

dral window, and flecks chancel, nave, and pillar with violet, purple and gold, according to the character of the transmitting medium? We have no more than turned over the first leaves of Dr. Maudsley's interesting treatise on the *Physiology of Mind*; but so suggestive of reflection have these proved that we find ourselves brought to the limits of an article sooner than we expected.

---

### POSITIONS OF THE INTELLECTUAL WORLD AS REGARDS RELIGION.

**I**NVESTIGATIONS into the true relations subsisting between science and religion are the passion of the age in which we live. Discussions arising out of these investigations, one would think, should necessarily be confined to the respective schools—that is, to men of science on the one side and to those who have chosen their vocation in the religious order on the other. But so far from this being the case, the controversy is largely conducted by persons who have no position in either school. Philosophers, statesmen, men of letters, have taken part in it to an unprecedented extent, and thrown the light of their varied intelligence upon it, or not unfrequently increased the existing confusion of thought.

Even a slight survey of the field of contemporary literature is sufficient to assure us that at no time in the history of the world has a greater array of ability ever been engaged in the consideration of any one subject. Nor is this remarkable. The deepest questions, and the most important, that can occupy the human mind are comprised within the sphere of religion, and, hence, it is easy to understand the paramount interest which the intellectual world accords so freely in our days to the discussion of these questions. Then, again, modern science undertakes to answer them, and attempts to elucidate the problems they involve; and so wonderful has been the success which has crowned its advance in almost every other department, that many minds have been led to believe, and perhaps do still believe, that it is able to solve them. Without expressing an opinion in regard to the possibility or rather impossibility of this, the present fact that science has undertaken to instruct humanity on points heretofore considered the exclusive realm of faith, has led into the field of controversy the volunteers already alluded to, and accounts partly for the other fact, viz., that the questions at issue have been treated from every possible and im-

possible point, under all admissible and inadmissible aspects, and in every conceivable and inconceivable way. And from the flood of light thrown, or, at least, supposed to have been thrown on them, the inference might be drawn that the main points of the controversy must be settled beyond dispute. Yet, strange to say, just the reverse holds good. It seems as if a singular fatality had presided over all these efforts made for the avowed purpose of arriving at a final decision, and made, moreover, in earnest and with great sincerity. A mysterious agency appears to have led the human mind to exhaust its versatility without accomplishing the desired end. For the haze of mystery which gathers around these subjects has not been dispelled; it has been increased rather than lessened; the result thus far reached is only intellectual confusion, and the final verdict is still seemingly involved in uncertainty.

Yet, notwithstanding all this, contemporary literature furnishes a vast amount of correct information, or, at least, of materials from which correct information may be gathered, with regard to the apparent conflict of science with religion. As an ingeniously contrived apparatus enables the meteorologist to measure the direction, velocity, and force of the currents of air, so do opinions stated and resfated, modified and modifying, serve as indicators of the currents which surge to and fro in the realm of thought. To give a detailed account of all the reports that have been made by men of high competence in their own lines, would be an undertaking very difficult in itself, and wholly impossible within the scope of this paper. But it seems to me quite possible to utilize the data or results of observations contained in contemporaneous writings for indicating what answer suggests itself to the questions, Whither is modern religious thought drifting? What will be the final outcome of this strife of conflicting opinions?

Mr. Mallock, in his well-known and quite remarkable book, *Is Life Worth Living?* has shown the necessity of making some sort of reply to these questions—questions of the gravest import to individuals as well as the race. How far the reply affects the value of life for each one of us does not concern us in this paper, but only the probable solution of the difficulty, so anxiously awaited and to all appearances so terribly uncertain. The very attitudes of modern thought toward religion are highly suggestive, because full of indications as regards the proximate if not the final result, and, therefore, they well deserve careful consideration. Patient search into these, we think, will enable us to discover the central idea in the opinions that are fast permeating culturèd society.

Passing over all positions which form simply links of transition from one school to another, the intellectual world may be roughly

divided into three classes according to their attitudes towards religion: One, without religion, without any wish for religion, nay, bent in all earnestness upon its abolition altogether,—the school of “advanced thought,”—which I will call for the sake of clearness and brevity the extreme left, borrowing for the occasion a parliamentary phrase with which every one is familiar; another, the extreme right, comprising the believers in orthodox Christianity in its most authoritative form, namely, the Catholic Church; and, third, the centre party, standing between these two extremes. The majority belong to the last-named class, for the world in our days, as is well known, is filled with people who are neither willing to accept the postulates of modern scientists in their fulness, nor altogether to ignore them; people who professedly belong to “a Church,” but whose confidence in their professed creed has somehow of late been seriously shaken, and who have become dissatisfied without being able to assign any clear or definite reason for their dissatisfaction or doubts; people, in short, who look with equally divided attention toward religion and toward science for a solution of their perplexing difficulties. The extreme right represents to us the cultus of religion as a science, the extreme left the cultus of science in lieu of religion, whereas the centre virtually consists of an indefinite mixture wherein both elements are contained in varying proportions. Numbers in this latter class are people who would like to possess a religion, but who unfortunately know not exactly what they want nor where to get it. Indefinite as this division may appear, it is by no means arbitrary, for the three attitudes are plainly perceptible in modern literature, and hence admit of verification without much labor.

It is scarcely necessary to remark that, the division has resulted from the influence of science upon society within the last few decades. At first the views of advanced thought were held by comparatively few. But “the disposition of mankind to impose their opinions and inclinations as a rule of conduct upon others,” as Mr. Mill and Professor Max Müller both tell us, has in this instance achieved quite a success. For that is precisely what the men of science have done for society in the recent past. The cultivated classes fell into the new views without much resistance, and since the intellectual class always represents a moral force also, the acceptance of the creed of science by that class has not failed to act accordingly upon the masses. The influence of this has already begun to be felt in the lower strata of society. So long as fatalistic theories are accredited and subscribed to by only a few, they can be ignored. Yet the importance of showing a doctrine’s fallacy, and proving, once for all, its absolute untenability, stands in direct proportion to the extent to which it may be productive of

harm. And it is gratifying to observe how generally the necessity of this work begins to be recognized.

Now, what are the *nova credenda* promulgated by the extreme left? They are not, be it stated with emphasis, scientific deductions legitimately obtained, but are encroachments of science upon an order which differs from it in *kind*, and hence they are illegitimate in and by the very process of their generation. Modern science as far as it has preserved its character as real science we all have just reason to regard with pride and admiration; its achievements will ever remain genuine triumphs of the human intellect, and the practical benefits resulting from them flow in a thousand channels around us. Let us not depreciate what science has accomplished, but let us not forget, too, on the other hand, that the lines

“Reason our guide, what can she more reply  
Than that the sun illuminates the sky?”

will always be applicable to the line of demarcation between science and religion. “Faith” can become a matter of science, and so it has in Christian theology; but science never can supplant faith, as will be presently seen.

However, since modern science has had the arrogance to proclaim a creed of its own, it is well to examine the positions on which it rests in trying to make good its assumptions. They may be reduced to two propositions, each of which is not an affirmation but a negation. What science denies is, in the first place, the existence of a personal Deity, a belief which is the corner-stone not only of Christianity but likewise of all monotheistic religions. And, in the second place, science denies the existence of a supernatural order; that is to say, the existence of the soul as an indestructible, immortal entity, a belief which the Christian holds in common with the pagans of old. Now the consequence of conceding these two negations is this: Faith, in the sense with which mankind has invested that word for wellnigh two thousand years, nay from the very earliest dawn of history in one nation,—this time-hallowed faith is transformed into an absurd superstition; and if the above-mentioned premises could be granted it would, of course, follow that the sooner the human race were freed from that superstition the better. This brief synopsis of the fundamental principles of the creed of “advanced thought” leads to several important reflections, which it is well to keep before us. The substitute offered for religion in these our days does not put us on a level with classical paganism. For the paganism of Greece and Rome appears far more consonant with Christianity than is the paganism of Christian countries in our own times, because Greece and Rome, and even the idolatrous forms of worship in the East, carefully preserved cer-

tain conservative elements, namely, belief in a supreme governing power, and belief in future rewards and punishments. But as the denial of the existence of a personal God does away with a Ruler on high, and as in like manner the negation of a supernatural order implies the impossibility of retributive justice after death, these two restraining forces are shaken off altogether, and man is launched into the sea of passion, on a frail craft, without compass, rudder, or sail. What modern science, therefore, endeavors to put in place of the teachings of Christianity is not a cultus of æsthetics, or of honor, or of nature, but is simply and solely a complete negation of any and all religion, in other words, a deification of man; for in virtue of this new creed man acquires all the prerogatives heretofore accorded by unanimous consent of all ages to that Supreme Power in which mankind has heretofore believed. And this conception—that the foundation-principle of the world consists in an impersonal, changeless, and yet change-producing system of forces—what is it capable of producing but at best a barren feeling of despondency as to these inexorable forces, or a sort of æsthetic complacency with or stoical indifference to, its wonderful manifestations?

The pretensions of positivism have been so felicitously handled by Mr. Mallock, in the book already referred to, that I shall not dwell on any point here where the final word has been spoken by him. But in regard to the ignorance with which he charges modern advanced thought, a few remarks may not be amiss. He claims that the foremost thinkers of our age show "real knowledge in the hands of real ignorance," a statement so precise and so true that it seems all the more paradoxical. Yet ignorance, and nothing but ignorance, is the reason why all the laudable efforts of the school of "exact thought" at philosophical construction have failed; and the same fault must vitiate its further efforts. A certain amount of ignorance in regard to scientific data always does and always will prevail, even among the majority of fairly well-educated people. Nor is ignorance always to one's disgrace, since it is not always one's fault. The word, therefore, in itself, is not necessarily one of reproach. The ignorant very often are rather objects of pity than of condemnation, and absence of correct information may be both excusable and natural even among the cultured classes as such. Ignorance grows into a deformity, however, a disgrace, when it is coupled with self-conceit and presumption, and it grows finally into a crime in one who sets himself up to teach others; and the gravity of that crime must be measured by the gravity of the subject on which the ignorant pretend to teach. And of this crime the foremost thinkers of our day are guilty to an almost incredible extent. The mischief worked by inaccurate terminology, by an

“iron force of logic,” which proves when put to a crucial test more pliant than melting wax, is great enough; but the havoc wrought by a complete mistaking of first principles, and of the nature and function of scientific terms, is altogether beyond expression. An elementary fact misapprehended leads, of course, to the construction of utterly false doctrines and systems.

It is true that since the time of Pythagoras the science of man and of the universe, and even of the Author of man, as far as it is deducible from principles furnished by natural reason, has been called philosophy. Yet never until now has philosophy claimed to be heard authoritatively when touching upon the matter of theology; and in the sense in which modern science understands philosophy it is made to embrace also the sphere of theology, that is, religion. Now philosophy, let it be well understood, is the science which deduces conclusions from principles obtained by the light of natural reason alone. It can, therefore, arrive at no valid conclusions beyond the range of natural reason, and since all the great problems of man and his destiny, and of the universe itself, lie beyond that range, philosophy alone and unaided cannot be a guide in the realm of faith. These problems, if solved at all, can be solved only by the aid of a supernatural light, that is, by revelation, and are, *ipsis-sima natura*, withdrawn from that region where the human intellect alone and unaided may reign supreme. Modern philosophers, however, magnify reason beyond all reason, and imagine they obtain results from it, which, though in most cases quite indirectly, they in reality obtain from revelation. They contend that the dogmas of faith are reducible to philosophical propositions, and maintain the fatal error that the *matter* of religion and the matter of philosophy are essentially the same, and that they differ only in *form*. They fail to discern that the matter of the one is that portion of universal truth which is intrinsically evident to natural reason; whereas, the matter of faith is that portion which is intrinsically *not* evident to natural reason, and is contained in revelation, and hence is precisely that which philosophy must bow down to and worship. Philosophy is not able, nor will it ever become able, to strip from faith its mysterious robes, and present its naked truth to the natural understanding. For, let us repeat it again, philosophy is concerned solely with truths naturally cognoscible; faith, on the contrary, with truths only supernaturally cognoscible, and consequently intrinsically not evident until we are supernaturally enlightened to see them. Clear and obvious as this distinction is, modern science has completely lost sight of it. Yet, much to be regretted as is the intellectual confusion which links belief in physical laws with disbelief in the supernatural order, it is a phenomenon that can partly, at least, be easily accounted for. A man of

science concentrates his keenest attention for a long time upon the observation of one small manifestation of life. To the physicist life, and not only life, but the world and the whole universe, resolves itself into an infinite aggregate of the workings of certain sets of laws. His thoughts, instead of acquiring a wider range, instead of becoming more and more comprehensive, are thus continually narrowed and hemmed in. And the result is that whatsoever cannot be brought under the focus of either telescope or microscope ceases to have existence for the scientific observer, and its reality is denied. The measure of what our senses can compass and take in by investigation becomes his measure of life, of the world, of the universe. To mention but one instance, modern science instructs us that an atomic movement in the brain is not only the concomitant of every "thought," but that this very "thought," after all, is the effect which the atomic movement as cause produces. This virtually converts man, despite free-will, into an exquisite automaton, whose loftiest flight of imagination may in the last instance perhaps be reduced to "*chablis*" and "*pâté de foie gras*."

Again, let us not fail to note that the creed of the religion of taste does not discard morality; professedly it sails under that flag, and proclaims—and this quite seriously—that a further development of morality is one of the great results which the advancing civilization of our age has still to accomplish. As modern science overlooks the fact that religion and science have spheres belonging to different orders, so it also overlooks the fact that morality and Christianity are inseparably bound together. The morality which science inculcates is a morality bent down to earth, drawing all its nutriment and strength from the physical laws; it is a morality looking only as far as the eye can reach, and proclaiming all dreamland that lies beyond our vision in space and time. Such morality may take hold for a time of those who have grown up in tainted Christian morality, nay, it may even continue a gradually decaying sway for some generations, but if put to the test of time it is certain to collapse, as all earthborn fabrics do collapse. Never yet has natural reason alone proved adequate to furnishing safe rules for the conduct of life. Ethics, as a science, must borrow its chief fundamental principles from faith, and unless it does so it must fail as a system. For a code of morals resting entirely on the reality of the laws of matter declares itself insufficient. The problem of obligation, that is to say, our duty to seek the *summum bonum*, proclaims in that case "follow nature." And hence the gratification of our natural desires, the complete satisfaction of every passion, every craving, every appetite—this and nothing else would constitute the final aim for each individual; and the greater or less success with which this aim is attained would be the measure of

the greater or lesser morality of that individual. Nor is this all. Science preaches its system of morality notwithstanding the fact that not one ethical system based upon natural reason alone, has ever obtained for any length of time, while Christian morality, on the contrary, has outlived all systems. The much-vaunted theory of the "survival of the fittest" should have suggested an inquiry into the cause why common-sense has rejected one system after another except this one, and why natural reason still seeks for and concocts new systems, to be superseded in turn by newer still. This point has remained without investigation so far as science is concerned; perhaps this is so because the reason of it is so clear and tangible. But nature herself feels that there must be something above her, in which she must participate, else there is no supreme happiness for her. Without a supernatural order no real and lasting basis for morality, that is to say, for genuine morality, is conceivable; and this imperative necessity of morals, which happily is admitted on all sides, points to and presupposes in fact the supernatural order.

Schopenhauer, pessimist and misanthrope as he was, and one who certainly cannot be accused of hyper-religious tendencies, recognized this very clearly. He says: "We may just as well expect our system of morals and ethics in general to produce virtuous, noble-minded, and saintly individuals, as æsthetics to create poets and sculptors and musicians." And he contends that "the recognition of the supernatural as far above the natural order, metes out to the human race its greater or lesser share of happiness, and the more we cling to the material world the more do we forfeit the enjoyments which, as moral agents gifted with free-will, are within our reach in the immaterial world;" and again, "The highest, the most varied, the most lasting enjoyments are those of the intellect, no matter how greatly in youth we may deceive ourselves as to this fact."

The claims of modern science, then, for the non-existence of "soul" and of "God" are summed up thus: the soul refuses to be analyzed like that world of sense, which is all that is tangible within our reach, and hence it is not; and hence, furthermore, there is no supernatural order. And so in regard to God. The champions of exact thought declare to us—and their declaration is true to the letter—that neither the chemical laboratory nor the electromagnetic current, neither vivisection nor decomposition, have ever yielded up the infinite entity "God," and hence there is no God. Thus "God" and "soul" are placed in the category of the unknowable on precisely the same grounds.

In one instance, though only in one instance, does science admit that it is confronted by something which the foremost thinkers



not only declare baffles science now, but which they moreover believe will always do so. And this phenomenon is consciousness, the gate, as it were, by which man enters into intercourse with the infinite. This one admission inflicts a deathblow on the whole artificial structure of the creed of advanced thought. It seems to be beyond contradiction that facts which are not reducible to matter and its manifestations, and which are yet undeniable and real facts, presuppose and must belong necessarily to an order real and yet immaterial. Whether it be compatible with unimpaired reasoning faculties to admit this much and deny in the same breath the existence of a supernatural order, is a question which the reader may decide for himself. On a matter of less grave import so exquisite a piece of inconsistency would be simply ludicrous ; but occurring, as it does, on a subject which influences not only the short period of life on earth, but that life which is no longer subject to death or pain or change, it must fill one with deep regret for the individuals who stake on it the future, waiting to have their eyes opened when *trop tard, jè l'abandonne* will be the sound reaching their ears, to resound there for evermore.

Several revolts have been made against the triune majesty of God since Christianity brought to wretched mankind the teachings of faith, accompanied by hope and by an infinite never-failing charity. And of all these revolts that of the present age bears the most atrocious character. In the records of history there are accounts of an almost constant struggle against "kingcraft." This struggle being directed against authority, and hence against the Author of authority, that is, the first person of the Trinity, is not so much a questioning of the authority of God the Father, as rather a finding fault with Him for the form in which through a divine hierarchy He has been pleased to impose the law of obedience upon us. The nations proposed then rather a transformation of the links through which the authority of God becomes manifest, ascending from father to king, from king to God's vicar upon earth, and from God's vicar upon earth to the Author and Father of all in heaven. The revolt therefore was not bereft of purely human features ; it is the rebellious child that in vain tries to break loose from paternal tutelage. And again, the revolt against God the Son, traceable in all that has been done against His Church, and familiar to us as the struggle against "priestcraft," was also not devoid of certain characteristics which bring it within the circle of transgressions essentially human ; for here also it was rather the form of Christianity than its essence which shortsighted human nature presumed itself capable of improving upon, and hence no essential attribute of Deity was directly assailed. Secondary issues were made ; the highest sphere was still left undisturbed. Not so in the present revolt. Be-

ginning with the denial of God as God, the act bears no longer the semblance of a purely human trespass ; it deprives the races of faith, of hope, of charity ; it defies *à l'outrance* the Holy Ghost, the splendor of light and grace and wisdom. There is no palliation here ; no appeal for mercy pleads in behalf of a pride which begins and ends with a declaration of self-sufficiency and recognizes no power above it. The revolt inaugurated by modern science terminates immediately in an apotheosis of human personality, and erects egotism into a basis of culture and morality. But enough of the attitude of the extreme left.

Next in order comes the centre. As has already been remarked, a variety of elements goes towards making up its vast aggregate. It includes many whose religious sentiments raise them above the depraved materialistic tendencies of the age ; many who are honest, sincere, upright in their conduct, blameless in their morals ; many who cling with a tenacity worthy of a better cause to some mere fragments of Christianity ; many who believe not only in One Father, and One Redeemer, and One Sanctifier, but who are also willing to accept dogmatic teaching, through which alone, as they correctly perceive, practical results are obtainable from faith. The onslaught of science on religion, and the fatal results accruing from it to Protestantism on the one hand, and on the other hand the imperturbable majesty of Rome, have each in its own way acted upon and influenced this by no means homogeneous mass. Having been stirred as never before, the different elements are shifting and contending, undecided and uncertain. Color-blindness hides from their sight the white robe of Catholicity, and yet they still search for truth without a proper knowledge of the whereabouts of truth. At this very time it is claimed in England, and also by some on this side of the Atlantic, that this is, after all, nothing but a returning movement towards a more mystical form of Christianity. This is what Mr. Gladstone in his remarkable paper "On the Evangelical Movement, Its Parentage and Issue," seems to maintain, for he contends that the deep craving of the human mind after an intimate intercourse with its Creator, led to Ritualism, as it led in many cases to Rome. So far as it goes this is true. The case can, however, be stated in a more correct and more comprehensive manner. Since atheism has gained a certain ascendancy, the necessity of replacing a cold and unsatisfying creed by one which leaves no vacuum in the human breast, has become more and more imperative, and made itself more and more widely felt. Protestantism and atheism are separated only by an imaginary barrier, and the need to strengthen this weak partition has become obvious. Now Anglicanism, in spite of all its solemn protests, finds itself to-day in the same uncomfortable position as all the other offspring of

the Reformation. Without a fundamental reorganization no new lease of life is possible for Protestantism under any form. During and for some time after the break with Rome in the sixteenth century, fanaticism carried the adherents of Protestantism on its wings. Isolated instances excepted it does so no longer. Its flight was short, and would have ended sooner had not the Catholic teaching which it superseded continued to still live in the hearts of many, who led astray by a sort of religious intoxication embraced then and there the one or the other Protestant "Church." Nominally Protestants, vast multitudes remained actually though unconsciously Catholic; for the Catholic Church claims all who are Catholics in their hearts, be they heathen, or Mohammedans, or Protestants in the eyes of the world. The narrow view which tries to fasten upon Rome the stigma of unjustifiable exclusiveness, reserving the realms of endless bliss for those only who professedly and openly belong to her, begins happily to be more and more discarded. Her pale, in reality, includes by inalienable rights all who partake in the fruits of Calvary either through the baptism of blood or of desire; and all, again, who have received the sacrament of baptism and believe with unshaken sincerity that the denomination of which they are professedly members is the unadulterated form of Christianity; so that there are Catholics, true children of the Church, outside of Catholic congregations, and their fate hereafter will depend upon the manner in which they have used and obeyed that "light which enlighteneth every man that comes into the world."

Others, again, have tried to explain what is going on in the Established Church of England as a reaction. Through the overzeal of the first Reformers an indispensable part of Christianity has been lost, so they tell us; and hence what we are witnessing now is merely the reacceptance of this indispensable part. But this too is a misstatement. It was not our dogmatism which led to the Reformation; and, besides, the Ritualistic movement bears on its face the marks of a decided effort to cast off bonds which bind the Ritualists to a religious system which has no claim to infallibility. The fact is that the Christian doctrines held and taught by Rome cannot be improved upon. Attempts to do so have not been wanting; they have continued through a period covering more than three hundred years, and they have been made in almost every country in which Christianity has planted its banner. The conditions, therefore, as regards time as well as space, have been most favorable for a continued series of these experiments; and, as a matter of fact, variations of Christianity have sprung up everywhere, each claiming to contain the very essence of Christianity. True, all of them contain some vague sort of Christianity, a dead

and silent Bible, and more or less of Catholicism in a mangled condition. But what is the result? Not one of these patent religions has been able to stand a test of three centuries. They change color with chameleon-like rapidity, and while the process of creed-manufacturing still flourishes with unabated vigor in the camp of Protestantism, the discovery of "*the*" religion lies still to be made. If Ritualism be placed at one end of the religious spectrum and broad Unitarianism at the other, every conceivable variety of shade and color can be arranged between the two. Hence people have had a very wide field for their choice, and yet all these religious experiments are coming more and more to be looked at by the public generally with disgust as so many religious vagaries, and the insufficiency inherent in each of them alike asserts itself. Under the auspices of these varying and contending creeds the human heart has become the prey of an undefinable melancholy. A brooding sorrow moves over man's fate, and has seized upon most highly gifted minds; a mysterious forlornness touches us in the productions of the most distinguished writers. It is a feeling of despondency which springs from the consciousness of a lost felicity, and it neither can nor will be banished by anything save such faith and hope and love as give to man heaven, since it expresses the yearning of the heart after things not of this earth,—things that God alone can give and does give if we but humbly ask for them.

For the better verification of this mental condition, and also in order to illustrate the truth of Mr. Mallock's prediction that "prejudices, even when so dogged and so virulent as that against Catholicity, will lift and disappear one day like a London fog," a few quotations from a writer in *Frazer's Magazine* are subjoined:

"The motives of right conduct which Christianity has to offer,—hope for the individual, hope for the race, a great act of self-sacrifice requiring self-sacrifice in turn, self-reverence springing from a sense of a high and divine calling, the consciousness of the divine fatherhood resulting in a claim of universal brotherhood, an unswerving faith in the complete and final victory of good over evil, love to God and love to our neighbor as the mainspring of life,—these motives are considerably superior to any mere 'honesty is the best policy.'"

Again:

"The mere blank negation of all religion, which seems to be the present mental attitude of the cultivated classes in Germany, can result in no high or noble activity, no moral heroism, nothing but the old story, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.'"

Continuing his observations on Germany, the same writer goes on to say:

"Catholicism is the only form of Christianity that has any real hold upon the people.

In the Rhineland and in Southern Germany the churches are crowded with devout worshippers, whereas in Protestant Prussia the very profession of Christianity has well-nigh died out."

And on the connection between morality and faith the following comment is made :

"The acceptance of the supernatural as a condition of adopting Christianity as a rule of life, nay, the acceptance of the supernatural in this highest sense, is an essential condition of any religious faith. Christian morality is in the highest sense supernatural."

And from a paper entitled "Agnosticism and Women," published in the *Nineteenth Century*, we quote what Mrs. Lathbury says in regard to the saddening effects upon society should the day ever arrive when the spread of the new views shall extend over her sex. After pointing out that from whatever side the practical issues of the question are broached, the motive power is always withdrawn, and no substitute offered capable of appealing to what predominates in the female character, the heart, she raises a pathetic and touching cry for mercy on behalf of her sex :

"To be in the front ranks of progress and in the tide of intellectual fashion, to rise above the prejudices that spring from our instincts rather than from our reason, and, above all, to be in sympathy with the men they admire, are often the most potent influences that sway a woman's mind towards the atheism of the present day. If it is the lot of any to be obliged through honesty of thought to cast away their ancient landmarks, let them consider whether it is all gain to others that they should be led to do likewise. What has the agnostic to offer in compensation? In the strength of his days he sets out for the goal of culture. Physical, mental, moral culture is his aim and his watchword. Enlightenment in this world takes the place of hope in the next, and the intellect alone sets its mark upon the future. Enthusiastic for all progress, he forgets that a progress that comes to an end with death is no true progress at all, and that what is untrue for the individual cannot be true for the human race. With faith of an ultimate age of ice, and their hope bounded by the grave, what is left to the women of the future but their love alone, to tell them of how much happiness and misery they are capable? If such is the only truth possible for mankind, in very mercy let us pause long before we help others to attain to it."

These quotations offer considerable matter for reflection, and help us to form a definite conception of the real drift of thought. It will be seen that both writers agree that human nature cannot be lifted by its own strength to the level of truly moral actions. Unless an element of a higher order draws us by its influx on into an upper stratum, the current of animalism will succumb to the constant pressure around, and flow downwards from its present level in the direction of the least resistance.

Such views are all the more deserving our attention, because even from so-called Christian pulpits the sound reaches the ear that the cosmogony of Genesis is, at best, an untrustworthy compilation of primeval tradition. Men whose professed calling in the world it is to preach, proclaim that belief in an infinite substance informing

all phenomena, a trust in an eternal First Cause underlying all change, is the belief which has satisfied in all ages the greatest minds, and which suffices for the advanced civilization society has reached at the present day. They indorse in full the pretence of science that the universe is an unbroken chain, without even a break between plant and animal, or animal and man; they probably think a catena of facts established, which science itself only hopes to establish; they subscribe to "natural selection by conflict," though they do not dwell perhaps upon it, nor advocate it in individual cases, probably because of the unpleasant backwardness of legal views on such matters; in short, they are the oracles of scientific materialism, ridicule quite openly what they call "the old orthodox faith," which sees in life traces of direct divine intervention, and think they have discharged their functions as enlighteners of conscience in a highly conscientious manner if they finish their discourse by a remark that while reason must furnish the guide religion may still continue to give the vivifying motive. The model modern clergyman comes generally of a respectable family, is well-bred, has, besides, a good figure and voice, a "charming wife" as life companion, possesses excellent social and domestic accomplishments, keeps clear in most cases with considerable tact of all sorts of trouble, is, in short, "a gentleman," but has neither deep convictions nor much scholarship, no initiative power and no vocation. With a bland smile he informs his audience of the deep psychological meaning of the doctrine of atonement; he perceives a matchless didactic method in the doctrine of inspiration; in rites a moral and æsthetic cultus; and in churches incomparable instruments of discipline and social order. And this, people are told, is preaching Christianity, that is, Christ and Him crucified. But, though these esteemed pastors of souls instil such soothing syrup into the consciences of men; though the material wealth, which is commonly a concomitant of these "fashionable churches" serves as another incentive to swell their ranks; though science and religion are temptingly amalgamated in them; notwithstanding all this, these establishments do not thrive as one might expect. Disgusted with the vague and meaningless teaching of broad Protestantism, mental obtuseness must give way to more clear and more correct estimates of true religion. The principle of subjectivity introduced by the Reformation, as Professor Luthardt, the eminent Lutheran leader, himself admits, can no longer maintain its position. Men wished to be certain of salvation, each for himself, without priestly mediation. They have tried it, and the supreme judgeship of *ego* stands condemned before the forum of conscience. However much pride may revolt against anything which implies humility, there is a something within us which bids us

be humble, and this element once asserting itself is not to be silenced. And it is this element which bursts through and finds expression in our days, though restrained by the very men who ought to nurture it. It is this element which stamps hopefulness respecting the future of the centre, a hopefulness which will find its fruition in the decision the individual ultimately must make, to escape from the dreary dilemma. And thus it is that, against and in spite of all adverse influences, the conservative lines have been much closer drawn in the sphere of religious thought than was the case two decades ago.

And now how does the extreme right act? how does Rome act? Has the Catholic Church also been drawn into the vortex, or does she keep aloof from the contending masses, like an uninterested and indifferent spectator? To those who know her, her actions are also known, and to those who do not know her the uncompromising dignity and firmness she preserves are a more eloquent testimony than words could convey. Fully aware of the far-reaching and grave import of the issues involved in the questions which are agitating our times, she fulfils her mission in the same spirit which was given her on the day of Pentecost, the spirit of wisdom guiding her, the spirit of charity animating her to extend the tender mantle of divine love to all who seek for refuge and shelter.

These then are the three principal attitudes of the intellectual world towards religion as they strike us in a more or less pronounced way in contemporary literature. They are the constellations from which the horoscope of the future must be cast; they are not conjured up by imagination, but are plainly perceptible on careful observation.

The English character is distinguished by that calm, just measuring of the evidences which should decide the actions of individuals and of nations. Some extraordinary event may for a time weaken this national feature, as was actually the case in the sixteenth century; but sooner or later it will reassert itself. This process, it is true, is one which requires time for its consummation; but for that very reason after the reaction has once set in, the final result is less doubtful than in cases where the prevalence of passionate, emotional elements render every conclusion doubtful. A volatile temper has never yet been predicated of Englishmen as a race. If we cast a glance over the religious history of England for the last half century, the steps by which this reactionary movement has progressed are traceable. What, let us ask, has led the maturest intellects, the ablest scholars, the ripest minds, men of whom the nation feels justly proud—what has led and induced them to humble themselves before Rome, and ask for admittance into her fold? Manning and Newman, names too illustrious to need more than

mere mention in order to bring them before us in all their grandeur and lustre, sifted the evidences of Christianity with the thoroughness, and perseverance, and courage which ought to be inseparable from investigations into the most important subject man has to deal with; and they did not shrink from a manly acknowledgment of their error when the suspicion of being wrong had ripened into sincere conviction. Bent upon embracing truth in its fulness they accepted it where alone they could find it. If it is urged that what landed them safely in the Church of Rome was the greater ability they could apply to the task of searching for and finding the truth, the answer is that not in that, but in their great earnestness of purpose, in their unswerving justice, in their wondrous moral courage, and in their humility lies the secret of their conversion.

The Ritualistic faction of the Established Church of England likewise bears testimony that the weighing of evidences of the past has, in the opinions of a considerable portion of the clergy, made a departure from the rites of the "Established Church" an obligatory duty. Only after a long and careful search did Ritualism adopt a cultus, which is best described as a fac-simile of the cultus of the Catholic Church minus her life-giving spirit. Here again we see the same element asserting itself as in the individual cases mentioned before. While only the individual minds of a Manning, a Newman, a Faber, a Ripon, and many others went over the ground with the careful solicitude of persons desirous of discovering truth in its entirety, the Ritualistic clergy showed their unwillingness to take at once the path of humility and avow their error on all points of difference. They were submerged too long in the deep waters of self-complacent error to rise quickly to the surface; they rose high enough to see the blue sky in the firmament above; they saw rays of that light before which darkness recedes, but they did not venture to gaze upon the sun in his full brilliancy. But there is ground for hope that their union with the sole repository of unchangeable truth will at last be accomplished.

And lastly, as regards the nation itself, our judgment of its future attitude must be guided by the new currents which display themselves already in contemporary literature. A spirit of equity, of impartiality, greater freedom from prejudice, lessening aversion to Catholicism, these are features distinctly observable, and from their presence one is constrained to think that the pulse begins to beat with a hopeful vitality. The pretensions of modern science and its atheistic creed violate too grossly the deep-seated religious sense of Englishmen. Publications like Mr. Mallock's works increase in popularity, and they are gauge-glasses for ascertaining the temper and the direction of the drift of thought. Mr. Mallock, a literal skeptic, as he himself avows, typifies the sterling quality of the



English character to which I have already alluded. Viewing science by the light of reason, and religion by the light of reason, he arrives at the conclusion that Catholicity is the one religion that can, and the one religion that will, survive the complete and inevitable shipwreck of all other creeds. As an outsider he sees, of course, all things that belong to the Catholic religion foreshortened; his picture of the Church of Rome is deficient in drawing, in perspective, in coloring, in the distribution of light and shade. Nor could this well be otherwise, since it is necessary to look at her from a central point of view, in order to perceive the harmony of proportions, the classic simplicity of style, the matchless beauty of color. Nevertheless, how great is the gain when a mind drifting about without aim, desirous simply of finding relief somewhere from an overpowering, unbearable anxiety, ascertains at last where relief may be found, if relief is to be found at all.

And thus three successive stages seem to be quite perceptible: Giant minds, at first, leading the way, followed in turn by individual strong minds; next, the clergy, setting fresh canvas before the breeze, and sailing for Rome, but unable to make more than Civita Vecchia; and lastly, the nation, surging to and fro, shaking off the old yoke of prejudice, casting aside the glacial doctrine of science, looking about for new and safe moorings, and no longer unwilling to listen to the soothing strains of peace, and rest, and happiness that peal forth from the organ of the true Church of God.

Yet *one* step has to be taken by one and by all before that peace and that rest and that happiness can be attained, and of that one step Mr. Mallock speaks when he asks: "But that first decision, how shall we make it?" answering: "That decision, if we have a will at all, lies with our will, with the will alone to make," which answer, however, is not full, since to secure the blessings of grace and peace and faith there is, above all, required humility, calling for help in prayer. Hence, let hesitating minds reflect well on the two words: "Pray and obey."

---