

lowship, a fellowship based upon the common human nature and the common human needs, and not upon ancient and partly outworn creeds and systems. They perceive that the barriers dividing Church from Church are largely barriers of tradition and sentiment, or barriers of a theology claiming an infallibility which it can no longer demonstrate, and they say with the poet:

"For forms of faith let graceless zealots fight
He can't be wrong whose life is in the right."

The theologian may with superior air smile at the shallowness of this couplet, but let him first feel sore that he has extracted from it all the truth it contains. For my part, it seems to afford a better test of him that shall

"Sojourn in the tabernacle of the Lord,
Or shall dwell in His holy hill,"

than any mere denominational system.

I am deeply interested in all such societies. They are, I am convinced, a highly important sign of the times. Viewing these many movements, not only without resentment, but with deep sympathy, I yet feel that my first love is to the Church, though less to the Church as she is than to the Church as she might be.¹

That the Churches are unmindful of these signs of the times, I am far from intending to imply. That a broader spirit pervades them all, I believe, but they are very slow to act. *Festina lente* is not always a good motto. It is true rather of some occasions, that the cry should be, "To-day, oh, that ye would hear His voice!" because "Now is the accepted time." It seems quite within the bounds of possibility that a hundred years hence our children may

(1) In the year 1918 I attended a Communion Service in Appleton Chapel of Harvard University. The celebrant was the Bishop of Massachusetts. Men of several denominations, including Unitarians, broke bread together. To many Church people this seems a dangerous, to some even a scandalous thing. To me it is far more dangerous and scandalous that a Church should reject from Communion any disciple of Christ.