

of the full creed, every article of it, but merely as the declaration of the position of the Church, which the candidates were not to be *required* to take, but which it was expected that they would take after being admitted to the Church and properly instructed.

The whole discussion would have seemed to me to indicate a position painfully behind the times if I had not been prepared for it by a paper read by Dr. McKenzie, of Cambridge, at the ministers' meeting the day before. This was a review of the Unitarian controversy in New England, and went far to explain the difference between Congregationalism here and that freer form of it which I have been used to in Canada. Congregationalism here is split in two. Claiming the same old Puritan ancestry, and cherishing the same traditions up to the beginning of this century, the two wings are diametrically opposed in doctrinal tendency, and there is no mediation between them. "No compromise!" shout the sturdy old Puritans; "the creed, the whole creed, and nothing but the creed!" They wait for the time when the Unitarians will come back to the true fold, as the Bishop of Ely waits for the Methodists; but they have no notion of making it any easier for them to come. The Unitarians, on their side, seem as a body to be going further and further away. Most of the younger men seem to have broken with traditional Christianity altogether, and instead of the positive and definite faith of Channing and Norton, are embracing (if such a thing be possible) a nebulous Pantheistic sort of belief which leaves no place for real fellowship with God, and makes the doctrine of Christ's resurrection not worth discussing.

My impression, as I listened to the conversation which followed Dr. McKenzie's paper was, that the great schism was due mainly to two causes—1st, the connection of State and Church in Massachusetts, which left them the parish system, making it possible for the non-members in the parish to unite with the unorthodox members, and outvote the orthodox portion, driving them forth to seek a new habitation, and changing the doctrine of the original Church in accordance with Unitarian views; 2nd, the hardness and dryness of the orthodox creed. In those days any departure from the "highest" kind of Calvinism was regarded with suspicion and dread by the faithful; an altogether disproportioned value was attached to the creed, and the living power of Christianity was buried. I do not wonder that the "unregenerate" got restless and wanted something else. I cannot agree with Dr. McKenzie and his brethren that the trouble is to be explained on the ground of the love of the natural man for error; on the contrary, I doubt not there was a deep feeling that the truth was to be found elsewhere than in the long, dreary discourses on Decrees, Justification, Sanctification,

Adoption, Perseverance and the like, which these persecuted New Englanders had to listen to from their preachers. If the minds of people could have been diverted into another channel for a time, till a juster view of the relations of Christian doctrines had grown up; if, as Dr. Clarke, the Secretary of the American Board, suggests, missions had been started ten years earlier, so that there should have been a healthy movement of spiritual life as distinguished from mere doctrinal activity, the crisis might have been tided over, and such men as Channing, Ware, Longfellow, Bellows, Hall, and even Parker, might have lived and died in good orthodox fellowship.

I have said there is no mediation between the two. Yet the movement at Andover to appoint Dr. Newman Smyth Professor of Theology points in the direction of a letting down of the orthodox bars, while the fact that Dr. McKenzie of Cambridge is delivering the same course of lectures at Andover and Harvard, on the Theology of the New Testament from the orthodox standpoint, may indicate a softening towards the old faith within the ranks of Unitarianism. Of course this last matter may be misunderstood. Any hopes which may be built upon it that Unitarianism is inclined to old-fashioned orthodoxy are sure to be disappointed. The English squires may as well look to see stage-coaches drive the railways from the field, as we may look to see New England Orthodoxy take the place of New England Unitarianism. But it is possible that a new orthodoxy, embodying all the real eternal truth of the old, will soon be found, to which the deeper spiritual life of Unitarianism will respond. Unitarians at least want to hear the claims of orthodoxy. Many of them have no sympathy with the Free Religious movement, but would rather be glad to find a common ground on which they could have fellowship with all reverent disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ. The hearty endorsement of Newman Smyth's appointment to Andover by the Faculty and Trustees goes to show that the orthodox are also looking about them to see what obstacles to a common faith are even now waiting to be taken out of the way. When the ice begins to shove, it is not a long way from the opening of navigation.

C. L. PEDLEY.

*Cambridge, Mass., May 1st, 1882.*

MR. EDITOR,—Permit me a few words on a part of the very excellent sermon you published in the May number. Most heartily do I accept its teachings respecting the atonement of our great High Priest, who "through His own blood has entered into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us;" and most heartily do I agree with the writer that "the Church to-day needs more faith in the 'parousia' of her Divine Head;" but I must take exception