked the kitchen door. Entering, the capacious fireplace—the historic culinary pledge for ponderous roasts—was found to be partly bricked up for the accommodation of a plebeian nineteenth-century stove. Passing through a moderate-sized wainscoted room, a hall thirty or forty feet long is reached. Here an original wooden mantel, a broad window leaded with over a hundred and forty small panes of glass and recessed in the thick wall, and heavy dark beams marking off the ceiling into squares, plead for a recognition of by-gone days of dignity. There are nine or ten rooms in the house, and it is said that there were more, but those upstairs are only noticeable for the dark beams thrusting themselves about the walls and ceilings. On each side of a sort of vestibule, into which the front door opens, are a lion and a griffin made in the plaster. Stepping out into the weedy confusion of long-neglected ground, there is an opportunity to scan the face of the gray stone house, two stories and a half high. The door is somewhat pointed, in the fifteenth-century style, and in the two corners of the lintel are small shields bearing the Washington coat of arms—the three stars and two bars or stripes. Higher up on the wall reappear the lion and griffin; there is also a large shield, too defaced to present anything intelligible. The roof is of oak, and friendly ivy partially covers the now shabby residence. The property was sold by the Washington family in 1583. Within a short distance is the church, in the south aisle of which is a slab marked: "Here lyeth buried ye bodys of Laurence Washington, Gent. & Amee his wife by whome he had issue III J sons & VI daughters we laurence Dyed ye day of ano 15 & Amee deceased the VI day of October ano Dni 1564." Besides this brass inscription, there were originally full-length brass figures of this Lawrence and his wife, two small pieces representing groups of the sons and daughters, and an enameled or painted shield bearing the famous stars and stripes. The figure of Amee disappeared some time ago, and on the eleventh of August, 1889, the two small brass memorials of the sons were stolen. Suspicion points to two Americans allowed free access to the church during the day. "Gone to Yankee Land!" was the laconic verdict of a Sulgrave resident. The head of Lawrence Washington's figure has been knocked off, and the poor little shield is pathetically loosened.

Sulgrave is in the midst of a gently rolling agricultural country, netted with hedges, beautifully blending dull browns and greens in a tranquil atmosphere. It is pleasant to know that in the furious rush which thousands of Americans make from one royally iridescent center of attraction to another, there is a number, increasing year by year, of those who spare time and thought to visit the home of the ancestors of the "Father of Our Country."

London, England.

The Christ of Faith¹

By Prof. C. A. Beckwith²

The aim of this paper is purely religious, to present some relations of the Christ of faith to existing conditions of Christian life.

Who, then, is the Christ of faith? We have the Christ of prophecy, the Christ of the Gospels, the Christ of history, the Oriental Christ, and the Christ of dogma; who is the Christ of faith? In a word, he is the one with whom the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles and the Letters of the New Testament are concerned. He lived a few eventful years in Palestine, where he went about doing good, where he died for our sins, and was buried, and rose from the dead; he ascended, and now, dwelling in the world of light, glorified, he is the Mediator of heavenly grace. In him is revealed all that we know of the nature of God as love; through him the Father is reconciling the world to himself; "whom, not having seen, ye love; on whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice greatly with joy unspeakable and full of glory." We attempt no exhaustive definition of him who is both Saviour and Lord. To those who have trusted in him, none is needful. We all unite in addressing him:

Strong Son of God, immortal Love,
Whom we, that have not seen thy face,
By faith, and faith alone, embrace,
Believing where we cannot prove.

I. First, the Christ of faith exists apart from the Christ of dogma—that is, the Christ of theology. Theology is the philosophy of the contents of faith, and dogma is such philosophizing with the added element of authority. But, since the Christ of faith is not the product of man's reason, therefore he is not dependent on any special ideas of his person. Speculative questions concerning him may not have been raised, or, being raised, may receive one answer or different answers; still he in whom we believe remains undisturbed, the supreme object of childlike trust.

He has been the Redeemer to those who have adopted contradictory theories with reference to him. For example, he has been worshiped as well by those who could not accept his personal pre-existence before his human birth, or even his divine Sonship previous to his baptism, as by those who held that, as Son, he was eternally with the Father. He has been recognized as the absolutely authoritative teacher both by those who regarded him as omniscient during the whole period of his earthly life, and by those who confessed to a limitation of his knowledge to the essential purpose of his mission. He draws near with the grace of sympathy to the man who maintains that he was insusceptible of temptation, and to him who believes that he was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. One speculative inquirer regards the human nature of Christ as personal and the divine nature as impersonal; another adopts a contrary view; yet both equally see in him the God-man. One class of theologians conceive that the incarnation was complete at birth, only differing among themselves concerning the relation of the divine to the human nature during the earthly life, some, for instance, affirming the possession but not the use of the divine attributes, others asserting the voluntary abandonment of so much of the divine attributes as allowed him to assume the conditions of human life, still others declaring that the divine element became quiescent until the resurrection; while another class hold to a gradual communication from the divine to the human side of his personality throughout his life on earth; yet both of these classes reverently confess the mystery of godliness in that the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth. As to Christ's work in behalf of men there is similar divergence of opinion, yet still, under whatever shade of differing theory, he is, for all alike, the Saviour who died for our sins.

What, therefore, the nature of the case requires, history confirms, that the Christ of faith depends, not upon the

Christ of dogma, but upon the Gospels; that the Christ of faith is more essential than the Christ of theology; and that in the presence of him who is both Saviour and Lord, the ignorant and the learned, the aged Christian and the little child, are on exactly equal ground.

The statement that the Christ of faith is independent of the Christ of speculation must not be misunderstood. If the Christ whom faith receives were incapable of rational vindication, or if his actual existence were accepted without adequate historical or prophetic testimony, then, of necessity, this conception must give place to the reality, however bitter the alternative.

Nor does it mean that restatements of the doctrine of Christ are not demanded in the interest of faith. No doubt faith is sometimes momentarily imperiled by such restatements. Only then, however, is faith in the gravest danger when it commits itself to a being who is no longer defensible.

There are those who tell us that the less firmly speculative thought or historical criticism holds to Christ, the more eagerly must faith cling to him. This is true, if it means that faith may thus cling while reason is unsure or is on its way to light. But if it means that faith on the one hand and reason and scholarship on the other may be permanently divorced, with wholly independent and contradictory interests, then no saying could be more pernicious. Since all Christian facts have both a religious and a rational value, therefore faith may grasp the facts while reason may miss their true explanation.

If we were asked why we receive the Christ of faith, we should have to reply: Not because the Scriptures command it, and not on account of the authority of the Church, but because, as deep answers to deep, so Christ answers to the cry of our hearts. Sinful, we find in him forgiveness; restless, he gives us peace; longing for life, he fills us with the fullness of God.

II. The Christ of faith is a principle of growth in all who receive him. Just as there was progress in the unfolding of his personal consciousness from infancy to the scene in the Temple, and from that hour to the baptism, and from baptism to his death, so there will be progress in the believer and in the Church. St. John, son of thunder, once longed to sit in the chief seat of power in Christ's kingdom, yet afterward, under the training of his glorified Master's spirit, he came to behold in sympathetic and suffering love the secret of supremacy. The spiritual development of St. Paul is witnessed to by his simple Letters to the Thessalonians, later by his four great doctrinal and practical Letters, and, finally, by his Letters to the Ephesians and Philippians and Colossians, richest of all human literature in rational insight into the glorious person of the Son of God and of his mediatorial redemptive agency through the Church in the world. No sooner is Christ thus received by faith than his influence begins to expand every spiritual capacity. Bigotry is rebuked, sympathy broadened, familiar truth lights up with new meanings, and, for the first time, the real progress of the soul commences.

The secret of this lies in the fact that the Christ of faith is not locked up in a dogmatic formula whose logical dimensions are exactly and forever fixed, nor presented in an ethical ideal looking down from some inaccessible height, but is a living person, with all the attributes of life, apprehended in part, yet with mysterious reserves of power, manifested in infinite variety of ways, able to transform those in whom he dwells into his own God-loving and man-loving likeness.

Accordingly, in the Christ of faith are the promise and potency of the culmination of the kingdom of God. In him as the divine Son is revealed the Fatherhood of God, the shaping power of all worship and of all moral life. In him as the Son of man is seen the brotherhood of man, the correlative principle of progress. In him man, by nature a child of God, yet lost to his filial relation through sin, is restored to fellowship with the Father, and thus led to realize in ethical attainment that to which he was destined by birth. And where else do we find the spirit by which all the fragmentary forces inspired by his grace among men are conserved and wrought into unity and

¹ An address delivered at the General Conference of the Congregational Churches of Maine at Bangor, January 21, 1894.

² Professor of Christian Theology in Bangor Theological Seminary.