

born in a less conspicuous station, would in all probability have made for himself a still more honorable name and fame than those he possessed. Not often can this much be said of princes.



### “Heresy and Schism”

Mr. Gladstone's article in the August “Nineteenth Century” on Heresy and Schism has attracted public attention because of the distinguished character of the author rather than because of any remarkable value in his contribution to the problem of Church unity. This article contains more than anything we have ever seen from his pen to give color of justification to the criticisms so often brought against him by his political opponents. It is subtle and ingenious rather than profound, and suggests the adjustment of a long-standing controversy, not by the discovery of some radical principle deeper than the superficial debate, but by suggesting the material surrender by both parties of real and profound religious convictions.

Mr. Gladstone's position may be easily summarized in a paragraph. He assumes that Christ founded a visible and organized Church, to be a standing witness in the world for him; that to sever one's self from this Church is schism, that to depart from its standards of Christian faith is heresy, and that these in the primitive Church were serious offenses, not to be condoned. But both heresy and schism have taken place and have become permanent facts. The present Nonconformists have not created but have inherited them, and there is an enormous difference between the founder of a heresy and those who inherit it. As God condemned Korah, Dathan, and Abiram for instigating a schism, but patiently accepted the fact of schism and heresy when it had been accomplished by the secession of the ten tribes, and continued to send prophets into the Northern Kingdom, and to recognize piety in certain of its kings, so the Church to-day may legitimately pass over the continuance of heresy and schism in the descendants of the Puritans. It was a duty to resist heresy and schism while they were in progress; but they may wisely be accepted now that they have become permanent and apparently unchangeable facts. There is, however, a point beyond which this condonation cannot legitimately go. “With exceptions so slight that we may justly set them out of the reckoning, the reply is still the same as it was in the Apostolic age: the central truth of the Gospel lies in the Trinity and the Incarnation, in the God that made us and the Saviour that redeemed us.” The marvelous concurrence of Romanist, Greek, Anglican, and Protestant in these great central truths at once constitutes a remarkable witness to their truth and affords the basis of a true undenominational religion. If—so at least we understand Mr. Gladstone—the heretic denies these doctrines, let him be as a heathen man and a publican; if he accepts them, let the Church disregard his schism in separating himself from the Church, and his heresy in other and minor points.

We do not believe that Mr. Gladstone's ingenious article constitutes a valuable contribution to the problem of Church unity, because we do not believe that either party will, or indeed can, accept it. The Anglican will reply that an offense is not to be condoned because it is persisted in; that since, by the terms of the Lambeth Articles, the Church has freely offered to the schismatics the gift of Apostolic succession, and so a corporate existence in the visible and organized society which Christ constituted, their refusal to accept it is a fresh act of contumacy, a renewal of the original schism. Courtesy may prevent his saying this in terms quite so explicit; but, however

veiled and gracious his phraseology, this will be his logical position. And we do not see how he can consistently take any other. The Nonconformist, on the other hand, cannot conscientiously assent to the fundamental assumption of Mr. Gladstone's article, that Christ formed a visible and organized society on the earth, with Apostles designated as his successors and empowered to choose successors in turn. The Nonconformist does not believe that the grace of God is thus piped and conduited; he believes, on the contrary, that it falls like the rain and distills like the dew, and that all the sons and daughters of God are his prophets. He regards this doctrine of ecclesiastical exclusiveness as identical in spirit with that Judaistic form of Christianity against which Paul contended with vehement earnestness in his insistence that the Gentiles need not become Jews in order to become Christians, and that he himself was an Apostle, no whit behind the other Apostles, though he had never received Apostolic ordination or commission. These two conceptions of Christianity—one that it is a human society, divinely constituted as a visible witness in the world; the other that it is a spiritual life, bestowed on each individual soul according to the measure of his receptive faith—cannot be harmonized by proposing that one party plead guilty to inheriting a schism which they will not abandon, and the other party forgive them their offense without insisting on their repentance.

We may add that, if the unity of the Church is to be built upon any dogmatic basis, the one proposed by Mr. Gladstone would not be the right one. Christlieb's famous creed, “Sin and salvation,” would afford, both historically and philosophically, a much better dogmatic basis than Mr. Gladstone's; for this creed can be easily translated into the terms of spiritual life, having their exact counterpart in the two experiences of repentance and faith. If Church unity ever comes, it will not be the result of a surrender of cherished convictions, nor will it be based on an ecclesiastical foundation, such as an acceptance of “the historic episcopate,” even though the spiritual value of that episcopate be left undefined; nor will it have a dogmatic basis, even though the dogmas be but two in number, as the Trinity and the Incarnation. It will grow out of a recognition that spiritual life is more than either ecclesiastical order or philosophical definition, and out of a consequent agreement that all who sincerely repent of sin, and strive to cure themselves and their fellow-men of sin, under the leadership and in the spirit of Jesus of Nazareth, are “one in Christ Jesus,” however they may differ in their methods of work or their philosophical definitions.



### Mr. Crooker's Third Error

Following the criticisms in our issues of August 18 and 25 on the politically controlled public schools of New York—surely a warning to other States—we now wish to imitate Mr. James F. Crooker in calling attention to the *pro rata* share of the primary and secondary educational systems. In his annual report for 1894, Mr. Crooker, who is the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, wrote as follows: “The unnecessary expense of sustaining two educational departments is sufficiently great, alone, to entitle this question to serious consideration, and, as a matter of State economy, I most respectfully recommend that the Legislature in its wisdom adopt measures to change this dual system into a single-handed, responsible management of all State educational interests, by which a great deal of expense may be spared the Treasury. Such measures would be in the line of good government and in the inter-

ests of the taxpayers." We agree with Mr. Crooker as to a change from the dual system. But where he proposes to put the schools deeper into politics, we propose to take them out.

Mr. Crooker opposes the "use of the public-school funds for higher education beyond a *pro rata* share with the elementary schools." He seems to overlook the fact that more than seventy per cent. of the local cost of the maintenance of the public schools is raised by local taxation, and that boards of education in union free school districts are especially prohibited by statute (Laws of 1894, ch. 556, sec. 23) from applying to the high schools any part of the moneys apportioned to the common schools under their charge. The amount of public money appropriated for the support of high schools is very small as compared with the moneys apportioned directly for common schools. Take Buffalo as an instance of the amount of school moneys unfairly diverted. The common schools in that city received in 1894 \$125,157.42, while by the last apportionment the Buffalo high school received only \$3,974.34. The average daily attendance of children of school age in the Buffalo schools was 26,062, while the average attendance per term in the Buffalo high school was 980. In other words, the "*pro rata*" for the elementary schools was \$4.80, while that of the high school was only \$4.05. The figures for the whole State are even more convincing. The apportionment by the State for higher education in 1893, including the apportionment to academies, that to the examination department and to the Regents' office, was \$148,500. The average daily attendance in Regents' schools was 32,760. The State appropriations for elementary instruction, including cost of reform schools and other institutions inseparably connected with any scheme of public elementary education, were, in 1893, \$4,909,750. The average daily attendance for the State of children of school age was 688,097. The "*pro rata*," therefore, for the elementary schools was \$7.13, while that for the high schools was only \$4.53.

Superintendent Crooker announces himself as "an ardent advocate of fostering higher education," and professes to advocate for the high schools "a *pro rata* share with the elementary schools" of public funds. If Mr. Crooker is sincere, he should advocate, on his own line of reasoning, an increase in the appropriations for the support of the high schools.

Furthermore, Mr. Crooker himself represents the control which politics has on our schools, for he was chosen simply because Lieutenant-Governor Sheehan named him. Mr. Crooker now desires that politics shall control higher as well as elementary education, by the abolition of the University Regents who have secondary instruction in charge, and that he shall undertake their powers in addition to his own. The Superintendent holds office for three years, and has already too much power for one politically appointed. He apportions public-school money appropriated by the Legislature, he supervises the reports of School Commissioners (they need supervision, too, since some of those gentlemen do not know how to spell correctly), he has charge of the Indian schools, and he appoints pupils to be sent to the institutions for the deaf, dumb, and blind. More than all, he constitutes the court of final appeal in all disputes, and has power to carry his decisions into effect. All this exists in a system popularly supposed to be that of local self-government.

Not only is there no attempt made to limit these centralizing powers, but their holder actually proposes to usurp those of the Regents of the University of the State of New York, a board of gentlemen representing all parties and

sections of the State, and selected only for their high ability in matters of instruction and culture. Their work is absolutely unpartisan, and is thus at utter variance with that of the Superintendent. At present the Board consists of the following distinguished men:

Martin I. Townsend, LL.D., Troy; Anson Judd Upson, D.D., LL.D., Glens Falls; William L. Bostwick, M.A., Ithaca; Chauncey M. Depew, LL.D., New York; Charles E. Fitch, M.A., Rochester; Orris H. Warren, D.D., Syracuse; Whitelaw Reid, LL.D., New York; William H. Watson, M.D., Utica; Henry E. Turner, Lowville; St. Clair McKelway, LL.D., Brooklyn; Hamilton Harris, LL.D., Albany; Daniel Beach, LL.D., Watkins; Willard A. Cobb, M.A., Lockport; Carroll E. Smith, Syracuse; Pliny T. Sexton, LL.D., Palmyra; T. Guilford Smith, M.A., C.E., Buffalo; Bishop William C. Doane, D.D., LL.D., Albany; Lewis A. Stimson, M.D., New York; the Rev. Sylvester Malone, Brooklyn.

Is Superintendent Crooker better fitted to do the work which is so intelligently performed by these gentlemen, or are they better fitted to do his? Why not give them the chance and thus lift the schools out of politics? An amendment to this effect, that the Regents shall appoint the Superintendent of Public Instruction, is now before the Constitutional Convention at Albany. Every member of that Convention should be instructed by his electors as to whether they wish the public schools to continue under the dominion of politicians, or whether they desire public education to be directed and guarded by men trained and fitted for the work.



## Editorial Notes

—We must not let the eighty-fifth birthday of Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes pass without a word of congratulation on his hale and sound old age and his young and cheerful spirit. Among our "Literary Notes" will be found some pleasant autobiographical chat from the "Autocrat" himself.

—The "office-boy who owns the office" is sometimes spoken of by business men. Evidently a much-trying sufferer from the complaint is the man who advertises in a New York daily paper: "Sealed proposals for the services of an errand-boy in a publishers' office will be received for three days; it is hoped that applicants will condescend to specify the character of work they are willing to do for a remuneration of three dollars a week."

—It is reported that the Christian Endeavor Societies and kindred Methodist and Baptist leagues of Indiana are quietly but earnestly organizing to make their political influence felt in securing the enactment and enforcement of laws against the liquor traffic and other public moral evils. This movement, which Mr. John G. Wooley has urged with so much force and enthusiasm, is full of hope to those of us who believe that political duties are also religious duties, and will never be efficiently performed until the religious sentiment of the people impels the performance.

—The very cultivated Russian Jew who, deprived of his government post and expatriated at the time of the last persecution of his race, now occupies the position of janitor at the New York University Settlement, has discovered our National anthem. One evening, when he had been playing the Russian hymn, the "Watch on the Rhine," the "Marseillaise," and "God Save the Queen," he remarked that he would now play our National air. The interest aroused was replaced by a decided mixture of feelings when he began with perfect gravity to play "After the Ball is Over." In a philosopher's scales this international episode might outweigh the Behring Sea complications.

—Our able and always esteemed contemporary "The Congregationalist" remarks: "The Rev. Dr. A. H. Bradford is an admirable correspondent at home or abroad, but he is not the only American who is competent to write letters to our religious papers, the 'British Weekly' to the contrary notwithstanding. Twice now has that journal reprinted extracts from the English letters written for us by our managing editor and credited them to Dr. Bradford." We congratulate Dr. Bradford (an interesting letter from whom will be found on another page) that his fame is so great that all good things are attributed to him, Mr. Bridgman that his letters are so good as to be taken for Dr. Bradford's, the "Congregationalist" that it has Mr. Bridgman's letters, and The Outlook that it has Dr. Bradford's. But we call upon the "Congregationalist" and the world at large to condole with us upon the fact that the New York "Tribune" attributes Mr. Dailey's remarkable article on "The Saloon, the Church, and the School," in our issue of August 25, to "a writer in 'Outing'!!"



## Some American Artists

By Susan M. Ketcham



R. JOHN S. SARGENT was recently asked, in London, regarding American art. "American art!" he exclaimed; "there is no such thing." Entering the splendid galleries of the Fine Arts Society, in Fifty-seventh Street, near Seventh Avenue, New York City, where forty of the strong American artists are now represented in the "Group Exhibition," one must protest that Mr. Sargent is "neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet."

Mr. Howard Russell Butler, as President, should head the list; for his brain conceived the idea of the Fine Arts Society, his pluck and push transformed a "castle in Spain" to this solid marble monument marking an epoch in the history of American art.

Mr. Butler, "a man of few inches—every inch a man," summoned together the clans—artists, architects, and members of the Art Students' League—and organized the Fine Arts Society. They bought ground, drew plans, and erected this building (at a cost of \$400,000), where the three societies in one dwell together in millennial peace. For the last six years Mr. Butler has devoted himself to marines, painting on the coasts of Cornwall, of Brittany, and at his summer home at East Hampton, L. I. His is never "a sea of glass," but always in motion, "an everywhere of silver." One specially charming picture is a shore view of tender color in quiet evening light, except the summits of three sand-hills which have caught and held the afterglow. This note of rosy light seems to sing in the prevailing gloom as a final chord of music—the harmony hangs and vibrates in surrounding silence.

Mr. William M. Chase (whom Indianians proudly claim), re-elected for many times President of the Society of American Artists, is the busiest, as he is the most versatile, artist of America. He gave himself ten years in Munich to find whether he had talent. Every morning, before class hour, he visited the old masters at the Pinakotek. "Then I flew to my easel at such a rate that my coat-tails stood straight out behind, that I might not lose the inspiration." His master's opinion of his talent was proved, beyond a peradventure, in giving Mr. Chase the order to paint his (Piloty's) children.

Mr. Chase's summers are spent in his beautiful cottage on Shinnecock Hills, where pupils flock by scores from north, south, east, and west. The remainder of the year he teaches two painting-classes at the Art Students' League, one at the Brooklyn School, and at his own studio a class for women, mornings, and for men, afternoons. The wonder is that he finds time or strength to paint. But one always sees something delightful under way on his easel, and something fine just finished. He is often called upon to talk to men's literary clubs, as well as to the prominent



J. Carroll Beckwith

art schools of the large cities. His talks are epigrammatic, his quick intuitions and clear comprehension driving directly to the point.

Mr. Chase's studio is a Mecca to art-lovers. The open-sesame (a heavy iron knocker) reverberating through the corridors, setting the mysterious music of the Dutch door-



W. M. Chase

chimes a-going, is followed by Mr. Chase's cordial greeting. The walls are covered with studies dating from his student days, and with pictures by his friends, old masters and the new. Antique hangings, bric-à-brac, unique ornaments from the ends of the earth, make the place rival Aladdin's palace. On reception days the faint odor of incense and soft harmonies of the harp add a charm.

In the Fifty-Seventh Street gallery Mr. Edwin H. Blashfield shows a most impressive group. There is dignity, almost majesty, in his work. His "Choir-Boys," painted in the Church of Santa Maria Novella, Florence, through the courtesy of the church authorities, was done during the siestas of summer noons, from twelve M. to four P.M., when all Italy dozes and dreams in "dolce far niente." Thus Mr. Blashfield escaped the ubiquitous critic. The boys posed with swinging censers, singing in processional.

Mr. Blashfield, tall, slender, fair, with a gentle, courteous manner, is an ideal American, though he has lived abroad twenty years, going with Mrs. Blashfield, on an average, every two years. They seek some quaint old town, and settle down for months of study and for writing—articles written by Mrs. Blashfield, illustrated by her husband, and published in "Scribner's" and the "Century." These show careful study, profound thought, and wide research in art, history, and literature. Speaking of her husband's not teaching, Mrs. Blashfield quoted: "We are born so young, and the world is so old;" adding, "One must have ideas in order to paint."

"The Angel of the Flaming Sword" Mr. Blashfield considers his best picture. The strange light emanating from the two-edged sword, making the "outer darkness" visible, illumines the inflexibly upright figure with its pitiless blue eyes and its firm, untender mouth. It is a wonderful portrayal of immutable, irrevocable moral law. "The Bells" was hung, in the Philadelphia Academy exhibition, at the head of the entrance stairway. Looking up, it was as if one were in the tower—the bells actually swinging high above. Studies for the angels were made separately from Italian models in Paris. Men were used for the bodies, as more perfect in violent action, and women for the heads, as more beautiful: thus carry-



Charles C. Curran

ing out the accepted idea that angels are neither male nor female.

Mr. Blashfield went to Florence for the bells, but, finding those of Giotto's Campanile too shut in, he returned to Blois. Here, in the Church of St. Nicholas, the bells hung in the open, and there were twin towers. His studio was seventy feet high; its cracks and crannies were filled with flora and fauna sown by the wind. Swallows and pigeons hovered round as he painted, and a rook constituted himself critic, croaking and scolding like a veritable master! The old sacristan, who had rung the bell for forty years, looked on with loving interest.

Mr. Blashfield is a member of the Board of the National Academy of Design, and originator of the Municipal Art



Edward A. Bell