

world for which physics or biology can never account. This of course provided a sufficient basis for religion: belief, in M. Bergson's philosophy, is an eminently scientific attitude. So is patriotism, for it is another great feature of Bergsonism that it has more respect for man's instincts than for his intelligence.

On the whole, we can say that French science and philosophy are no longer antagonistic to the idea of free-will, morals, and religion, and the rare champions of materialism seem curiously out of date.

Literature shows a transformation of the same kind. Towards 1880 Zola was the undisputed master of the novel, and Naturalism, i. e. a coarser form of Realism, was triumphant; but it was the end of its success. A young writer who could not be called a man of genius, but who was sensitive and capable of delicate intuitions, Paul Bourget, felt that the public had been surfeited with brutality, and that there was a chance for a kind of fiction which would make more room for the soul than for the body. His success was immediate and universal. In less than five years, Zola appeared not only indecent but inartistic, and, what is even more damning, false. People began to shrug their shoulders at a view of life which presented men and women as mere automata acting under animal impulses. Nobody questioned any more that, even in a self-indulgent society, instinct is not the universal law and that even the lowest types of humanity know doubts and struggles. This meant the restoration of the moral element, of respect for sacrifice and contempt for selfishness in literature. Bourget's characters were weak, but he knew it, and they themselves confessed it: this was enough to dispel the stifling atmosphere which Zola's school had gathered around life.