

visional utility; and that as no one can really believe in all of them in the plain sense of the words, any religious man may with propriety make his private reservations with regard to any of them, and allow it to be understood that he believes what he does not believe while continuing to do his clerical work and draw his clerical stipend. Intellectual insincerity, in short, is justified on the ground that religion is essential, whereas dogmas are incidental. To which Francis Newman would have replied, and did reply by implication, that true religion and intellectual insincerity are incompatible; and that the proper course is to get rid of the dogmas while retaining the religion.

This belief of Francis Newman, we are told, is slowly gaining the apprehension of the world, which in some quarters realizes that a church without dogmas is a quite possible institution. To quote further:

"But a church without dogma? Is that also possible? One would perhaps hesitate to say so if the forty-church had not arisen within the ranks of a church once one of the most rigidly dogmatic. That, however, was what happened when the synod of the Evangelical Church of the Canton of Vaud met last autumn to discuss the revision of its formularies in the light of modern thought. The proposal was at first warmly received and substantially supported, but it was then for some reason or other based on submission to any dogmatic tests—that their adhesion should be to religion in general and not to any particularized creed. The majority rejected the proposal. The time did not seem to be ripe for it. But it was a very interesting sign of the times that it was rejected."

Necessarily such a condition of things would render controversy impossible. As Mr. G. G. G. remarks:

"The dogmas have been dropped, and the terminology has been retained—that is a sentence, the evolution of which the Higher Criticism has brought about in the course of the last half-century. And accordingly the theological controversy has lost half its bitterness by losing all its meaning. The skeptic, on his part, feels that to attack the dogmas of Christianity is to assail shadows of perpetually changing shape. The Christian apologist, on his part, can say little to the skeptic; for at least, denouncing him, he should also by implication be denouncing Dean Fremantle, or some other office-bearer in the household of faith. Quarrels, therefore, subside for the lack of anything definite to quarrel about; and all sensible men are of the same religion because the religion is capable of being stretched to cover all sensible opinions. Forcibly inhibited discussion—also also forcibly inhibited religiosity—the first thing needed is a rigid creed with penalties for those who reject it."

**The Church as "A School of Fine Arts."**—In a recent issue of *Etudes* (Paris), a review founded by the Jesuit fathers in 1856, Hippolyte Prevot, who has given an eloquent defense of the principle of State support for the church, "What!" exclaims M. Prevot, "Part of the public revenues are employed to pay dancers and singers salaries greater than the prime minister's—part again is used to endow schools of fine arts, museums, libraries, chairs of science and literature, and such like things, be given to the church which is for the peasant an open school of fine arts, his museum, his library; the only place where he learns there exist things called paintings, music, eloquence; where he hears duty and hope spoken of; where his ideas rise above that piece of ground which he turns over and over so industriously day by day until he has no more sense than a wall." "Is it not undeniable," some people argue, "that those who do not attend divine worship, who do not believe in it, should be obliged to contribute to its expense?" To this objection M. Prevot replies:

"Does a majority of the French people go to the theaters subsidized in Paris? Many a class lecture in the College of France has not more than half a dozen auditors. A great number of citizens have never had occasion to enter the hall of a court of justice. Of what good is the road running along the shores of the Mediterranean to the fisherman on the Atlantic coast and the public school? Would people who have no children wish to prefer to send their children to private schools, day or night, to pay the tax?"—*Translation made for THE LITERARY DIGEST.*

## A RETURNING AGE OF FAITH.

**A**FTER a long period of depression of the spirit, and kind of shamefacedness and apology to the gods of humanism, i.e., contrasted with his natural circumstances is about to stand up; it is already, indeed, upon his feet, with something of the ancient daring in his eyes." This view of the situation is maintained by the Rev. John A. Hutton, writer in *The Hibbert Journal* (London, July). At present, says Mr. Hutton, "we are living from hand to mouth, without the normal order and peace which come of obedience to some faith or vision." We are, he insists, in a condition of unstable equilibrium, of inner discord and unhappiness; a condition, however, which "gives men the hearing ear." In other words, we are not looking for a reaction in the temper of the community toward the problems of life. He continues:

"On the principle of the swing of the pendulum we ought to anticipate a reaction against the mood which has dominated men during, to speak roughly, the last generation. It is possible, no doubt, to give an arbitrary and arbitrary interpretation of this pendulum principle—that it is due to the interplay of the public mind. But a more serious and formidable explanation is also competent. Any reaction which is widespread and has the note of spontaneity, will be found to be the protest of man's sensitive nature against the arrogance and tyranny of one aspect or faculty of that nature. We have the instinct of freedom for self-assertion; but—it may be a reminiscence of the old book, it may be the calling of the election of God—we have also the instinct to deal severely with ourselves—the instinct of obedience, of bondage. . . . There are signs, it seems to me, that in certain matters are beginning to have misgivings, beginning to fear they have gone far enough; signs of a certain timidity which will be considered as weakness by some still stronger minds, but which will be regarded by others as belonging equally to man's true nature, as the sign of his inevitable need of some shelter for his spirit."

Mr. Hutton points to the rapid spread of Christian Science, and to the revival of the "occult" in our time, as bearing upon his contention. Of these particular symptoms he writes:

"That the Christian Science propaganda should begin and should find such a welcome in a generation of doubts and thoughts of doubt is a fact which is almost incredible, and which is a sign of how extreme men are. Sympathy is easily considered, also, it gives the rational, the inner reasonableness of that long-established maxim. Extreme men are for the same reason that tyrannies are overthrown. The latter extreme is the passionate reaction of the unjust and disastrous but inevitable, against the former. To the *ipse dixit* of materialism, of science, of more and more scientific and cook-book that there is nothing but matter in the world, Christian Science, with the quietest of obedience, replies that there is something but spirit. Now it is not the purpose of this paper to enter into proofs or to justify the general and more or less signs of which have here alleged. My purpose is simply to name some signs, as they seem to me, that, whether rightly or wrongly, in an absolute sense, the general mind of the day is steadily turning toward a certain consideration and attitude of attention with regard to the spiritual view of man and the world."

"The same interpretation may be given to the recent remarkable revival of the occult in our time. It is idle, it is simply not true, to say that this dabbling in the black arts is confined to those few queer people who have always had a vague wish and that it is without significance. One has only to walk up and down a street in the business part of any of our cities to see what a trade must be going on in the houses and the black and white. It may not be a comfortable sign; indeed, it is a point of view which will accompany any wholesale return to faith, as it has accompanied every such instinctive and elementary movement in past times. But it is the sign, I believe, of a kind of wild revenge which the spiritual side of our human nature is celebrating as a protest against its dogmatic neglect. As such it gives an insight into the necessities of human nature that the absurdities of the prophet from the soul, in the absence of some honorable faith, which will control the fluid and changing qualities of man, are necessary to take place, even in the most civilized societies, of a kind of a dark and dubious and imbecile things. By themselves, these things are disheartening and deplorable enough, but they are not by