

touching the German mind, has blossomed into a powerful school which owns almost every divine of importance at the present time in the Fatherland, and which, flushed with victory on its native soil, is throwing out here and there an outpost in England and in America.

What can be more depressing than the reflection that two of the finest prophetic spirits of the century have arrived at diametrically opposed conclusions as to what constitutes the essence of religion. Martineau preaches an undogmatic faith, a theism baptised as it were into Christ; Newman knows no time when religion presented itself to him in any guise save that of dogma, nor is he able to conceive religion apart from dogma. The former charges the latter with want of immediateness of religious vision, with failure to pierce to the primitive roots of faith where, apart from any distracting media, the divine and human mingle; the cardinal, on the other hand, can scarce detect on the Unitarian even a fugitive gleam of Christian light. We seem to be driven back upon an enquiry as to what really dogma is, and what value, if any, it possesses for the spiritual life of humanity. A dogmatist, in the conventional sense, is a person whom society is unanimous in voting a nuisance and a bore. He lacks the virtue of intellectual modesty; as Lord Melbourne said of Macaulay, "he is cocksure about things of which he knows nothing." And yet Maurice, one of the wisest teachers of this generation, has said, "A dogmatist and a rationalist in their worst sense I know I am liable to be; a dogmatist and a rationalist in their best sense I desire to be." There are dogmatists and dogmatists. We are familiar with the special form which dogmatist assumes in the religion; we should be as sensitive to the dogmatism of unbelief which by sheer intellectual effrontery would, so to say, bully men out of their religious convictions as though, to quote Butler's words, "Christianity is not so much a subject of enquiry, seeing that it is discovered to be fictitious." Clearly our ideas about dogma stand in sore need of being cleared up.

Etymology will not help us here. The question is not what Plato and Sextus Empir-

cus thought but what meaning do the thinking portion of Christendom ascribe to the term. The Church of Rome true to the principles of Anselm—*credo ut intelligam*—defines dogma as an article of belief imposed by the church, and and to be received, whether understood or not, upon her authority. But there are many upholders of dogma who do not believe in the church, and the modern cry is not so much against the decrees of Trent as against all theological creeds whatever. Now if we cast about us for some representative authorities who can tell us what dogma is, perhaps we can not do better than consult that genial "rationalist and dogmatist" of the Church of England, the "judicious" Hooker, and the no less genial, if anti-dogmatic divine who occupies the Chair of Church History in the University of Berlin, Professor Harnack. According to the Anglican theologian a system of dogma is not to be found "in black and white" in the Bible, but is thence "deduced by collection." That is to say, truth is not in Scripture in the form of dogma; it gains that form in the processes of perception, analysis and classification. This is the view that Matthew Arnold accepts as sound, and history would seem to justify his judgment. It would therefore tend to clearness if writers would cease calling historical events related in Scripture, dogmas, and would confine the term to express the formulated and logically shaped statement of what we find informally set forth in Revelation. It is confusing to read one author who writes about the dogma of the Trinity or the Atonement and then turn to another who, like Mr. Fiske the American writer, speaks of the "dogma of the resurrection." There is surely a plain distinction between an alleged historical event, and an intellectually elaborated system of ideas. Thus far Richard Hooker, the modern historian, uses the word dogma in a sense peculiar to himself—a sense too, we may add, which has not as yet met with general acceptance at the hands of scholars. Dogma is the scientifically formulated expression of belief considered as having behind it the authority of Divine revelation, and imposed by the church as necessary to salvation. It is "the formulation of Christian