

says the best was clearly the following by C. F. Perry, which he quotes in full:

"Every religion has its own particular phase of Truth. It could not be a 'living thing' without it, for, as Carlyle has reminded us, religions live not by their falsehood, but by their truth. If the world were of one religion, we should lose something of God's great revelation. It may not be precisely correct to speak of sects as religions; but apart from that, no liberal mind can doubt that the Friend, the Baptist, the Presbyterian, indeed every branch of Christ's Church, has contributed to the widening of the realm of life, intellectual and spiritual. True uniformity—universal and complete—could never come about without the forfeiture of man's freedom, his original power to think and act, his individuality. You may have uniformity where there is mechanism and death, but none where there is abounding life. In the varied modes of thought and worship, there is indeed essence of unity, but in as far as they are of God's Spirit they are living things, meeting the varied interests and temperaments and satisfying the need of the hearts of men.

Whenever and wherever attempts have been made to make the world of one religion, there have been serious losses—for tolerance, charity, the firm belief that Truth would triumph: all these and much else which are among the 'living things' of God's world, have died, and the common good has suffered.

While this is true, we recognize that each heart may have its 'true love' in whom it will rejoice to make its boast. There is the Church as well as the Kingdom, the local as well as the national, that personal apprehension and faith which is the soul's special and proud possession.

If there are twelve gates into the City, we can never forget the gate by which we entered.

With true spirit of charity we may pray for every land but our native land will always be our 'true love,' the land we love the most.

We may say, 'Grace, mercy and peace be with all who love Him' in sincerity and in truth, but in one place and company we may feel at home as nowhere else. There might be a condition of things monotonous, stereotyped, uniform, but the heart would still cling to its own because it is its own—well tried, understood, proved.

What matters if others scoff in jealous scorn and ask, 'What is thy beloved more than another beloved?' I have an answer: My beloved is mine. What matter to me if their star is a world? Mine has opened its soul to me; therefore I love it."

After speaking of the tyranny of the Church which had striven to enforce unity of organization Dr. Nicoll exclaims,—

"How many living things have died under tyranny? Even when the body has lived, how often has the soul perished? It was not so long ago a tradition in business houses that the assistants should do precisely what they were told to do, and that they should suggest nothing. Nowadays we are beginning to see that initiative is the life and soul of business and that the prosperous business is that in which everyone in his measure is an initiator. I came across a vivid description of the old tyranny in that curious and rare book the *Memoirs of Lady Hester Stanhope*. 'No one in her household was suffered to utter a suggestion on the most trivial matter—even on the driving-in of a nail in a bit of wood: none were permitted to exercise any discretion of their own, but strictly and solely to fulfil their orders. Nothing was allowed to be given out by any servant without her express directions. Her dragoman or secretary was enjoined to place on her table each day on account of every person's employment during the preceding twenty-four hours, and the names and business of all guests and comers. Her despotic humor would vent itself in

such phrases as these: The maid entered with a message—The gardener, my lady, is come to say that the piece of ground in the bottom is weeded and dug, and he says that it is only fit for lettuce, beans, or seek (a kind of lettuce), and such vegetables.' Tell the gardener,' she answered vehemently 'that when I order him to dig, he is to dig, and not to give his opinion what the ground is fit for. It may be for his grave that he digs, it may be for mine. He must know nothing until I send my orders, and so bid him go about his business.'

Following immediately after this quotation from Lady Stanhope, Dr. Nicoll says,—'The enthusiasm of many good men for amalgamating all our nominations, Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians and the rest, puzzles me. The day will come when a truly catholic creed will be wrought out, and then will the true unity of life be achieved. But if convictions are laid aside for the sake of union, we have not the unity of the Church, but the unity of the churchyard. J. G. Lockhart, who was not by any means an enthusiast, remarked that it was a great thing that men should be willing to abandon their warm firesides and throw themselves on the world for a principle, even though that principle seemed to others thin, unimportant, and largely unintelligible. The hiding-places of a slothful neutrality very quickly turn into graves. There is something to regret about our religious and theological disputes. All of us who have taken part in them look back with sorrow to things said in heat. Still how many a living thing would die were these controversies to cease! They must go on till by legitimate means we have achieved a worthy agreement.'

And then we have the following from Dr. Jos. Parker in an address to his people in the City Temple, 'I have seen unity manifesting itself in diversity; blessed be God we shall agree in love and charity; we shall never agree in political opinion, but we shall agree in patriotism and patriotism is the larger, and so piety is more than ecclesiasticism. I do not even object to the multiplicity of churches and small denominations in one village providing it be conducted in true spirit and in forbearance. This man thinks the Psalms should be magnified and the other thinks that doctrine should be made more prominent, etc., but let it be in love and forbearance.'

All these men of experience evidently see that where discord exists it is due to a wrong spirit and not to outside distinctions. As to the Foreign Field most of us would be prepared to say that on new ground a larger measure of union might be achieved, but it will be remembered that the recent Federal Council of the Churches in Philadelphia refused to advise organic union in the mission fields. It was distinctly noticeable at the recent great Missionary Laymen's Congress in Toronto that the unity and co-operation of all the churches in the enterprise of missions was frequently referred to with the manifest approval of the audience. But it was equally evident that the organic union proposal was not pressed and, if indirectly touched upon by any speaker, it met with practically no response. At the same Congress each church held an enthusiastic denominational Convention and at each one a policy of aggressive work was adopted. Each church seemed to feel its responsibility for its share of work at this crisis time and it was clear that the representative men who attended these denominational Conventions did not consider the organic union proposed was not practical possibility to be even discussed. They therefore ignored it and went on with their work, not the one church against the other but each eager to do its share against a common enemy. A recent writer in the Presbyterian referring to the Congress pithily says, — 'Here is the unity of spirit and the unity of endeavor that

dwarfs a union of creeds. It is safe to say that a union of creeds today is chimerical; but here beyond question or cavil is a union of purpose and performance that is a good thing and 'becoming well' among brethren."

Recently the matter of a 'National Church in India has been discussed and we clip the following from a Missionary paper:

An Indian National Church. — The Rev. J. R. Chittamgar is the professor in the Reid Methodist Episcopal Mission College in Lucknow, and is recognized as one of the leading Indian Christians of North India, on account of his wise, moderate and kind efforts for the Christian cause. He recently gave an address before the missionaries and Christian Workers in Lucknow on the above heading.

The National Church he defines as one controlled on native lines, in which the Christians of India will manage everything themselves, independent of anything from without.

Christianity has been presented to India in the western garb, with widespread rituals and westernized church policy. It does not seem to appeal much to the masses, because they regard it as a foreign religion, propagated by foreigners; a religion that had its birth in the Orient is presented in an Occidental fashion to the Orient now. To develop a church on native lines does not mean giving up the truths of Christianity, but the stripping them of their western garments and clothing them in Indian garb which fits them well. Much can and ought to be done to make Christian thought and doctrine more Indian. Why worship in the Western fashion? Why not use more of the Indian hymn tunes?

Turning to the practical side of the question we were asked, "Does the National Church mean annihilation or abolition of existing denominations? or the amalgamation of the various denominations into one organic union? The latter, I for one hardly think feasible. Foreign money and exotic leadership are still in demand, first, because the people are poor to a large extent, and secondly, they are not sufficiently trained. India needs indigenous leadership.

"There cannot be one National Church unless all the churches in India unite." This we do not believe to be possible. So long as men are rational creatures, and so long as there is liberty of conscience there is bound to be doctrinal differences between men. Why in the name of organic union should men be required to give up some doctrines which they honestly believe? Why do they insist on clothing David in Saul's armor? Christ prayed for oneness in spirit in their attitude towards men—absence of the spirit which makes people say 'I am of Paul and I am of Apollos.' It is sympathy, harmony, and oneness of spirit that should prevail so that Christians should stand shoulder to shoulder with their brother Christians of all denominations and preach the crucified Christ. Just look at Christ's own parables to illustrate this truth. The ideal condition of the Christian Church is when 'There shall be one fold and one shepherd.' The Greek word translated fold means flock; the flock may have many folds, but it is still one flock. Then again, 'I am the vine, ye are the branches.' All branches are not alike, and yet they are together in the same vine. With this kind of harmony and union among our various denominations Christianity will be a stronger force in India than it has hitherto been. The founders of the National Missionary Society have been wise in maintaining strictest loyalty to the churches.

Again, why should we force one particular creed upon men? We cannot expect all our converts to accept the same creed if we give them liberty of conscience. 'One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike; let each man be fully

(Continued on page 13.)