

success of writing in another language than his own. It was Thackeray's ambition to write a novel in French; it has been Maartens's achievement to write novels in English. Although there is a good deal of literary activity in Holland, the audience of the Dutch writer is necessarily an extremely limited one, and it is, for the most part, an extremely conservative audience, averse to the free and daring treatment of social matters in which Maartens always indulges. The necessity of a freer air and the desire for a larger audience have led Maartens to choose another language than his own as a medium for his work. To a man less strong this might have been a dangerous experiment, but Maartens has not suffered by it; for in changing his language he has not expatriated himself intellectually, but has preserved intact the individual qualities of his mind and the atmosphere of the country of which he writes. It is fortunate for English readers that he has chosen English as the medium for communicating his ideas to the world, since they are able to read his books in the original, and are not compelled to receive them through the uncertain medium of a translation. It is not many months since *The Outlook* commented on Mr. Maartens's latest story, "God's Fool," emphasizing the force of its irony in contrast with the noble ideal implicit in the writer's mind, and expressed in the extraordinary personality of the hero of the story. The strength displayed in "God's Fool" was not unexpected to those who had followed Maartens's earlier work. "The Sin of Joost Avelingh," which appeared three or four years ago, made an immediate impression by reason of its virility, its unconventionality, and the vigor of characterization which ran through it. The trial scene in that story is one of the most powerful pieces of work in recent fiction. "An Old Maid's Love" was less forceful and more attractive; full of delicate sentiment, of sharp characterization, and, although dealing with a theme too common among Continental novelists, treating it throughout on the highest plane of purity.

The writer of these strong novels is a man of about thirty-seven years of age, of thorough education, recognized social position, and cultivated tastes. His literary gifts are disclosed not only in his novels, but in his conversation and his letters, and those who know him regard him as a man of singular force and charm. Although a native and resident of Holland, the fact that his novels are written in English prepares one for the statement that his tastes and affiliations have drawn him strongly toward England, and especially toward English literature. He has extensive acquaintance with other literatures, has traveled largely, and is familiar with work in his own department in all countries, but he inclines more strongly to the methods and spirit of English fiction than to those of any other school. This is the more remarkable because the influence of French fiction has been so pervasive that very few Continental writers have escaped it. It is no doubt due to his freedom from French influence that Maartens owes, in large measure, the independence of his literary position. He is part, and, indeed, a great part, of the literary movement in Holland; but he stands by himself, representing no school, allied to no coterie, and in strong antagonism to some of the more marked tendencies of his time. Readers of "Joost Avelingh" and "God's Fool" do not need to be told that Maartens is far removed in spirit and method from his contemporaries in Holland who call themselves Sensitivists, and whose view of life is so lacking in breadth and virility. Maartens concerns himself little with literary polemics, and confines the exposition of his literary ideas to the writing of his own books, and the stu-

dent of those books will not find it difficult to discern the man's ideals and to comprehend his methods.

"The Greater Glory," the first chapters of which appear in *The Outlook* this week, will, it is believed, surpass in depth and grasp all Mr. Maartens's earlier work. He has a very exacting ideal, and, as he is relieved from the necessity of writing for money, he has had the opportunity of putting forth his full strength under the most favorable conditions. It may be expected, therefore, that "The Greater Glory" will record a further advance, and will exhibit the growth of a man who holds himself resolutely to life with very searching insight, with a keen touch of irony, but with a very noble purpose. Those who are misled as to the nature and spirit of Maartens by his satiric quality will do well to remember the striking fable prefixed to "God's Fool:" "There was a man once—a satirist. In the natural course of time his friends slew him, and he died, and the people came and stood about his corpse. 'He treated the whole round world as his football,' they said, indignantly, 'and he kicked it.' The dead man opened one eye. 'But always toward the goal,' he said."



## Theology and Religion

We agree very largely with the letter of a correspondent on this subject in another column. Theology and religion are very closely related to each other. Creeds affect character and character affects creeds. The Scotchman makes the Calvinist and Calvinism makes the Scotchman. But creeds are not character; theology is not religion. Theology is an abstract science; religion is an applied art. Theology is the science of life; religion is the life itself. Religion is the experience of faith, hope, and love; theology is what men think about that life.

The difference between science and life in other departments is plain. Seasons came and went, summer followed spring, and autumn summer, when men believed in the Ptolemaic theory, exactly as they do now when men believe in the Copernican theory. The sunlight warms and cheers those who hold the atomic theory of light, those who hold the undulatory theory, and those who have no theory at all. It is true that the life of man is affected by his theories of that life as the life of nature is not; but it is also true that the life is more than the science. When men believed in Rousseau's Social Contract, they loved their country; and now that the Social Contract theory is exploded, they still love their country. Mothers who hold the utilitarian theory of ethics, mothers who hold the intuitive theory, and mothers who hold no theory, all love their children and serve them and suffer for them. It is impossible to doubt that Jonathan Edwards loved God with a singular purity and devotion, though in his sermons he sometimes portrayed a God impossible for us to love. It is a mistake to suppose that opinions are the only influences with which character is fashioned and life is guided. Men are both better and worse than their creeds. And if creeds sometimes produce life, life also produces the creed. Calvin's severe doctrine was born of Calvin's strenuous temperament. Channing's placid and sunny theology was the child of his sympathetic and sunny temperament. If we are as we think, it is still more true that we think as we are.

These distinctions are simple enough, but they have to be continually asserted, for men continually confound religion and theology—that is, life with what is thought about that life. Romanism does not tend to independence of thought, and Protestantism does; but some Romanists are more inde-

pendent than some Protestants. Some Unitarians have greater reverence for Christ than some Trinitarians. Calvinism is awe reduced to an intellectual system; but some men brought up under that system are without awe.

Now, the function of the ministry is not to produce theology, but to produce religion; and to use theology in producing religion. The end of preaching is not creed, but character; it is not a theory of divine sovereignty, but reverence toward God; not a theory of the freedom of the will, but a sense of personal responsibility; not a psychology of Jesus Christ, but a love for Christ and a following of Christ. Religion, we repeat, is an applied art—the art of living. If one is living a life of fidelity, of faith, of reverence, of hope, of love, he is not to imagine that he has lost his religion because he is compelled by a broader knowledge to recast his theology, nor even because, during that reconstruction period, he is without any theology. In our epoch all science is changing from the catastrophic to the evolutionary form; all creeds, religious and secular, are undergoing questioning; long-settled convictions are put back into the furnace and become molten that they may be recast in new molds. In such an epoch the first duty of the religious teacher is to make clear this distinction between religion and theology, life and science, character and creed, that those whom they teach may not lose, nor think they are losing, their religion because they have lost their old theology and have not yet found a new one.



## The Situation in France

A sudden tempest swept the French Chamber of Deputies on Thursday of last week, when M. Millevoye, a Boulangist Deputy, taking up the story published by "Cocarde," the Boulangist organ, declared that an agent of that paper had stolen from the French Embassy in Paris certain papers which convicted a number of prominent Frenchmen of having been engaged in treasonable schemes against the Republic. This statement brought into the Chamber the scandal which the Boulangist papers in Paris have lately been publishing, and which relates back to the extradition of Cornelius Herz. Herz, it will be remembered, has been ill in England, and the French Ministry have declared a number of times that they were taking steps to secure his extradition. The Boulangist journals charge that these alleged stolen documents bring to light promises to England on the part of a number of prominent men in public life that if extradition is refused and Herz kept in England, France will give England a free hand in Egypt; the motive of the French Government being to prevent the disclosures with regard to the Panama business which it is said Herz would be compelled to make if he were brought to Paris. Among the persons implicated by Millevoye in his charges were M. Clemenceau, M. Ribot, and a list of public men and newspapers that he declared to have been bribed by England. The documents on which these charges were based were mainly letters purporting to have been signed by the Secretary of the British Embassy some time ago. The speech of M. Millevoye produced the wildest excitement, but at the close, by a vote of 489 to 4, the Chamber condemned the documents as spurious. By subsequent confession the letters are barefaced forgeries.

Political flurries may be anticipated in France during the summer, the general conditions being favorable to the outbreak of short but violent storms. The great difficulty in the present campaign, as in many preceding political campaigns in France, is the absence of strongly organized and vigorously supported parties, having definite pro-

grammes and dividing the country along clearly recognized lines. Both the Republicans and the Conservatives of all shades are feeling the effects of the withdrawal from active issues of the question of the Republic itself. Heretofore the Republicans have been able to declare that the success of the Conservatives would endanger the safety of the Republic, as, for a great many years after our Civil War, the Republicans found political capital in a similar appeal to the country against the success of the Democrats. The most important factor in the present political campaign in France is the disappearance of this dangerous issue; a disappearance due to several causes, chief among them being the acceptance of the Republic by the Pope, and the practical disappearance of the old Monarchical party as the friend of the Church, and of the clerical opposition inside the Church. Nothing of late years has so confirmed and strengthened the Republic, or has borne such testimony to its permanency, as this action of the Pope, which at a blow destroyed the Monarchical party and turned the immense influence of the Roman Catholic Church to the support of existing institutions. The Monarchists had been demoralized even before this by the Boulangist adventure, which not only discredited the Conservative policy by revealing the fact that Conservative money had supported the cheap and shallow adventurer, but discredited all pretenders and adventurers of every kind. All parties are therefore compelled to frame their electoral programmes on the basis of the complete acceptance of the Republic by the whole body of the French people, and the result is great difficulty in framing issues which shall sharply define the differences between different groups.

At the present moment there are no French statesmen whose position gives them the authority once held by Ferry, and earlier by Gambetta. The present Premier, M. Depuy, is a respectable politician of a very light type intellectually. M. Goblet will endeavor to organize the Radicals into a homogeneous party, but the relation of the Radical party with the Socialists and the Anarchists is such that it is doubtful if it can frame a policy which can command any large support among French voters. What France needs at this moment is a strong Progressive Liberal party, which should combine all the Moderate Republicans, and announce a policy of financial and other reforms along sound lines. For the leadership of such a party there are several men who are well qualified; among them M. Constans, who is anxious to get the post, and who has recently made a vigorous speech for that purpose; and M. Ribot, who has proved himself a man of genuine political capacity, and whose reputation was not smirched by the Panama scandal. The memory of that scandal is the heaviest burden the Republicans will have to bear. They are no more corruptible than any other body of men in French public life, but they were in power, and it was to them, therefore, that the temptations of that vast and unscrupulous bribery were presented. The quietness and self-restraint of the French people during that severe crisis bore striking testimony to the advance of France in political education. In this campaign the people are so far silent, and it is idle to speculate with regard to their sentiments. Now that the question of the Republic itself is disposed of, the Conservatives have some hope of success from the fact that so many of their opponents are stained by complicity with the great scandal. The people are sore, indignant, and chagrined by the disgrace of that scandal, and it is very probable that they will strike every one connected with it who can be reached by popular vote; and this is about the only prediction that can be made with regard to the outcome of the elections.