

great danger that all the blessings of religion may be lost, and the writer urges the preservation of the heart of religion after its dogmas have vanished. What the next form in the evolution of religion will be it is impossible to tell, and the article ends with mere wishes and hopes. Even if in religion we admit evolution, as we cheerfully do, is there not something substantial and abiding in that which is in the process of evolution? Certainly amid the changes something remains unchanged; and certain religious evolutions have so long proceeded in the vacuum of negations that, if pious wishes are in order, we may be permitted to hope that something positive and fixed will eventually be evolved.

The opponents of Christianity present the spectacle of a house divided against itself. Neither in their negations nor in their positions are they agreed. Recently the advocates of positivism and agnosticism have attacked each other as literally as each opposes Christianity. Both profess to be desirous of conserving religion itself, and yet neither can claim religion in any true sense. If Mr. Harrison proves agnosticism utterly void of all that is allied to religion, Prof. Huxley ridicules the positivist's religion of humanity. We can understand the worship of exalted individuals by savages; but the worship of that abstraction termed humanity deserves all the contempt Prof. Huxley pours upon it.

Positivism as a religion is dead and only awaits decent or indecent burial. The religion of agnosticism never was anything else than a ghost; the progress consists in the fact that everybody now knows that it is only a phantom. One wonders how it could ever have been presented as the saviour of the soul otherwise than in bitter mockery. The utter emptiness of agnosticism is now mercilessly exposed; and

with all possible charity it is hard to believe that its advocates did not all along know its worthlessness. Prof. Huxley is offended because the Bishop of Peterborough speaks of "Cowardly Agnosticism"; but in the April *Fortnightly* W. H. Mallock makes cowardly agnosticism the heading of his article, in which he shows that if agnosticism were not cowardly it would admit its inability to furnish a basis for faith and hope and duty, and for life itself. If agnosticism is true, then all that is dearest to the soul must be false. He states that religion says: "Deny the existence of God, deny man's freedom and immortality, and by no other conceivable hypothesis can you vindicate for man's life any possible meaning, or save it from the degradation at which you profess to feel aghast." In order to get a firm basis for life a great act of faith is necessary. Advocates of agnosticism pronounce this act of faith "intellectual suicide," an expression which the author does not think justifiable. But using that expression provisionally, the author says: "It is only through the grave and gate of death that the spirit of man can pass to its resurrection."

In England, as on the continent, the trend of thought opposes the exclusiveness both of positive science and of faith. They must supplement instead of antagonizing each other. It must cease to be an objection to faith that it cannot be demonstrated; for it will be evident that if it were demonstrated it could not be faith. The attacks directed ostensibly against Christianity are, on closer inspection, found to be subversive of all religion and even of morality. Mr. Mallock thinks that perhaps he was wrong in affirming that agnosticism can supply us with no religion, and so he corrects his statement as follows: "It will supply us with a religion which, if we describe it in theological language, we may with