

hold an audience under like conditions, to such themes. Undoubtedly, philosophy can be taught, and is taught more carefully and connectedly in the recitation-room of the University than it can be before the great audiences in Tremont Temple. But in the University it can also be made very dry and technical, and often is made so. Here it is lifted into light and air, and goes out upon the broad ranges of practical use. It speaks directly to the souls of men with all the solemnity of a sermon. In the rapid sweep of the discourse little faults of manner, little infelicities of thought or expression, little inaccuracies of statement are hardly to be noticed, so grand and elevating is the aim of the speaker, and so strongly is he bearing the hearer forward toward the end he has in view. The very charm of these lectures, as one listens to them, is, that philosophy is here wedded with a vivid ideality, — that the resources of literature are brought to its illustration, — that history, art, poetry, are all made ministering spirits in the unfolding of the deepest workings of the soul. Something of all this must be lost when one sits down, in the distance, calmly to read the published volume. But he who reads, though he may discover some things to criticize, will find himself in converse with a man who has an aim high and noble, and a philosophy which bears men toward the good, and ministers to the highest interests of human society.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE ORGANIC REUNION OF CHURCHES.

BY PROF. J. P. LACROIX, DELAWARE, OHIO.

WILL such a reunion ever take place? Have we good grounds to anticipate that churches which have once become confessionally distinct will ever, to any considerable extent, be merged again into organic unity? What has been the lesson of history thus far? Is it not of very discouraging purport? Has it not been the fate of the church from the very first century of its existence to the present day to suffer one after another of its members to break off into independence and isolation? And has she ever, to any considerable extent, had the fortune to re-absorb any of the very prominent of these revolted members?

A very interesting discussion of this subject is found in a prize Essay on the Reunion of Churches, by Rev. G. Joss, of Saanen in Switzerland.¹ The book begins with a general statement of the whole series of influences that are at play in the general subject of separation and reunion; thereupon follows a careful historical review of the circumstances of the several

¹ Die Vereinigung Christlicher Kirchen. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1877.

secessions, and of the various efforts that have been made at reunion; and finally, there is presented a judicious survey of the unionistic tendencies that are so widely prevalent in the present day, together with suggestions as to how much and what kind of church reunion may reasonably be expected in the church of the future. Mr. Joss writes in an admirably Christian spirit. In theology he is of the earnest, but mild, orthodoxy of the Rothean type.

In his historical retrospect Mr. Joss has made large use of the two thorough histories of all former reunion efforts, viz. that of A. Pichler (1865) and that of C. W. Hering (1838). Let us cursorily follow him.

First, what are the chief forms of reunion that are practicable? There are several. Where a church assumes that it alone holds to the whole and pure truth, as is the case with the Roman Catholic, then there can be no thought of any other union than an *absorptive* union (*unio absorptiva*), the other church being required to give up absolutely its entire individuality. The chief example of this form of reunion is the submission of the Gothic Arians at the synod of Toledo, in 589. This can hardly be called, however, a union at all. It is rather simply the annihilation of one of the parties. A real union can take place only thus: Either both of the parties must *give up* such of their peculiarities as distinguish them from each other, until finally they shall become identical (which is a *unio temporativa*), or each is permitted to *retain* its peculiarities, and yet both agree to hearty intercommunion (which is called a *unio conservativa*). The former of these is more strictly a reunion; the latter is more like a mere alliance.

As preparatory to a glance at the various efforts at reunion, let us notice the successive secessions in the order of their occurrence. The church of the apostolic age was undoubtedly an organic unit. It held to the one faith; it recognized its several members; it intercommuned. It was only in the first half of the third century (Cyprian, *ob.* 258) that the genuineness of the church was made to depend on its having a regularly ordained episcopate. Henceforth the watchword was: "None can have God for his Father who has not the church for his mother. No salvation outside of this church."

It was this church that attained to universal dominion in the age of Constantine, and that set upon itself at Nice the seal of exclusive orthodoxy. The first secession from this compact world-church was that of the Nestorians, in 431. Nestorius held to two distinct natures in Christ. His excommunication drew a large part of the church of Syria out of Catholic unity. Nestorianism retired to the distant East, and continues to exist to the present day.

Opposition to Nestorius led to the second schism, in 451. Eutyches identified the two natures in Christ. Hence sprang the Monophysites, who perpetuated themselves in the Coptic and Abyssinian churches, as

also in the Armenian and Jacobite (of Mesopotamia) churches. Thus orthodoxy, in its effort to hold the true mean between two separate natures in Christ and two identified natures, saw itself forced to strike off from its communion *five* vital members, which have persisted in asserting themselves to the present day.

The next great schism was that between the Roman and Greek churches — between the West and the East. It grew out of the expression *filioque*. This the Western church had added to the creed at the Synod of Toledo, in 589. It had been seriously protested against by the Greeks in 867. The quarrel culminated in 1054, when the papal church completed the schism by excommunicating the Greeks. By this act the one great Christian Catholic church was severed into two nearly equal hostile sections.

The next secession from the Latin branch was that of the Protestants, which was accomplished by the decrees of Trent in the middle of the sixteenth century. A century and a half later followed the expulsion from Rome of the church of Holland. And our own day has witnessed the Dollinger movement, which has led to the organization of an anti-Romanist Catholic church in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria.

Since its exclusion from Rome the great Oriental church has remained practically a unit, holding fast to the primitive and earlier faith and organization. But the more positive life of Protestantism has led to several principal organic divisions, and to almost innumerable minor subdivisions or sects. Now, what have been the fruits of the very many and very earnest endeavors that have from time to time been made to heal these various breaches, and to effect a reunion of the dissevered members? It is needless to say that, on the whole, they have been absolute failures.

The early popes and the Byzantine emperors, especially Justinian (527-565) and Heraclius (611-641), made the most sincere efforts to win back the early seceding bodies, the *Mónophysites*. But in vain. In the age of the Crusades, the most sincere and protracted efforts were made by the Western and the Eastern churches towards a mutual reunion. And these efforts were seconded by the most urgent political considerations. But all in vain. The friends of the movement were doomed to the bitterest disappointment. Everything went to wreck upon the shoals of Rome's absolutely unyielding pretensions. She would hear to no union but an *absorptive* union, in which the other party simply gave up its existence. And such has been Rome's attitude in all subsequent efforts at reunion, both with the Greeks, the Lutherans, and the Holland Catholics at Utrecht. She has persistently and obstinately held fast to the church ideal of Cyprian of Carthage, that there is and can be but one salvatory church organism, with the addition that she herself is that organism. Holding that outside of herself there is no salvation, her attitude is necessarily absolutely intolerant.

Nor have the persistent and serious efforts that have been made toward

reunion between the chief sections of Protestantism met with a much more successful issue. The Lutheran and the Reformed types of ecclesiasticism received from their founders such a crystalized "bent," such a rigid self-consistency, that they could not be made to melt into one. Having once become confessionally distinct, they had each such a positive individuality that no union could take place between them which would not be simply the death of one of the parties: So also with the Anglican church. All the overtures which it has made, both a century ago and in the present, toward a reunion of its Methodist branch with the parent trunk, have been simply propositions toward *absorption*. They have necessarily failed.

But what of the quite recent efforts of the old Catholics? What is the probable significance of the efforts at Bonn towards the establishment of intercommunion between the Anglican church and the great Oriental church by the mediation of the old Catholics? According to Dr. Joss these efforts, these negotiations, have a higher significance than some Protestants are inclined to give them. In the first place, they are efforts of a peculiar kind. They aim not at organic union, but simply at inter-recognition, culminating in *intercommunion*. They look simply toward the concession and admission of the Catholic Christian *churchhood* of each by the others. Each church is to preserve its confessional identity, but it is to rise above its excommunicating self-seclusion, and to extend to the other the hand of fraternal recognition. But what is the anticipated benefit from this? It is only a vague benefit, but yet a very positive one. It is this: the gradual reawakening of the slumbering Oriental church to a vitally Christian life. Now if this end can only be realized even in the least degree, all will admit the momentousness of the good thereby accomplished. For the existence of the Oriental church is in itself a stupendous fact. And it will, apparently, continue to be such a momentous fact for ages and ages to come. For weal or for woe, the Oriental church has held its place in the past, and will do so in the future. It is thoroughly seated in the heart, in the habits, and national prejudices of compact millions of population. No evangelistic tide will suddenly sweep through it, regenerating it in the Protestant sense, or overturning it as an effete and dead scaffolding. If, therefore, the old Catholics can attain to orthodox recognition from the Orientals, and can serve as a medium to bring zealous, wide-awake, high-church Anglicans into inter-communion with them also, certainly all friends of humanity will bid them God-speed. For thus the cold heart of the great Orient will, to some extent, be brought under the influence of unquestionably evangelical influence. And what if the eastern half of Catholicism should thus become at last thoroughly regenerated!

But, as a non-episcopal clergyman, Dr. Joss does not find the main hope of the church of the future in this approximation towards *organic* reunion between old churches once confessionally dis severed, He does not hope for organic reunion, nor even think it desirable. He rather

inclines to the opinion that even as each nation, each tribe, each class of peculiar temperaments in society, form severally so many legitimate and even desirable phases in the one common humanity, so there may and should be a particular church corresponding to the several national and social peculiarities of the various groups of mankind.

But are we, then, to give up all hope of Christian unity in the millennial future? By no means. There will be unity. But it will be a *unity amid diversity*. It will be a fraternal unity that concedes to the brother the right to differ. It will be a unity of love; hence it will be a unity that *intercommunes*. Before this Christian love, the bars of sacerdotal excommunication will fall away; the narrowness of close communion and of mutual rivalry and jealousy will be swept away as darkness before light.

In a word, the true reunion of churches in the future will not be an organic reunion, but a union of hearts in the sense of a liberally and wisely-guided *Evangelical Alliance*. The several churches now existing, and perhaps others yet to be formed, will heartily give to each other the hand of Christian recognition, will join each other at the Lord's table, and will turn a united front against the kingdom of darkness; but will, at the same time, be permitted to retain, unmolested, their several peculiarities of ritual and creed, of forms and ceremonies. Such is the author's ideal of church union in the future. Is it not the true one?

ARTICLE IX.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE ORIGIN OF NATIONS. In Two Parts: on Early Civilisations; on Ethnic Affinities, etc. By George Rawlinson, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History, Oxford, and Canon of Canterbury; Author of the "Four Great Monarchies," etc. 12mo. pp. 272. New York: Scribner, Welford, and Armstrong. 1878.

Canon Rawlinson stated, in the "Aids to Faith," sixteen years ago: "There is really not a pretence for saying that recent discoveries in the field of history, monumental or other, have made the acceptance of the Mosaic narrative in its plain and literal sense any more difficult now than in the days of Bossuet or Stillingfleet" (Preface, p. iv). In opposition to this statement it has been confidently said that there was a settled monarchy in Egypt at least five thousand years before Christ. Mr. Rawlinson attempts to prove, in the first part of the present volume, that there is no sufficient evidence of a settled monarchy in Egypt until B.C. 2450, nor in Babylon until B.C. 2800; that the earliest traces of civilization in Asia Minor are found in B.C. 2000. It has been said also in reply to Canon