

The Open Court

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and the
Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea

Editor: DR. PAUL CARUS.
Assistant Editor: T. J. McCORMACK.

Associates: { E. C. HEGELER.
MARY CARUS.

VOL. XVI. (NO. 6)

JUNE, 1902.

NO. 553

CONTENTS:

<i>Frontispiece.</i> MITHRAIC MONUMENT OF HEDDERNHEIM.	
<i>The Apostolic Succession.</i> Dogma and Criticism. * * *	321
<i>Apostolic Succession as an Historical Truth.</i> EDITOR	335
<i>The Dissemination of Mithraism in the Roman Empire.</i> (Continued.) With Two Illustrations. PROF. FRANZ CUMONT, Ghent, Belgium	340
<i>The Fylfot and Swastika.</i> (Concluded.) With Illustrations from Primitive, Classical, and Modern Times. EDITOR	356
<i>The Jesuit Under the X-Ray.</i> In Reply to the Article of M. De Ladavèze. CHARLES MACARTHUR	367
<i>Is Spiritualism Unscientific?</i> In Criticism of Lt.-Col. Gardner's Article. L. M. J.	375
<i>Charity.</i> A Poem. THE HON. CHARLES CARROLL BONNEY	378
<i>A Spiritualistic Séance.</i> W. H. TRIMBLE, Dunedin, New Zealand	378
<i>Selection from the Adi Granth, the Holy Scriptures of the Sikhs.</i> THE COUNTESS EVELYN MARTINENGO-CESARESCO	380
<i>Book Reviews and Notes</i>	380
<i>Doctor Marie Zakrzewska.</i> Obituary Note	384

CHICAGO

The Open Court Publishing Company

LONDON: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd.

Per copy, 10 cents (sixpence). Yearly, \$1.00 (in the U. P. U., 5s. 6d.).

Copyright, 1902, by The Open Court Publishing Co. Entered at the Chicago Post Office as Second-Class Matter.

A POPULAR BOOK ON MATHEMATICS

On the Study and Difficulties of Mathematics

By AUGUSTUS DE MORGAN. With Portrait of De Morgan, Index and Bibliographies of Modern Works on Algebra, the Philosophy of Mathematics, Plane-Geometry, etc. Pages, viii, 288. Cloth, \$1.25 net (4s. 6d. net) : : : :

Second Edition. Just Published.

"You have really done a service in getting out so handsome an edition of so excellent a book."—Prof. W. W. Beman, University of Michigan.

"As a sensible and lucid commentary on the principles of arithmetic, algebra, geometry, and trigonometry, it cannot easily be surpassed. The author says that his object has been 'to notice particularly several points in the principles of algebra and geometry which have not obtained their due importance in our elementary works on these sciences.' The way in which this has been done is ample justification for reproducing the work now."—Prof. Joseph E. Trevor, Ithaca, N. Y.

"It is a pleasure to see such a noble work appear as such a gem of the book-maker's art."—Dr. David Eugene Smith.

"The book is worthy of a place in every teacher's and student's library. It is full of sound pedagogy. The explanations of fractions, decimals, fundamental laws of algebra, the the negative sign and proportion are so clear and simple that the reader is fascinated, and wonders why he ever considered these subjects difficult."—*Inland Educator*.

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

LONDON: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & COMPANY, LIMITED.

INTERESTING BOOK ON EGYPT

THE

BOOK OF THE DEAD

An English Translation of the Chapters, Hymns, etc., of the Theban Recension, with Introduction, Notes, etc. By E. A. WALLIS BUDGE, M. A., Litt. D., D. Lit., Keeper of the Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum. With four hundred and twenty vignettes, which do not appear in the larger edition published in 1897. Three vols. Crown 8vo. Price, \$3.75 net. Just Published.

The Open Court Publishing Company, Chicago

Monon Building - - 324 Dearborn Street.



GRAND MITHRAIC BAS-RELIEF OF HEDDERNHEIM, GERMANY.

(After Cumont. See p. 340 of the present number.)

Frontispiece to The Open Court.

THE OPEN COURT

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and
the Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea.

VOL. XVI. (NO. 6.)

JUNE, 1902.

NO. 553

Copyright by The Open Court Publishing Co., 1902.

THE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

DOGMA AND CRITICISM.

BY * * *

[It is not the policy of *The Open Court* to enter into discussions of the internal problems of the several Churches. We treat the religious problem from a general standpoint; and the problem of the Apostolic Succession as a tenet of the Episcopal Church of to-day thus does not seem to fall within the line of our work. The present article, however, is written in a sympathetic spirit, and comes from the pen of a man who is entitled to speak with authority, for he is a clergyman of high standing in the Episcopal Church.

We state our own view of the subject in a special article which appears on p. 335 of the present number.]—ED.

I.

WHEN the State privileges of the English Church were threatened, Dr. Newman and his friends, whom we can never name but with respect, sought to establish for it a more secure basis by asserting as a fundamental doctrine the theory of the tactual Apostolic Succession. "When the government and the country," asks Dr. Newman of his brother clergymen, "so far forget their God as to cast off the Church, to deprive it of its temporal honours and substance, on what will you rest the claim of respect and attention which you make upon your flocks? Hitherto you have been upheld by your birth, your education, your wealth, your connections; should these secular advantages cease, on what must Christ's ministers depend? * * * There are some who rest their divine mission on their own unsupported assertion; others, who rest it upon their popularity; others, upon their success; and others who rest it upon their temporal distinction. This last case has, perhaps, been too much our own: I fear we have neglected

the real ground on which our authority is built—OUR APOSTOLIC DESCENT.”

Whether this theory had ever laid much hold on the main body of the English Church is a matter of doubt; certainly it had little at the time.¹ Keble had but just revived it in his famous Assposition. The original designs of the Oxford leaders so far pre-size Sermon, and beyond a few strong expressions of disapproval from Dr. Arnold and Dr. Whately, the efforts of Newman and his friends in its behalf did not at first arouse much sympathy or op-vailed, however, as to bring this theory down to our times and to our Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States as our main dogmatic heritage from that movement out of which they expected, and for which they sacrificed, so much. Honest we may well think these efforts and designs were; yet hardly, perhaps, far-sighted. Mentioning the less important truth before the greater, the history of the first theological generation after the Oxford Movement shows that this dogma which the leaders had made primary and elemental, attracted the assent of raw and undeveloped men in Holy Orders then as it attracts the assent of raw and undeveloped men in Holy Orders now; because magnifying the rights of the church as of apostolic descent amounts to magnifying the official rights of the clergy as the appointed means for maintaining the church's life: and to magnify one's official rights is largely to sanction one's own eccentricities and extend the limits within which one may assert them; and this is what raw and undeveloped men, in Orders or out of them, all like. So, as far as the clergy are concerned, in force of mere numbers,—of hands that hold it, if not of heads that appreciate its difficulties,—this theory has come to occupy a position of importance in the American church, although it has no place in its official formularies. By the diligent spread of unofficial teaching, it has become an inseparable part of the current thought of men about the church. It is held in a loose and indefinite form, no doubt, for the current thought about the church is in greater part loose and indefinite. It appears behind the fourth Lambeth Article as a shadow cast by distortion, effectually frightening off those whom the fair and attractive appearance of the article

¹“The following Tracts were published with the object of contributing something towards the practical revival of doctrines which, though held by the great divines of the Church, at present have become obsolete with the majority of her members, and are withdrawn from public view even by the more learned and orthodox few who still adhere to them. The Apostolic Succession, the Holy Catholic Church, were principles of action in the minds of our predecessors of the seventeenth century; but in proportion as the maintenance of the Church has been secured by law, her ministers have been under the temptation of leaning on the arm of flesh instead of her own divinely-appointed discipline.” *Advertisement to Collected Tracts.* 1834.

itself might be expected to conciliate and win. For the wording of the article and its plain reasonable interpretation is fair, and it is attractive. At present, leading minds in most other churches are less disposed than in former times to the mere self-assertion and bad economy involved in over-stressing the "Dissidence of Dissent," and they look with more favour upon the advantages of historicity and a mode of government that comports better with dignity and flexibility of practice and more generally effective administration. Less interested than formerly in maintaining non-Episcopal government as of the essence of Scripture because they increasingly feel that the thesis is sterile, they are appreciative of the benefits of an administrative system tried and proved good by a most mature experience, and might readily accept and use them, did they not think that in so doing they would be committed to the support of another thesis which they are quite sure is sterile, and withal straight across the grain of their most intimate and inveterate prejudice,—the *jure divino* theory of Apostolic Succession.

In the fourth Lambeth Article the Historic Episcopate is mentioned in an unobjectionable way if one reads it plainly and straightforwardly and free from the domination of the current thought. There is no reason beyond the suggestion of the current thought to suppose that the intention of the word *historic* is to assert more than that Episcopacy has prevailed as the usual and generally satisfactory and effective method of church government; and this probably no one would greatly care to dispute. Except as the current thought suggests, it could hardly be taken to convey the idea of unbroken continuity in the Apostolic Succession; in which as a private belief, so many find pleasure. Least of all does the word imply an official opinion that Episcopal ordination is necessary to the existence of a true church. But though all this be true, the interpretation of the article is practically fixed by the current thought, and with the clergy especially, tends beyond its language towards a more pronounced sacerdotalism: and other churches, though they see and probably desire the good that comes from Episcopal administration, naturally and rightly hesitate to accept this article. Possibly they would not wish more than ourselves that it should be given a fixed official interpretation,—no one would wish this,—but they and we together must regret that it is not cleared and illuminated by some official assurance of the liberty of interpretation which the church allows, placing this theory distinctly where it belongs, in the wide realm of private opinion.

So we may doubt whether it is so much the extreme and oft-

times very useful conservatism of the church as pure misfortune that witholds it from the opportunity for comprehension that the temper of the times appears to present. It is regrettable that any chance for bringing nearer a union of the chaos of sects about us should be looked at and passed by. For whatever be the theory of the church we choose to hold, certainly we must think that some organic form is necessary; and it is obvious that every approach to organic unity made consistently with necessary flexibility of practice, serves the interests of economy and peace. While agreeing that the mustard plant of the parable has many branches, we are disappointed by the waste of so much energy as is spent even now in busily affirming mere negations and emphasising mere disagreements, when there are matters of more weight and importance for all of us to be getting at. The most mischievous effect of this waste, we notice too, is not that there is no general agreement among churchmen upon a doctrine of the church, but that so many, both within and without, have no doctrine of the church at all. The growing number of those who repudiate any church connection see the ideal of religious liberty seeming to translate itself for the individual as a license to worship as he likes, lend himself to any extravagance he likes, think as he likes, rant as he likes; while separate organisations living in mutual exclusiveness, jealousy and occasional recrimination, tend to strengthen the attachment of each undeveloped person to the several things he finds in them ready-made and likes, by loudly calling them best and allowing him to stop at them as undeveloped as he ever was and caring less than ever for it. In the Protestant Episcopal Church one sees the organs reflecting the thoughts and aims of the "Catholic" element rejoicing in a local "Catholic" triumph over "Protestant" error and ineptitude; the hallowed satisfaction of "Protestants" over the upsetting of some tactless little hierarch amidst his copes and candles; Herodian and Pharisee in occasional political union with no abatement of their mutual distrust and defiance, bent on the suppression of those called "Broad Churchmen" whom they regard sometimes as radical iconoclasts, busy with the bruised reed and the smoking flax, and again as mere humanitarian Gallios, caring never a button for those things which Herodian and Pharisee both loosely describe as "essentials of the faith," but never define alike. All abroad in the land one sees the operation of a competitive missionary or proselyting policy, each party mainly intent, no doubt, on creedless error, but ever with half an eye upon the errors of its Christian competitors and its own "numerical in-

crease" as compared with theirs; a growing sect here and a waning sect there; advantage on this side pitted against advantage on that side,—pull Dick, pull devil!—and so far from discerning in this state of things any influences to make one come by a settled doctrine of the Church, the average man infers from it little more than that where bitter envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work.

Lovers of spiritual freedom and of the light and perfection revealed to one who sees in it hardly so much the license to resolutely follow what he likes and call it best as the liberty to find what is really best and then to like and resolutely follow that, feel dissatisfied with this appreciation of religious liberty and the witch's work that those who have it make with it. To Protestant Episcopalians especially, dissatisfaction's sting is sharpened by the sense of a lost chance to do something, first, towards sweetening and tempering this imperfect enthusiasm for the sake of its really valuable energy and endurance, and then, towards turning this valuable energy and endurance upon a work of more worthwhileness than that which now so largely wastes them. And since the best preparation for the task of sweetening and tempering somewhat an imperfect enthusiasm in others is to sweeten and temper it very highly in ourselves, it seems timely if we have these ends in view, to begin by criticising this dogma of Apostolic Succession which appears vaguely, perhaps, but yet with a damaging persistency, in the current thought about the Protestant Episcopal Church.

II.

While we who propose this criticism belong of many generations to the Protestant Episcopal Church, or rather, regard it with every emotion of gratitude as a priceless heritage and aid towards perfection belonging to us; we cannot speak in the name of High Churchmanship or Low, and we hesitate to say we speak in the name of Broad Churchmanship, attractive as that distinction is. To call oneself a Broad Churchman is a very large pretension,—so large that we have never dared to make it: for those who make it are bound to justify it by all their works and ways, and this we are by no means sure that we can do. We are more at ease and satisfied to say what we have to say from the less exalted ground of one who attempts only to see things as they are; for it is a ground open to almost any one who will submit to the simple discipline necessary to fit himself for it; and further, we believe that in see-

ing things as they are lies at least the first prospect of determining their law and handling it and them most easily and advantageously.

We propose this criticism then, free from concern to prove or disprove the fundamental nature of the dogma by the aid of ecclesiastical history. Most of those who have arguments to make for or against it make them depend on their interpretation of history. One class among us will have it that the continuity of the Apostolic Succession is historically certain; Mr. Haddan and Mr. Lowndes come forward with bulky volumes to prove it; and the corollary is that we are thereby spiritually marked off as a true church, from the Methodists, Presbyterians, Independents, or what not organisation. Now Rome, we may notice, standing officially upon this same dogma of Apostolic Succession, has pronounced our Anglican orders invalid, and shows a disposition to exclude and side-track us much like that which we show in our unofficial attitude and current thought to exclude and side-track the Presbyterians, Methodists, and other denominations. A second class among us believing that Presbyterians once lived comfortably within the limits of the Church of England, think they might very well do so now; that as many persons successfully exercised the ministry of the Church of England "with no better than Presbyterian ordination," as Keble tells us, such persons would be quite in place there now;¹ and as for Rome, whatever his Holiness may have since thought about the validity of Anglican orders, in the time of Mary and Elizabeth, when proposals were made to reconcile the Church of England, there was no provision specified in them for the reordination of its ministers. This second class among us reject the historical claims of the first, think their pretended Apostolic Succession is no better than a fable, and deplore the sacerdotalism that the dogma brings in, with its train of privilege and ceremony. But in method they are entirely at one with the first class; both hang their opinions upon their reading of history rather than upon their ability and willingness to see things as they are,—for they have this ability; every one has it and can use it if he will but take the pains. The second class look with satisfaction upon the inconsistency, as they term it, which modern sacerdotalists, especially those of the *Lux Mundi* school, exhibit in their well-known cordiality towards Biblical criticism. When the same kind of criticism, they say, that these persons are now quite willing should be applied to the Bible is applied

¹The proposals of Ussher and those of Stillingfleet, with a study of the circumstances leading up to them (1647-1667), are peculiarly suggestive and valuable.

to ecclesiastical history, their peculiar sacerdotal system will disappear bodily; and it is agreeable to these prophets to discern forerunnings of fulfilment in the works of Dr. Hatch and Dr. Hort, for example. It is the reading of history that separates these classes, that divides opinion on this dogma. One says, History as I read, is for it; one says, History as I read, is against it: and each naturally makes the most in an evidential way of what he chooses or chances to read.

But when both classes have thus made their evidential most, the ability and willingness to see things as they are must still, we think, pronounce it as amounting, just now at least, to very little. For we cannot avoid the fact that if the unbroken continuity of the Apostolic Succession could be determined beyond doubt, it would take us but a short way towards the principal thesis of the transmission of spiritual gifts: and lest we be suspected of casting in our slender fortune at the outset with the second class, we hasten to add that if breaks and lapses in continuity could be determined beyond doubt, it would not much help those who dispute and discredit this thesis. This, however, we can say with pleasure,—the proposition of each class is quite maintainable. As Mr. Haddan sums it up:

“Without Bishops no Presbyters, without Bishops and Presbyters no legitimate certainty of sacraments, without sacraments no certain union with the mystical Body of Christ, viz., with His Church, without this no certain union with Christ, and without that union no salvation.”

Or, reverting once more to Dr. Newman:

“We have been born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. The Lord Jesus Christ gave His Spirit to His Apostles; they in turn laid their hands on those who should succeed them; and these again, on others; and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present bishops I know the grace of ordination is contained in the laying on of hands, not in any form of words . . . and if we trace back the power of ordination from hand to hand, we shall come to the Apostles at last. We know we do, as a plain historical fact: and therefore all we who have been ordained clergy, in the very form of our ordination acknowledged the doctrine of the the Apostolical Succession. And, for the same reason, we must necessarily consider none to be really ordained who have not been thus ordained.”

This, we say, is quite maintainable. Those who maintain it do so, it is true, by virtue of what seems to us a very blind and incompetent Biblical criticism; yet no less blind and incompetent appears the Biblical criticism of those who maintain its opposite. Its opposite is also quite maintainable: it may be that historically as much may be made out for the one as for the other. But demon-

stration is obviously impossible for those who approach the matter in this way. The criticism, therefore, that we propose, relates to an ulterior question, seemingly overlooked by both these classes, yet so fundamental as to deserve being called the only question that is worth much pains to try to answer ; and since its value is practical rather than academic, its answer is fortunately not to be found by using some method of Biblical criticism or historical interpretation, at which most of us are not very apt ; but by undergoing the simple discipline necessary to enable one to see things as they are, which almost any one can do. The question is this : does human experience as it advances, recommend this dogma or does it not ? Does the course that the human mind is taking tend towards it or away from it ? The importance of this question is plain ; for unless the dogma is furnished with just this recommendation, unless it lies in the main stream of human thought, in the way the human race is taking, whatever other arguments and recommendations may be provided for it will in the long run surely fail.

And who having eyes to see can doubt that experience does not recommend it, that the main stream of human thought does not include it ? Experience as it progresses shows ever more clearly that the object of religion is *righteousness* ; and the relation of this dogma to righteousness can not be traced save in a way that is felt to be forced and artificial. The relation of the Bible to righteousness and of the church to righteousness is definite enough and experience shows that it is vital and necessary : and when those who have lost sight of it through identifying the Bible with the results of some unfortunate method of interpretation, or the church with some perverted and inadequate representation, take full account of the revelation of human experience, back to the church and Bible they will come. But the connection of this thesis with righteousness, or even with the church or with the Bible, is not definite nor does experience show by any means that it is vital and necessary, —quite the contrary ; and hence there is increasing difficulty found in attracting serious attention to any consideration of it at all. How often have we seen some preacher, loved and venerated for his blameless life and his masterly exemplification of Christian virtue, pause in the midst of excellent counsel to his attentive congregation and refer to this dogma in a passing word of approval and assent ; and then have we unfailingly marked how, with whatsoever accuracy his other words were aimed, this shaft had gone wide into the air. And when Mr. Moberly, the gentle and scholarly coryphaeus of the present apologists for sacerdotalism, compro-

mises with the times, quite after the manner of his school, and clothes his plea with arguments cut and shaped in a very modern fashion, so far is his average lay reader from conviction or from interest as to be sensible only of a hopeless incongruity, as one who sees the powdered peruke of a Colonial gallant surmounting our conventional evening dress. Yet it is not the preponderance of historical evidence nor the force of argument nor yet, as some say, the spread of education, that is deposing this dogma from the domain of reality in the minds of men. It is the same influence that in the past has insensibly, gradually, and without violence or strife, caused many dogmas and beliefs to fade forever from our practical credenda. Here education, as the word is commonly understood, must be satisfied with smaller credit than has been claimed for it: for education, the attainment of certain facilities and the command of certain accomplishments, has been found by no means incompatible with a firm and active belief in many dogmas against which experience has pronounced; for instance, a belief in witchcraft. History may be interpreted to give excellent testimony to the reality of witchcraft and a very good case for it in the way of argument and logic has often been, and still may be, made out. But the belief in witchcraft has permanently gone; and the best account we can give ourselves of its disappearance is that it has faded away before the breath of the *Zeitgeist*,—that experience has, in the long run, failed to recommend it. Argument, logic, the preponderance of evidence, powerless to dispel it, would be as powerless to bring it back. One professing it now would be regarded with no stronger feeling than the perfectly good-humoured toleration that is the surest token of indifference. And lest it be held offensive that we have placed these two theses, that of Apostolic Succession and that of witchcraft, so close together as to intimate a further comparison,—for such was by no means our design,—let us take by way of illustration another belief that is perhaps not so remote from the main current of human thought and therefore less likely to give offence when mentioned in the same breath,—the belief in the divine right of kings. The arguments, scriptural and otherwise, by which the establishment of this thesis was attempted, are just as valuable now as they were when Sir Robert Filmer put them in array: on the other hand, the counterblasts of Locke and Macaulay retain their precise original value as well. The thesis fails to command our assent, however, not because it has been destroyed by logic and argument, but because it has not the recommendation of enlarging human experience. When

persons now cite Scripture to prove the divine right of primogeniture, or when others use the same method in attempts to disprove it, one feels instinctively that thereby they do no more than give the exact measure of their own worth as critics. So, too, when persons propose the dogma of tactual Apostolic Succession, basing it on their criticism of the commission, "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you,"—a commission about which there is no reasonable doubt,—and propose further to erect their criticism of the New Testament and ecclesiastical history into a kind of stark gentile Leviticus for the hard and fast regulation of our present practice, we feel in the same way, that not only in criticism but in their interpretation of our religious and social needs as well, these persons understand neither what they say nor whereof they affirm.

And, returning to our observation made a moment ago, the very looseness and indefiniteness with which this dogma is held where it is held at all, is a signal proof of this. Men who are interested in goodness and believe in goodness, who are interested in and appreciate the church as a valuable means to goodness, are not attracted by this dogma. If they know of it at all, they know of it only as an academic thesis with which they feel no personal practical concern; and the claim that it is fundamental to the things in which they believe and are interested, simply escapes them. They usually accept what they hear about it from the clergy courteously but not seriously. When such statements are backed by personal qualities that win admiration and approval, they borrow weight enough sometimes to gain a rather long toleration; but of themselves, they have none. They are allowed for the excellences that go with them; but the excellences do go with them and not in them.

Such, then, is the course of the criticism that we would outline for present application to this dogma: for it is the criticism that will serve as the final test of all dogma, whether we would have it so or not. The criticism by which every shade and form of belief must ultimately stand or fall is found in this,—Does deepening and enlarging human experience recommend it? And if we of the Protestant Episcopal church, intent only on seeing things as they are, are beforehand in applying it now and diligent in conforming ourselves and our activities to meet the suggestions brought out by its application, we shall obtain an advantage that will hardly be taken from us and whose benefits are inestimable. For it will be a *real* advantage, based on the solid merit of seeing things as they are and keeping in the main stream of human thought, instead of a

nominal advantage, based on a criticism of Scripture and history which men even now suspect and increasingly will suspect, to be out of correspondence with reality.

III.

Although we are withheld from speaking for Broad Churchmen, we yet believe that the clue to the position of the true Broad Churchman is to be found in a clear apprehension of the nature of the final criticism of dogma. If so, we come in sight of certain advantages inhering in that position which do not seem to be quite appreciated by some who bear the name of Broad Churchmen. First and greatest among these, we discern that as with Israel of old, in quietness and in confidence rather than in controversy and argument, is the Broad Churchman's strength. And lest while we deliberately praise and advocate a policy of inaction for the Broad Churchman in legislative and controversial matters, we be found to belittle the specific work that there is for him to do, or to intimate that the direction of the best development is finally to lie in other hands than his, we say that it is our sense of the greatness of that work and the paramount necessity of instituting just the lines of development that he proposes, that impels us to recommend this course as the best means of accomplishing the results that we as well as he would bring about. For it is clearly surer and safer not to attempt these results by putting into exercise the direct opposition and antipathy that usually increases the attachment of an undeveloped person to the small ideal he likes and lives by, but rather to steadily exhibit a larger ideal and then try with all amiability and patience to get the undeveloped person to like that. A mere forward and combative strenuousness is forbidden those whose trust is in the power of the *Zeitgeist*, and has beside the practical demerit of antagonising those whom we would temper and enlighten and irritating those with whom we are in essential agreement. One who is consciously working with the *Zeitgeist* has everything to gain and naught to lose by leaving argument and controversy entirely to those who must depend upon them. Everyone remembers the animadversions of the Bishop of Oregon in the last General Convention, upon the ritual affectations of sacerdotalism. True and just enough, no doubt, his observations were; but we cannot think they served his purpose. Nay, did they not rather strongly work against it by affording the very opposition most likely to increase the loyalty of those who had incorporated this sacerdotalism and all that goes with it, into their ideal of the Christian ministry?

Everyone, too, remembers the notable effort of Dr. Winchester Donald in the same Convention, to "put it upon record that he would not countenance any reflection upon the ways the other Christian denominations were administering this rite (the Lord's Supper) and would not deprive them of the comfort and help they were receiving," by declaring his belief that "Episcopal ordination is not necessary to a valid administration of the Lord's Supper." True again, no doubt, and expressed with strenuousness and courage; but why not leave the expression of it to the *Zeitgeist*, upon whose judgment we must finally in any wise depend? The immense amount of controversial capital that has since been made out of the incident, the murmur of disapproval that arose from the floor of the Convention itself, are proof that the clearing and enlightening work of the *Zeitgeist* was hindered and not furthered by Dr. Winchester Donald's strenuousness and courage which are in themselves so admirable. But it may be said that the working of the *Zeitgeist* is slow, and that such strenuous and courageous words are sometimes needful to prevent the present generation from being sacrificed root and branch to a misrepresentation of Christianity and reality. Yet if they only make the slow work slower, wherein is the final balance of profit? It is as well that our generation should be sacrificed if need be, though we ourselves anticipate no such necessity, as to protract the sacrificing process through an indefinite future for the sake of the few in this and in each generation who can be beaten off their chosen ground by the force of argument and controversy. And we know, too, that by comparison with the numbers in this generation who can be *won*, to whom an ideal larger and higher than their own can be safely trusted to recommend itself, without recourse to argument or even to persuasion, these few are few indeed.

A second advantage discernible in the position of the Broad Churchman, if our clue to that position be right, is that it minimises the dissipation of time and energy upon things that lie outside the serious purposes of life. For, whereas some of us think that by establishing their favourite dogma of the priesthood, changing the name of the church, bringing in the Provincial System and forbidding marriage with a divorced person or a deceased wife's sister, we lay the best and surest foundations of a Christian society; and that if we use the six points of ritual into the bargain we shall be perfect: it follows that out of this dogmatic fulness of their heart their mouth must often speak. And whereas others again think that our present help is chiefly in a resolute antipathy to this program, it must needs be that they also labour in and out of season

for their faith's sake. From these and like necessities, the Broad Churchman is free. His time is not absorbed in attention to a fixed dogmatic and ecclesiastical routine, nor his growth in the greatest of graces impaired by devotion to prescribed antipathies. Freedom in the one direction helps him against deficiency in light, freedom in the other direction helps him against faults of temper. He is free to absorb fresh knowledge from any source, free to hold himself resolutely away from partisanship, to hate nothing but hatred, to identify no man with his sins, to feel an infinite tenderness for persons and reserve all his severity for actions. He is free to drive straight at conduct in his relations with men, free to exhibit to them the glory and beauty of their privilege to be perfect as their Father in Heaven is perfect, to be righteous in doing righteousness, even as He is righteous. And, finally, in the diligent use of this freedom there is the guarantee of a sure, rapid, unrestrained development. Increased knowledge, increased light, coördinated with increased mildness and sweetness of temper,—insight and flexibility,—how great do these appear when we attempt to take the sum of what we call sometimes personality and sometimes character. So far, we even think, may this development in insight and flexibility go as to cause the Broad Churchman to see a considerable measure of merit regularly appearing with the dogmatic and ecclesiastical routine that so regrettably absorbs the energies of his friends. Imperfect, indeed, as a representation of Christianity, must this routine appear to him;—and all the more imperfect as he increases in insight and flexibility; yet hardly so as to deserve to be called a misrepresentation: for it can seldom be adopted without carrying with it something of the saving notion of righteousness. The relation between the routine and the notion is, as we intimated a moment ago, purely artificial,—and thereby is the Broad Churchman warned from art or part with those who profess implicit belief in the routine,—but, though the notion of righteousness be taken imperfectly and artificially as it is when taken with the routine, yet it oftentimes *is* taken, and so far as it is taken it is saving.

The true Broad Churchman, then, understanding clearly that the final test of dogma is to be found only in the verdict of human experience as it deepens and enlarges; and possessing the advantages consequent upon this knowledge, such as those we have just now attempted to describe, has before him the largest opportunity for the furtherance of religion: for by driving at conduct, the worth of which men understand, instead of at a dogmatic and eccle-

siastical routine, the worth of which they do not understand; by establishing his work on the solid ground of experience, instead of on a mooted criticism of Scripture or history; he reveals directly and nakedly the essential nature, the essential worth and power, of religion, and thereby provides it with the most competent authority and recommendation possible. Especially is it true that the progress of organised Christianity depends mainly on the use the Broad Churchman makes of his opportunities. Such only as are consciously or unconsciously working in accord with the *Zeitgeist* constitute the Church's vital center. They vindicate its claim upon the consideration of men and justify its plea of divine grace and endowment. They take their place in a true and admitted Apostolic Succession, for their work bears straight towards the apostolic ideal of conduct and character.

But in these times when machinery is officially loved and glorified for its own sake, their resolute refusal to commit their trust to machinery naturally hinders a frank official recognition of their use and value. They will hardly be entrusted for some time to come with such preferment and factitious power as lies in the official gift of the Church; nor should we think in our envying contemplation of the immense natural power inhering in their position, that they would greatly care to be; especially as there is no apparent dearth of persons glad to bear the burden of these responsibilities. Canonists, debaters, dogmatists, controversialists, legislators,—of such as these there seems to be no end; and the newspaper that comes nearest their collective thought is the *New York Churchman!* But those who choose to work with the *Zeitgeist*, while seeing the advantage, whatever it amounts to, accruing from official preferment, see also that the price to be paid for it in time, labor, temper, and above all, in *seriousness*, is greater than they can afford to give. And so it comes to pass that while those who trust in machinery and routine have every facility given to enable them to display their logical grasp and brilliancy in expounding this or that phase of the metaphysics that have somehow attached themselves to Christianity, these must be satisfied with the simpler and more obscure work they find in the range of conduct and character. These must check the exuberance of their activity and so keep it in pace and line as to make it a part of the essential tendency of the human race; while those—the believers in machinery and routine—can give themselves without restraint to a theory of the priesthood, changing the name of the Church, the six points of ritual, and introducing the Provincial System.