

themselves. They are rather like pieces of paper and bits of straw and clouds of dust blown about by a wind which, nevertheless, is a good enough wind, bearing ships out to sea and to home."

A return to faith, according to Mr. Hutton, implies a reassertion of man's speciality in the face of the great impersonal forces of the universe. It is one way of stating the terms of the controversy of the last fifty years, he writes, to say that it has been a battle between man and the universe, between man with his instinctive and traditional ideas of himself—his dignity, his significance, on the one hand, and on the other the infinite world. But now, he concludes, "it seems that man's 'personality,' which in reality was being threatened by the formulas and deductions of materialistic science, is showing signs of recovery; and, because the sense of personality once confirmed will proceed to claim its inherent rights, and at the further stage to take up its duties and responsibilities, the survival and enforcement of personality is a conclusion which must be dictated with satisfaction by all who would not despair of the human enterprise."

### LITURGICAL UNREST IN THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH.

THE Rev. Herbert A. Jupp, a Congregationalist pastor, discussing in *The Church Economist*, New York, the liturgical unrest "with its hidden denominational aspects" that a Congregationalist "conceives of liberty as a locomotive liberty, a freedom to move; and so, like an ecclesiastical Abraham, he is forever going out from the old, not knowing whither he goes, often not caring whither he goes, so long as his soul thrills with the sight and conquest of new worlds." Mr. Jupp admits that this attitude at times results in embarrassment. Prior to the present uneasiness Congregationalism passed through a period of theological unrest. Says Mr. Jupp:

"Then it was, Do you believe in the Apostles' Creed? Now it is, Do you say it? Then it was, Shall we cut the Trinity from the Doxology? Now it is, When shall we sing that Doxology, before or after or in the middle of the worship? For an old-fashioned Congregationalist to attend service in a modern church is like going to explore an unmapped province of Greenland—or is the cold country closer to the sea than he accidentally. He finds himself liturgically lost." He looks hopefully to discover if the church calendar will not announce a mid-week preparatory and interpretative lecture on next Sunday's order of service; pupils please bring modebooks. His state of mind is like that of the little fellow who was being put to bed by his nurse while he smothered entertained callers downstairs. Suddenly a wail descends from the nursery. 'Oh, mama, mama! Come quick! Maud is mixing me all up in my prayers!'"

Mr. Jupp goes on to explain the origin of this liturgical poverty from which Congregationalism is today suffering. We read:

"Dissatisfied with Romanism and its papacy, and as the historical ancestors wrote themselves free from all forms of liturgical art. The Puritan was essentially and conscientiously a reactionary. Like a rubber ball, he showed his inmost nature by the energy with which he rebounded from all that had preceded and *ipso facto*, irritated him. And as religion was the most intimate part of his nature, his rebounds in the religious sphere, like Abou Ben Adhem, led all the rest."

But now, he continues, has come a reaction:

"In this last decade, however, we are experiencing an unrest that looks not toward destruction but toward constructive restoration. A rebellion against the extremeness of the seventeenth century reaction is taking on form, tho' not as yet much comeliness. The armada which Puritanism is flung into the ash-heap as nothing but burnt-out coals are seen to be still possessed of warmth and power. The minister to-day, accordingly, is satisfying himself liturgically and grimly setting his teeth to solve the mysteries of the prayer-book and making the Christian year."

Mr. Jupp attempted to settle the matter of liturgy in his own congregation by referendum. He reports:

"Among the illuminating comments gleaned from nearly two hundred submitted answers, one confession expressed finely that nobler, open-minded temper which has made Congregationalism a world-force. The question was, 'Do you like fixed forms of prayer?' The answer was, 'I do not like them!'"

### A GODLESS THEOLOGY.

THE charge has recently been repeatedly made that the representatives of modern theology "think atheistically." This does not mean that they are atheists in the historical sense of this term, but that they practically eliminate God as an active or special factor in the constitution of their theories, and the term thus only emphasizes the old charge that modern theology is purely "naturalistic." The charge is again raised in a manner addressed in *Eisenach* by Professor Lüttge, one of the conservative members of the University of Halle. He declares that the difference between the conservative and the advanced school of theologians is this, that the former in their historic researches in the origin and development of religion make use of their knowledge of God, while the latter do not. He quotes the following proposition of a leading protagonist of advanced theology: "Our scientific research comes to an end when we include God as a coefficient in history." In opposition he declares that "when in our thinking and work we leave God aside, this is no longer a method but a deception"; and "that it is absolutely impossible to dismiss God from our thoughts and actions. The very fact that we ignore Him is a proof that He is a factor in our minds and hearts."

Paul Jaeger has taken up this new phase of the never-ending struggle between the two schools of theology in the *Christliche Welt* of Marburg, the leading popular exponent of the liberal school, and discusses the question in how far it can be truthfully said that modern theology is "atheistic." From this discussion we quote the following characteristics passages:

"Modern theology is distinctively scientific. This is its highest goal and aim. It purposes to produce a science of religious life that stands in exact contact with the scientific consciousness and work of the times. The object is not to produce a certain particular type of science, but to bring theology in to harmony with science as this is now generally understood and accepted. It has become more and more clear that, in contrast to the scientific thought of the ancient times or the Middle Ages, a new type of science has in modern times been developed, the program of which, tersely stated, is this: We must explain the world by the world or on the basis of the world itself. This is at the same time the leading method of work adopted by the entire modern scientific world. History and its phenomena are to be explained on the basis of the agencies that are active in the development of the world, and that, too, without any appeal to the idea of God. It is only in this way that theology can be placed on a par with the other departments of research and thus claim a place in the *universitas litterarum*. Theology is not to have a special relation of its own, but its researches are to be conducted under the same canons that prevail in the lines of investigation. In modern science God is no longer a self-evident factor as He was in former investigation. Modern scientific research *ignorat Deum, &c.*, it knows nothing of Him. It has been generally accepted that God, as understood by the poets, is not an object of scientific research at all. As a matter of principle modern natural and physical science, takes no consideration the powers that are operative in nature and its processes, and does not take into consideration any that come directly from God."

The writer here denotes a return more to showing that such "ignoring of God" by the theologian is not only contrary to the Christian at all, because the Christian physician in applying his science, just as much "ignores God" as the theologian under modern conditions does. Each one of these two operates experimentally and