

but his the divine anointing who watched and waited and toiled and prayed,—
and failed,—and can yet be glad.

* * *

I would travel in all climes that I might return and tell you of the beauty of
my own little garden plot.

I would explore heaven and hell that I might come back and tell you what a
charming place is the earth.

* * *

Wishing will bring things in the degree that it incites you to go after them

* * *

If the populace marched in file, 'twere my signal to break from the ranks.

If a thousand generations did thus and so, 'twere my cue to do otherwise.

* * *

I longed to build as you had builded, but I knew that your joy lay in the con-
ception of your own design.

I longed to follow where your feet had trod, but I had watched your exhilara-
tion as you felled a new way.

I longed to do that thing you did and be that thing you are, but I knew life's
fulness was yours because you were yourself.

* * *

Let my grave be unmarked: I fear not to be forgotten.

* * *

Better than tiaras—the diadem of freedom.

Better than broad acres—a garden of heartsease.

Better than mines of gold—a mint of dreams.

Better than bars of molten silver—the silver of a laugh.

Better than strings of pearls—the crystal of a tear.

Better than bands of choristers—a lute in the soul.

* * *

I am life's mystery,—and I alone am its solution.

I am the dreamer of dreams,—and I am dreams come true.

I am the supplicant,—and I am the god that answers prayers.

THE PRESENT RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN FRANCE.¹

In answer to your letter of April 10th, I would say that unhappily I do not
think myself the right man to write a review or appreciation of religious events
now going on in France, although I follow them with great interest.

The events in question are a page of our historic evolution. It was "written"
that some day or another we should have to get rid of the Congregations, which
were multiplying immensely and which are the temporal army of the Papist domi-
nation. Was this the proper moment to begin, through a junction of the Radicals
and the Socialists, brought about by M. Waldeck-Rousseau? Have they done as
they ought? Was it not too much to attack at once the three sorts of Congrega-
tions: men and women, schools commercial, meditative, etc.? I do not know.
The final object, the most desirable for our country, would be a French National
Church independent of the Pope, having synods, say once a year, and adapting it-
self progressively to the spirit of the century; or at least an equality with other
Churches, such as you have in the United States.

¹ From a private letter by Dr. Paul Topinard.

As to a general article on some religious subject I do not know whether I am yet ripe for this.

1. What is religion? Is it a system of philosophy spiritualistic or metaphysical (I don't say materialistic), monistic or dualistic; a given mythology; what serves as a basis to morality (that is to say the best conduct in society toward one another); or a collection of prescripts, ceremonies, rites? No, it is adoration and prayer, a believing in something which may see our adoration, hear our prayer, and answer to our demands, in other words to an anthropomorphic, a mere conception or hypothesis.

2. How is it the socialists (I do not say sociologists) and all the other leaders of the lower classes are enemies of Religion, God, and the priests, "No God, no Master," they say. Is it not because the generality of philosophers profess that the search and supposed knowledge of God is the field of the *sages* only, of the enlightened—they and their followers? Is it not because they have left mythological legends, developed or not, by the poets and priests, to the warriors and citizens, leaving to the mass of the people what? Nothing! Indifference! Is it not because such philosophers as Platos and the Stoics did not believe in justice, as so well described in Ecclesiastes, and made use of an artificial religion only to make the suffering classes keep still and obey the law, without offering them any method, or even the hint of a remedy to their suffering on earth? In Egypt the superior classes had fine and solid graves for their "Doubt"; but the laboring classes had not even a sepulchre. The "last," as elsewhere, were nothing.

The great success of Christ was due to the fact that he was the first to say in our part of the world: the rich and the poor, the strong and the weak, the woman, the slave, all are equal before my God; his kingdom will come in a short time on the day of resurrection; you have been the last, you will be the first. But all those promises have faded away. The Christ of the people is not known, at least not to those brought up in the Catholic faith. The new social strata, those that now awake to thinking do not make a difference between God and religion and priests who have failed to give them a remedy for their sufferings and happiness or equality on earth. Therefore they say, "No God, no priest; we will make our happiness ourselves."

3. Some now say that, when in the second and third centuries after Christ the general spirit was for a new faith, it is most unhappy that the schools of Alexandria, Constantinople, and Rome arrived at the form adopted by them. They think that something better might have come out of the Stoics, of Marcus Aurelius, and the Emperor Julian or others. Is it true?

4. . . . But I must stop. It is enough.

For my part I do believe in an Unknown, in a general principle of things, and I find your word *nomotheism* very good. I do believe in a one universal soul of the world of which a part is in each of us. But that is only a scientific and I must say a materialistic idea. It leads to nothing in the practical conduct of individual life. It does not lead to prayer. I cannot adore either the universal and impalpable soul, nor my own soul. Conscience is what hereditary habits of thinking and doing makes it (putting aside individual habits obtained by the present surroundings and education.)

We Stoics see things as they are; we know we are but ants, we bend our heads and make the best of life. But the mass of the people wants a religion having for its aim morality in society, and, surely, as much as possible truth.

The ideal would be to take justice as a basis. But on earth there is none, and

some other artificial basis must be found. The conception of the *unknown* without that of an *afterdeath* . . . ! No!

Of the existing Churches the Protestantism of l'Abbé Poquesal is what I would prefer. But instead of taking the Bible, I would take a compendium of moral extracts of the wise men of all nations: Confucius, Christ, etc. I am not sufficiently acquainted with India to speak of it. All my morality would turn around these two phrases:

Do to others, Do what you would wish to be done to you: Love one another.

You see that after all I am a Christian. But really my convictions are not yet settled. Be it as it may, it is by the mother's education that there is possibility of doing something.

P. S.—Note the three sorts of justice: The posthumous justice of Christ at the time of the Resurrection; the posthumous justice of the Catholic faith for the survival of the individual soul; and justice on earth, are absolutely negative. The pantheism of Buddhism, monotheist or any other, does not imply any idea of justice. No, I see no basis for it save in equality or reciprocity of conduct; that reciprocity has no sanction except law and the policeman.

TOLSTOY'S PARTING WORD TO THE CLERGY.

Count Leo Tolstoy's excommunication has caused a considerable excitement all over the world, and Russian newspaper reports indicate that the old venerable reformer felt the sting of it considerably more than might have been expected. We are now in possession of Tolstoy's *Appeal to the Clergy*, translated into English by Mr. Maude and forwarded us through his friend, Mr. E. H. Crosby. Mr. Maude has translated the entire document, and we have selected from it the most significant and telling passages, those which are most characteristic of the whole, cutting it down to about one-third of the original. In going over the pages as they go to press we cannot help thinking that it is a most remarkable document. It is Tolstoy's parting word; he is serious about the matter he has to communicate and takes into consideration that he is "standing on the brink of his grave." There is no frivolity, no flippancy about Tolstoy; he is a deeply religious man and his *Appeal* deserves a hearing.

THE GREAT APOSTACY.

In Tolstoy's article, written in reply to the clergy of his Church, the State Church of Russia, we have a symptom of the fermentation that is agitating the religious world. The reader is apt to gain the impression that the Churches are full of hypocrites, but undoubtedly there are pious souls in the Greek Church, as well as in the Roman, Anglican, and Protestant Churches, but a change in our world-conception makes our religious institutions totter in their foundations. What will become of it?

Before us lies a little pamphlet¹ written by an Episcopalian clergyman, rector of a church in Pennsylvania, and his essay is a "voice crying in the wilderness," and representing in many respects the opposite pole to the sentiment of Tolstoy. The Rev. Thomas Scott Bacon is a pious orthodox Christian, who is perhaps little touched by the changes that are being wrought in the world. He is shocked at

¹*The Great Apostacy of the Twentieth Century.* Baltimore: The Sun Printing Office. 1903. Pp. 42.