

ture and journalism as he says: "A further glance at our modern literature will exhibit the almost abysmal profundity of the chasm which, in this respect, divides our present culture from our Christianity." The reference here, of course, is to German letters as related to German thought and life, and yet the author is not slow in extending its application to other lands and peoples, and among them to England and America. In answering the further question, whether this breach can be closed, it is interesting to read from Christlieb the statement "that the Teutonic races have a special need and a special vocation to overcome this deep-seated contradiction, from which our age so greatly suffers."

Sentiments such as these every careful observer of contemporaneous literature and morals must indorse, nor need we go outside the limits of our modern English peoples for sufficient evidence to confirm them. England itself is a province quite broad enough for investigation.

If we inquire as to the departments of literary life and effort which evince the presence of this skeptical tendency, it may be said that no one form of authorship is devoid of it—not even theology itself—the area of ethics having become a chosen one for this particular type of conflict.

The sphere of prose, history, fiction, and critical miscellany may be said to afford inviting fields for its exercise, as seen in the pages of such writers as Lecky and Buckle, George Eliot and Mrs. Humphry Ward, Carlyle, John Stuart Mill, G. H. Lewis, and Gerald Massey; while among authors of lesser note in these and similar departments of prose expression the name is legion of those who may be said to dabble in doubt, either as children with their toys or in that revolting self-conceit which is begotten of the joint parentage of ignorance and moral bravado.

So, as to the modes of manifestation which literary doubt may be said to assume, they are marked by as wide a variety as are the phases of the human countenance or the operations of the human mind. Such doubt is expressed directly and indirectly, positively and negatively, in honest and in captious and cynical forms; at times, in the extreme statements of the baldest atheism or in the more concealed and modified language of skeptical inquiry. Poets and prose-writers are, in turn, anti-religious and irreligious and non-religious and un-religious, as the occasion may demand, or as their respective mental temperaments and investigations may suggest. Doubt is as diverse in its phases as is faith, and takes its character in literature, as elsewhere, largely from the individuality behind it and the particular environment in which it originates and develops. The French encyclopedists evinced one form of it, and the English deists another. With George Eliot it assumed one character, and with John Stuart Mill another. Matthew Arnold, as an author, had his own way of reaching and expressing his skepticism, as Byron and Shelley had