

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. XIII.

JULY, 1895.

No. 3.

[FOR CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.]

CONCERNING THE USE OF FAGOTS AT GENEVA.

BY LEONARD WOOLSEY BACON.

FAGOT is one of that large class of common words that grow familiar to Americans in literature, but the meaning of which is not distinctly realized to the senses till we go abroad. To make sensible acquaintance with commonplace objects that one has known from childhood only by name is one of the delights of travel, as much as the seeing of famous places and pictures and buildings; and I believe that it is partly because they have so much more of this to do, that Americans are, beyond other nations, enthusiastic and delighted travellers. Doubtless one would go farther to see Melrose by moonlight than to see a teakettle simmering on a hob; but after all, to the diligent reader of his Scott and his Dickens, there are many like elements of pleasure in the two sights; and I will not too hastily decide whether I have more daily pleasure from the vast white pyramid of Mont Blanc, that looks me in the face through my parlor windows,* and "clear, placid Leman," down the slope beneath me, and the gray mass of towers of the old cathedral to my right, than comes to me from the magpies that chase each other chattering across the lawn, and the primroses and tiny daisies that blossom along our path under favor of this mild February, and the tufts of legendary mistletoe that hang in the bare poplar tree, and the hedge-rows, from which the gardener is now busy in gathering store of good material for next winter's fagots.

Which brings me back again to fagots, where we started. The fagot is not, as I used vaguely to imagine, a mere indefinite bundle of fire-wood. There is logic in its constitution, as there has sometimes been, in the severest sense, logic in its application. First, there shall be a handful or two of small twigs, such as the trimmings of the hedges furnish in generous abundance; then a handful of bigger brush; and finally,

two, or at most three, stoutish sticks, to give solidity and respectability to the whole. These elements being brought together, then does the hedger cunningly lay about them a green and supple withe, and by some dexterous twist or double-hitch firmly bind them into one. With a few months' seasoning, the true and normal fagot becomes the ideally perfect commencement of a wood fire. A wisp of lighted paper, sometimes a mere match, is enough to start a combustion which matures, when properly sustained, into a solid mass of brands and coals. I often raise the question whether the enormous waste of small wood in all our forests, even those within easy reach of a market, might not be saved, and a fine opportunity of delightful employment given to workless city street-boys, if some one would only organize a phalanx of fagoteers for an expedition against the underbrush which is so often accounted a nuisance, but might so easily be converted into a blessing both to him that gives and him that takes.

It would astonish you to see in this woodless country, where coal is of easy access, how general is the dependence both for warmth and for cooking on wood fires; when, in New England, even farmers in little inland towns begin to feel that they cannot afford to burn wood on a hearth. If you were to ask me whence come the supplies on which the people here rely, I should refer you partly to the mountains, but rather to sundry lines of lopped and stumpy posts that intersect the landscape, bearing all over their wrinkled bark the scars of ancient wounds, and about their knobby heads, sometimes, chaplets of gay young sprouts, strangely in contrast with their aspect of venerable and bereaved old age. The Swiss woodman rarely ventures manfully to attack a tree at its trunk. He trims, he lops, he maims, he mutilates, and then he leaves the poor branchless, leafless stock to bring forth a new progeny for a renewed slaughter. Standing before one

* In revising this paper for its present use, the writer has not thought needful to wash out the "local color" that came into it by its being written at Geneva.

of these venerable boles, gnarled and hollowed out with age, yet making one more brave effort to put forth a growth of young branches, one is irresistibly reminded of some white-haired old "mammy" cherishing her last pickaninny of a grandchild, and telling the rueful story of two generations gone one by one to the auction-block. There is vast economy in this method, I am told. Managed with care, the mere shrubbery and ornamental trees on a gentleman's place can be made to yield his supply of fire-wood and hardly show any mark save that of judicious pruning. But oh! the ruthless cruelty of it as generally conducted! Hardly a tree in the canton of Geneva is suffered to grow in its natural shape; and the wide waste of reckless ruin around a charcoal pit on a Litchfield County hill-side is less sad than the double aisle of naked trunks of beech and oak that stand despairing in the hedge-rows between which I take my daily walk to town.

My fagot, as I find it waiting for me in the morning on my study hearth, sets me thinking on many things. I think of Roman lictors and their fasces; of "the good Lafontaine" and his fable teaching that union is strength; and as I strike a match, and the flame crackles through the twigs, and there is a smell as of a forest fire, and in a moment a fierce blaze shoots up the chimney, I think of Fox's "Book of Martyrs," and of Latimer, and Ridley, and others of whom the world was not worthy. For the fagot has been hallowed, like the cross, as the implement of death for religion's sake.

But most I am reminded of that October day, nearly three hundred and fifty years ago, when one of the first physicians of that time, and one of the greatest scholars of an age of great scholars, was brought out from the prison in which he had been shivering with cold and devoured by vermin, and led into the presence of the magistrates of Geneva to listen to this sentence:

"Having God and His Holy Scriptures before our eyes, and speaking in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, we do by this our final sentence, which we give herewith in writing, condemn thee, Michael Servetus, to be bound and led to the place called Champel, and there to be attached to a stake, and burned alive with thy book both in manuscript and in print, until thy body be reduced to ashes; and so shalt thou end thy days to give example to others who might commit the same crime."

The records do not inform us whether

the school-boys at Geneva had a half-holiday the next morning, when the procession started from the prison at the top of the city hill for the place of execution at Champel. The principal figure in the procession, Servetus, though suffering from disease, and haggard, no doubt, from his imprisonment and from mental anguish, was a man in the strength of his age—he was forty-four years old, having been born in the same year with John Calvin. By his side walked Farel, the friend of Calvin, exhorting him to confess and renounce his heresies; but he only declared that he suffered unjustly, and prayed God to have mercy on his accusers. "Whereupon," says Farel, "I said to him immediately: 'What, what! when you have committed the worst of sins, you justify yourself! If you go on so, I will leave you to God's judgments; I won't go with you another step! I had meant to stand by you till your last breath.' After that, he did not say anything more of the sort. He prayed: O God, save my soul! O Jesus, Son of God eternal, have mercy on me!' But," says Farel, "we could not make him confess Christ as eternal Son of God."

They came, at last, to the place called Champel. Few visitors at Geneva see the spot. The people are not proud to show it. It is on a hill-side to the south of the town, commanding a fair view of the broad valley of the Rhône, and of the ancient city. The precise place is now covered by a house; but I have met old people who remembered when it was known as the *Champ du Bourreau*—Hangman's Lot—and who say that when they were boys there was a little pit in the midst of it that they used to point out to one another as the place where the stake was planted. Here the pitiful procession halted. With much persuasion the victim was induced to commend himself to the prayers of the people. And when he had kneeled down and prayed, he stepped upon the fagots that were heaped about the stake, and was bound to it by a chain about the waist; his book was hung at his side; a wreath of leaves dusted over with brimstone was placed on his head; there was one loud cry as the executioner brought up the lighted torch; but that was the end of it. Some say the fagots were green; but then old Mr. Gaberel's History may be right, that this was out of humanity, so that the suffocating smoke might put the sufferer more quickly out of misery.

"That was the end of it," we said. It seemed to be the end of it. But somehow

this case of Servetus, in one shape or another, keeps coming into court over and over again from generation to generation. Generally, not to say always, it comes in the shape of a discussion of what sort of part it was that John Calvin had in the affair; and in this discussion a very needless amount of acrimony has been shown by some, who have seemed to think that the character of Calvin's theology, or of that great and splendid order of Christian churches of which he was the father, was somehow involved in the result. Let those on either side who have been discomposed by such a thought bear in mind that the discredit of whatever wrong Calvin may have done in this matter can fall only on those who accept and justify his course.

To defend Calvin for his course towards Servetus is no longer possible, in the light of the full array of evidence now accessible to every scholar. Something can be pleaded in mitigation. He was not, as is sometimes asserted, guilty of unfaithfulness to any principles of toleration of his own. Farel expressed his master's thought as well as his own in one of the letters to Calvin, in which he clamored for the death of the heretic. "Because the Pope condemns believers for the crime of heresy, because passionate judges inflict on the innocent the punishments which heretics deserve, it is absurd to conclude from this that the latter ought not to be put to death as a protection to the faithful. For my part, I have often declared myself ready to die, if I had taught anything contrary to sound doctrine, and that I should be worthy of the most dreadful punishment if I were to turn any from the true faith of Christ; and I cannot apply any different rule to other men." This point being established, the fatal conclusion followed; for it is impossible to dispute that Servetus was a heretic of an aggravated and dangerous type. He was no mere unbeliever, but a theologian intense in his convictions, with a plan for reconstructing theology, the church, and society, as set forth in his book of the "Restitutio Christianismi," or "Christianity Restored." And since he was a theologian of that period, it is needless to add that his manner of expressing his views was acrimonious and insulting to all antagonists, both Catholic and Protestant. Taking his career altogether, he does not appear to advantage in the figure of a martyr of free thought and fidelity to conviction, under which some would fain present him to us.

But admitting that according to the principles universally accepted in that age the execution of Servetus was justifiable, we are still far from any adequate vindication of the course pursued by Calvin in the affair. One of the latest contributions to the debate, and one of the fairest and most thorough, is to be found in Mr. Amédée Roget's *Histoire du Peuple de Genève*. Geneva is a very hive of busy antiquaries, among whom Mr. Roget is distinguished for his patient exactness. As a man of orthodox sympathies, he cannot be impeached of prejudice against Calvin. I think that his judgment in the case, delivered in view of important evidence that was not known to all his predecessors, is not likely to be reversed. Says Mr. Roget:

"The punishment of Servetus, considered in itself, leaves no very dark stigma on the reformer's character. But on moral principles that are the same in every age, Calvin stands condemned for having denounced Servetus to the Catholic Inquisition by the use of confidential papers, and for having delivered the unfortunate fugitive to the Geneva magistrates, when he was on his way to try his fortune in Italy. Granted that Calvin was in the line of his duty when he kept guard, in his way (which was the way of his age), for the security of the reformed churches. Had he any charge over the police of consciences in Catholic countries? Neither can we accept as natural, or compatible with a Christian spirit, the hard heart with which the reformer expresses himself to the end with regard to his rival, without so much as a moment's softening at the sight of the scaffold." *

* A still later volume contributed to the literature of this controversy is entitled "Servetus and Calvin: a Study of an Important Epoch in the Early History of the Reformation." By R. Willis, M.D., London. It is an interesting book; ambitious in style, and diligently prepared; but adds little to the work of previous authors, especially of Tollin, French pastor at Magdeburg, who has made Servetus his life-study. With the recent work of Mr. Roget, and with Pünjer's *De Michaelis Serveti Doctrina Commentatio*, Dr. Willis does not seem to have been acquainted. His volume is affected both by the *furor biographicus* and by the *odium theologicum*. It is not easy to make a first-class martyr to the truth, of a man who lied so easily under oath as Servetus, and who professed before the Inquisition his prompt readiness to renounce all his cherished convictions; and a cool judgment will decline to follow Dr. Willis in elevating him above Calvin and Luther as a theologian. Dr. Willis will be surprised to be accused of a theological spirit, having, doubtless, the prevailing impression that it is only Christian writers that are liable to this affection, and that disbelievers are necessarily safe from it. But his scornful ignorance of theological history and nomenclature betrays him into some strange blunders. The most remarkable of these is that of claiming for his hero the original invention of the "double sense of prophecy," which applies the words of the prophet primarily to a near event, and secondarily to a remoter one; and he illustrates this at much length from Servetus' edition of Pagnini's Bible, by instances which, he is sure, must have roused the orthodox rage of Calvin. If he had taken the pains

Let us make every concession that the case admits. Doubtless Calvin was seriously anxious to prevent the propagation of destructive error. Probably the case of Servetus was complicated with political plots for the overthrow of Calvin and his work. Certainly the reformer made some motion to procure the commutation of the penalty to a less dreadful form of death. We will try to believe, even, what he tried to make himself believe, that there was no spark of human vindictiveness in all his efforts to compass the death of the man with whom he had for years been exchanging every sort of acrimonious insult. This is about all that can be said. But against this we have before our eyes those fatal letters of Calvin's confidential friend, De Trie, which show the reformer in the act of furnishing the proofs to convict his antagonist before the cruel tribunal at Vienne, in France, and the sentence of that court predicated upon seventeen letters furnished by John Calvin, preacher at Geneva. We have that letter to Farel, of seven years before, in which, speaking of Servetus' offer to come on to Geneva, if Calvin wished, to discuss certain subjects with him, he says: "I shall make him no promises, for if he comes, and if I have any influence in the city, I shall see to it that he does not get out of it alive." We have Calvin's own avowal that the arrest of the furtive sojourner and the relentless prosecution that followed were of his instigation. We have the official record and Calvin's own version of the bitter, bitter wranglings between himself and the prisoner in the presence of the judges, and of his last interview with the condemned, on the eve of execution, in which he shows himself to the last the same fierce dogmatizer. And finally, we have his writing in self-vindication, when the dreadful scene was over, in which he taunts his dead adversary with not having formally restated, in the article of death, the doctrines for which he heroically perished, and seizes on his dying prayers as a proof that he had no sincerity in his opinions. It is in this same paper that he recites the appearance of Servetus, when his punishment was announced to him: "When the news was brought to him, he seemed at intervals like one

to turn to Calvin's Commentaries, he would have found these identical expositions given to many of the same texts! As to the principle which strikes him as so bold a novelty in Servetus, he will find it as far back as Theodoret of Mopsuestia, not to say as far back as the Apostolic Fathers. Theology may be a very unworthy study, but after, all it is well to know something about it before undertaking to write on theological subjects. Dr. Willis' slip-up on such a matter as this tends to discredit that splendid air of omniscience with which he sweeps away all remaining doubt as (for instance) to the date of the prophets, and the authorship of the fourth gospel.

stunned. Then he sighed so that the whole room resounded. Anon, he began to howl like a mad man. In short, he had no more composure than one possessed. Towards the end he got to crying so that he beat his breast incessantly, bellowing, in his Spanish fashion, '*Misericordia! misericordia!*'" Through all these dismal documents, not one syllable of tenderness or human pity, unless it is in that letter to Farel, of the 20th of August, in which he says: "I hope he will be sentenced to death, but I wish that they may mitigate the horror of his punishment."

The prevailing motive that impelled the burning of Servetus was not less honorable than that which stirred in the bosoms of Caiaphas and the Sanhedrim on an occasion not in all respects unlike: "It is expedient that one man die for the people." Here was a golden opportunity for vindicating the reformed churches from that reproach of latitudinarianism that was thrown upon them by the Catholics. Thus wrote the pastors of Zurich when officially consulted on the matter by the Geneva magistrates: "We think it needful to show great rigor against him, and all the more as our churches are decried, in distant parts, as heretical, or as lending protection to heretics. Divine Providence now offers an opportunity to purge yourselves, and us at the same time, of an unjust accusation." It is a curious fact, repeatedly illustrated in ecclesiastical history, that persecuted heretics commonly seek to vindicate themselves from the charge of heresy by persecuting other heretics still more heretical. In the present case the fact has a double illustration; for among those who have given their strong approbation to the execution of Servetus is the most unexpected name of Dr. Jerome Bolsec, who had been hunted out of Geneva in peril of his life by the same John Calvin, for his unsoundness on predestination. He attempts to settle this account with his adversary by a "Life of Calvin" which is the reverse of a panegyric. But he protests therein: "I do not write these things out of any displeasure at the death of such a monstrous and stinking heretic as Servetus; I wish that all his like were exterminated and the church of our Lord well purged of such vermin."

This name of Bolsec brings to mind the story of his trial, the documents of which have lately been printed in full by another Geneva antiquary, Mr. Henry Fazy, and prove that the austere severity of Calvin in the case of Servetus was no solitary lapse under unwonted temptation, for his

pursuit of Bolsec, if less fatal in its result, was not less truculent.

A century and a half ago, that malicious wit, Voltaire, who never knew how to do a generous thing without mixing it with a malignant stab at somebody, paraded the Servetus story in its worst light, by way of exhibiting Protestants as equally intolerant with Catholics. One of the most eminent of the Geneva pastors, Vernet, set himself to the task of refutation, and made application to the city council for access to the official documents, which at that time were under lock and key. He was surprised at the delays and discouragements which he encountered. The syndic Calandrini advised him that silence seemed wiser than anything that could be said. Vernet begged that at least three questions which he wished to put might be answered from the documents, and pressed his petition with some importunity. He received at last a letter from the syndic, of which he could not complain as wanting in explicitness. It ran on this wise: "The council considers it important that the criminal procedure against Servetus should not be made public, and does not wish it to be communicated to any person whatever, either in whole or in part. The conduct of Calvin and of the council was such that we wish it to be buried in profound oblivion. There is no defence for Calvin. Plead the state of your health in excuse for dropping a work which will either be damaging to religion, to the Reformation, and to the good fame of Geneva, or will be very unfaithful to the truth."

More than a century has gone by, and the archives of Geneva, and many a sorrowful document besides, are now accessible to every comer. But the advice of Syndic Calandrini to any one who would attempt the vindication, on this head, of the otherwise illustrious memory of Calvin, is as good advice to-day as it was then.

[FOR CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.]

WHAT SHOULD THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH BE TOWARDS EVOLUTION AS A WORKING THEORY OF THE UNIVERSE?

BY THE REV. GIDEON J. BURTON, M.A.

THERE was a time when men of science exhibited a personal hostility towards Christian scholars. The fault lay perhaps as much with the theologian as with the scientist. The leaders of religious thought were too much opposed to scientific investi-

gations, and scientific men were too radical and too positive in their conclusions. That time is fast passing away. No modern theologian can close his eyes to the startling revelations which have been made in recent years by scientific men. And he is bound to acknowledge that many of their conclusions may possibly be true. These conclusions he cannot affirm or deny, because the facts are not before him at first hand. The inferences from these facts may appear to him to still require proof. I think they do, and it may take centuries to decide some of them.

It has been said that the characteristic temper of the thinkers of our time is "suspense of judgment." Prof. Osborne, of Columbia College, at a meeting of American naturalists in Baltimore, in December last, said: "It seems best to consider that we are on the threshold of the Evolutionary Problem and to take an entirely agnostic or doubtful position as to all the prevalent theories and press forward to the search for laws which may not be forthcoming until the next century."

What shall we do in the meantime? "What should be the attitude of the Church towards evolution as a working theory of the universe?" I want to premise that by "the Church" in what I shall say I mean churchmen, the clergy and laity as individuals. The Church in its corporate capacity has, I think, no more to do with scientific theories than Holy Scripture has, and it scrupulously avoids them. If she had taken neither side in the time of Galileo, adopted neither the Ptolemaic or Copernican system of astronomy, she would not have stultified herself, as she did in the eyes of all subsequent generations. It seems to me that the proper course for us to assume, for the sake of argument, is that the conclusions of science are true, and inquire what these conclusions amount to; what effect, if any, their establishment would have upon the doctrines of Christianity; to what extent they would change or modify our ideas of God's working in nature; and if we find, which I think we will, that if fully proven, they would not militate against the faith, the Church can afford to wait, assured that no amount of discovery in the field of evolution can dispense with the necessity of an Almighty and ever-present Creator.

The most venerable theological writers, like Sts. Augustine, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Thomas Aquinas, and Cornelius à Lapide accepted a doctrine which, without any violence to language, may be called a theory of evolution. The theory of evolution as a

method of creation, which is all that its advocates claim, is not inconsistent with Holy Scripture and the teachings of the Church, and is accepted by the most orthodox modern theologians. Says the late Dr. McCosh: "I have been defending evolution, but in doing so, have given the proper account of it as the method of God's procedure, and find that when it is so understood, it is in no way inconsistent with Scripture." And Dr. Pusey wrote: "What are we that we should object to any mode of creation as unbecoming our Creator?" And speaking of the origin of species, and the struggle for existence, says: "These questions have no bearing whatever upon theology." If time would permit, I could quote many others. Let me give you the view of the theory of the process of creation as held by evolutionists of our day and considered most in harmony with modern knowledge. To prove that this view is not too conservative, I will say that it is taken from the *Outlook* edited by Dr. Lyman Abbott.

"The present organic world is the product of an evolution, but this evolution is the deliberate method of a Divine Intelligence.

"God made the body of man out of dust, though not instantaneously, but by a long evolutionary process. God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life—a spiritual life, a new thing not breathed into the animals over which dominion was given to man, and this new endowment of spirit to mankind is itself capable of a long evolution until man shall reach the ideal revealed to us by God through the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Says Canon MacColl, in his recent work, "Life Here and Hereafter": "The Christian need have no hesitation in accepting, within reasonable bounds, the doctrine of evolution, viz., that all forms of life have been developed from a few primordial germs in an ascending scale until man appeared as the apex, and, in a manner, the recapitulation of the process. I do not say that evolution, as thus stated, is absolutely proved as a fact, but the balance of evidence is so much that way that we had better look the doctrine fairly in the face, and ask ourselves whether there is anything in it calculated to shake our faith in the creed of Christendom. So far as I have stated it, there is nothing that conflicts with the Christian faith."

The theory of the evolution of the body of man from a lower animal order, it seems to me, is not a question of much religious signification. Dr. McCosh, late president

of Princeton College, wrote: "If any one asks me if I believe man's body to have come from a brute I answer that I do not know." Prof. Orban, of the Roman Catholic University at Washington, writes: "Did the Creator make choice of a living body already existing, to raise it up to the dignity of a human soul made in His own image? I do not know. I would consider it a question open to free discussion," and goes on to show that it is not inconsistent with the account of man's creation in the book of Genesis.

Again, are we to accept the theory of extreme evolutionists like Le Conte and Drummond, that the higher nature of man was developed out of the lower animal instincts? That is a question, too, for science, not religion, and we may leave it for science to determine. The learned Bishop of Ripon, Boyd Carpenter, says: "There are many who feel an immense dread of such a theory as this, . . . it seems to them fatal to the very life of religion. But there is no need," he continues, "to be afraid of truth, and if it can be shown that they are *evolved*, it is the part of religious and reasonable men to accept it. It is of course far from true that this has been proved, but if it were proved it would leave the first germ of conscience unexplained, for the theory of evolution is a theory of method, not a theory of origin."

I deprecate the spirit which is still manifested in some quarters against scientific men. As has been well said by a recent writer: "They are accused of falsifying the verities of God, because they have corrected our common acceptance of facts by the sacred standard of God in nature." Again he says: "Abusing your opponent is not answering him. Gibbeting them in public speeches and consigning them to perdition is not the way to convert them. The result has been to turn them into railers and accusers, and the penalty has been agnosticism." H. Spencer says in a letter to Dr. Janes: "I have had to rebut the charge of materialism times too numerous to mention, and I have now given it up. It is impossible to give more emphatic denial or assign more conclusive proof than I have repeatedly done, as you know. My antagonists (they are Christians) must continue to vilify me as they please. I cannot prevent them." Says Professor Fiske, notwithstanding some excusable bitterness: "Defenders of the established creed persistently ascribe to their antagonists views which they do not hold, and thus furnish themselves with weapons of offence."

It seems to me there are two ways of looking at the views of scientists, as there are of looking at the opinions of others from whom we may differ, viz., to select the points in which we agree, or those in which we disagree. I prefer the former. We gain nothing by calling them names—materialists, agnostics, etc.—instead of hailing with pleasure any approach which such men as Spencer, Hæckel, Romanes, and Huxley may make to the doctrines of Revelation. A recent Christian writer taunts them with not being able to get along without using Christian terms and Christian phraseology, as “the *purpose* of this,” “the *object* of that,” and “the *design* of the other.” I rejoice that these men, who began with the idea of turning God out of His own universe, are coming to see that they cannot do without an “unseen, inscrutable and intelligent Power behind all phenomena.” Let them call it what they please, if they mean the same as we do by what we call God. I rejoice to know that there is a way of proving the existence of God outside of Revelation, and by a purely scientific process; and if we will treat the scientists in a Christ-like spirit, and patiently wait for the final results of their investigations, I believe they will redound to the greater glory of God. Prof. Max Müller says in a recent article in the *Nineteenth Century*: “There is a power that manifests itself in the whole universe. Call that Power the Father, or call it a person, and you will neither gain nor lose anything.” Scientists are, I believe, working back to Revelation. They are adopting its teachings, although they still try to account for many things by natural causes. One says, “We see in nature the influence of a free will, teaching us that all living things depend on an everlasting Creator and Ruler.” And let me quote further the most recent views of Max Müller, an avowed evolutionist. “I cannot help discovering in nature an all-pervading causality or reason for everything. Accident has been dethroned in all scientific studies, and neither natural selection nor struggle for life, nor the influence of environment or any other aliases will account for the *λογος* the thought which with its thousands of eyes looks at us through the transparent curtain of nature. We can no longer say that in the beginning there was protoplasm, and that the whole world was evolved from it by purely mechanical or external agencies. I cannot help seeing order, law, reason, or *λογος* in the world, and I cannot account for it by *ex post* events, call them what you like—survival of the fittest,

natural selection, or anything else.” H. Spencer says, “All science leads at last to the mystery with which all religion begins.” “The Supreme and Everlasting Power, which religion calls God, is the Eternal and Inscrutable Energy which science finds at the back of its widest generalizations, and beneath its deepest investigations.” “The absolute certainty that we are ever in the presence of an Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed.” Prof. Tyndall said: “It is no departure from the scientific method to place behind natural phenomena a Universal Father, who, in answer to the prayers of His children, changes the currents of phenomena.”

It has just been announced by Canon Gore that Prof. Romanes, at one time a radical evolutionist, had become increasingly occupied with religious problems, and the last ten years of his life was slowly passing from the position of a rigid Agnostic, almost materialism, into the full communion of the Church, in which at last, with intellectual faculties unimpaired, he peacefully died.* If there were more theologians like Canon Gore and the late Canon Aubrey Moore, and Canon MacColl, there would be fewer Agnostic scientists.

Any one who compares the views of evolutionists of the present day with those of fifteen or twenty years ago cannot fail to see, how unconsciously it may be, they are groping their way back to the doctrines of Christianity. They are giving up one by one their old atheistic and deistic doctrines of spontaneous generation, the eternity of matter, denial of causation, or teleology, and even doubting the truth of natural selection. The pendulum which swung to the extreme of radicalism is now rebounding. Let us take heed that we do not stop the rebound by harsh names, obstinacy and uncharitableness.

Even his own friends fear that Prof. Huxley has practically surrendered the claims of evolution in its higher fields of ethics and sociology. And Dr. Janes, a radical evolutionist, mourning over Huxley's pessimistic views, says: “The strictly logical affirmation and scientific conception of a reality immanent in all phenomena, inconceivable indeed in its essential nature, because of the limitation of our knowing faculties, but the existence and potency of which constitutes the most certain of all our knowledge”; and adds, “the development of moral power, an ever-deepening

* His thoughts on religion had not been published when this article was written.

moral consciousness through the conflict with evil, is the lesson of evolutionary ethics."

Nine years ago Phillips Brooks, with his marvellous insight, saw the turning of the tide, and in an essay on the New Theism says: "There are indications more or less clear that the scientific and philosophical systems, whose stately building we have all been watching with the profoundest interest, are at last becoming ready for the thought of God, and are beginning to claim it. That there is such a turning" he says, "there can be no doubt," and with his big, warm heart he was ready to welcome the wanderers back.

One of the most striking admissions of modern science is that recently made by the Marquis of Salisbury, president of one of the most important and advanced scientific bodies in the world, the British Association for the Advancement of Science, which shows that the belief in the theory of Natural Selection is weakening, and he frankly admits that, if it is rejected, there is no alternative but "to fall back on the mediate or immediate agency of Intelligent Design." H. Spencer has also recently written an article on the Inadequacy of Natural Selection. While Prof. Weismann, a most radical evolutionist, in a recent paper says, "We must assume Natural Selection because there is no other way of explaining the adaptation of organisms without assuming the help of a principle of design." If scientific men one after another acknowledge the inadequacy of Natural Selection, it may be but a short time before the doctrine of Creative Personality will be universally accepted.

Listen to the words of John Fiske: "The existence of God—the supreme truth asserted by Christianity and inferior historic religions—is asserted with equal emphasis by that Cosmic philosophy which seeks its *data* in science alone. Evolution teaches us to realize more vividly than theology can teach us to realize the utter absurdity of Atheism. It has made Atheism forever impossible." And again: "From birth until death we are dependent on a power to whose eternal decrees we must submit, to whose dispensations we must resign ourselves, and upon whose constancy we may implicitly rely. It is scientific inquiry, working quite independently of theology, which has led us to the conclusion that all the dynamic phenomena of nature constitute but the multiform revelation of an omnipresent Power that is not identifiable with nature." And the

late Canon Liddon has declared that: "To assert God's presence in his works while refusing to identify Him with them is but to repeat the teaching of the great theologians of the undivided Church."

I will adduce but one more proof of my position that there is a decided reaction towards religion among scientific men. M. Brunetiere has published an article in the *Revue des deux Mondes* on the "Bankruptcy of Science," which is having a great run in France. His position is that science is *bankrupt* in the sense that it has failed to satisfy what is in the nature of man, or to explain the mystery that surrounds him. The *London Saturday Review*, in commenting on it, says: "A free-thought attitude among students even when it was not sincere, used to be a successful pose, because it was *à la mode* in the Latin Quarter. The same cannot be said now. The youth of the schools have not grown pious, but Auguste Comte, Renan and Darwin have lost the hold that they had on the students, and their increasing 'mysticism' is noted with pain and disgust by the sceptics who were born earlier in the century. Several writers of note could be named who, from being the thorough-going materialists that they were some ten or fifteen years ago, have with steadily increasing boldness been reaching towards an idealism that is *almost* if not quite *religious*." "A change is passing over science no less than literature," says a very recent reviewer of "Professor Huxley's Creed," "a new spirit and wider views towards which men are moving, as they realize how inadequate is the materialism of the Comtes, Haeckels, etc." Tyndall, Huxley and H. Spencer protest against being classed with the materialistic school, which they say has no claim to rank with the great schools of philosophy.

"It may be a long way off, but the time is surely coming when the scientific world will be most forward to do homage to the Lord of all power and might. There are many signs of it, and the great men who now stand professedly in the ranks of the agnostics cannot at times conceal the unsoundness of their footing," said a speaker at the last Church Congress.*

I wish there was time to show you in their own words how keenly such men as Fiske, Herbert Spencer and the higher class of scientists have felt the hostile attitude of the majority of Christian writers.

* Prof. Fiske writes to the author, "The reaction against materialism, etc., to which you allude is unmistakable."

I would like to give the scientists fair play, which they have not always had. "Scientific writers," as one of them says, "are accused of holding opinions which they not only do *not hold*, but against which they have publicly protested. Devotion to time-hallowed tradition is liable to be accompanied by a lofty disregard for accuracy of statement, which to the scientific inquirer seems so indispensable."

I believe that if the doctrine of evolution, the evolution of the body, the mind and conscience should prove to be true, it would not destroy or change the Christian faith. It might change the way of explaining or accounting for facts, but would not change the facts themselves. It would have no more effect upon Christianity than the acceptance of the discoveries of Galileo and Giordano Bruno had.

Before closing I want to point out some of the benefits which, I think, we have derived from the recent discoveries of science. I speak not as a scientific man, but as one who hopes that the aid which science has given him may be useful to others.

1. Let us take the Divine Immanence. So prominent has this doctrine become, that a writer already referred to says: "The sum total of what scientific men would have us believe is, after all, the Immanence of God." It is surprising what fear some Christians have that this doctrine will lead to Pantheism. It is utterly opposed to Pantheism. Says Prof. Fiske: "From first to last it has been implied that while the universe is the manifestation of Deity, yet is Deity something more than the universe. Once really adopt the conception of an omnipresent God, without whose notice 'not even a sparrow falleth to the ground,' and it becomes evident that the law of gravity is but an expression of a particular mode of Divine action, and what is true of this law is true of all laws."

By the Divine Immanence I understand that God is not outside His creation, but immanent or abiding in it, though personally distinct from it; not limited by it, but infinitely transcending it.* It is the Scriptural idea contained in the words of St. Paul: "God is all and in all"; "Christ in whom are all things"; "In Him we live, and move, and have our being." It corrects the old Deistic conception of God which has influenced the Christian world for many generations. We no longer think of God as a great Creator

who in six days made the heavens and the earth and rested on the seventh day from all His works, and since then has been sitting on His distant throne watching this planet wheel around in space, occasionally sending His angels from the distant heavens to watch over and guard His people; at last sending His only Son to live among men for three and thirty years, who, when He had accomplished our redemption, returned to His far-off throne; but we think of Him as being very near us, even within our souls, manifesting Himself in all His works; that what we call natural laws are but His working; that He has come into human life in the person of the Logos, His only-begotten Son, and is gradually filling humanity with Himself. I now understand as I never did before how He can dwell in us and we in Him. I no longer have to try to lift my thoughts and send my prayers to the great central sun around which the old astronomers thought all other suns revolved, which was God's throne, for I know that He is in my very soul, so close, as one has said, that He cannot be called near.

Again, take the Antiquity of Man. Geology finds him existing at a date immensely earlier than was once supposed. Biology has added the conjecture that his physical form at least was developed from some lower animal form, and this would necessitate a still earlier date for his appearance. Some think that the age of the earth can be approximately calculated, and that it falls far short of the demands made upon it by the extreme evolutionists. But suppose the geologist does want a million years for the evolution of the earth, and the biologist a million more for the evolution of man, what are millions of years to Him who is from everlasting to everlasting? Does it not help us better to understand the eternity of God? Does it not give us a far more exalted idea of the great Creator, carrying on the work of creation, as our Saviour says, "My Father worketh hitherto," than to think of Him as in eternal rest, contemplating His own perfections? Does it not increase our reverence and admiration of His wisdom and power so that we are ready to fall down and worship Him and say, "Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty."

Is the theory of evolution inconsistent with the spiritual consciousness of man, his consciousness of a divine life which makes him more than an animal and links him with God? I do not think so. The picture of the slow evolution of man, which science has enrolled, in no way affects his

* "He is infinitely above and beyond, while potentially within all things. In God there is absolute transcendence of substance, while there is in the world the immanence of His efficiency."—Bishop McLaren.

spiritual nature. It may modify our view of the method which God has pursued in the development of that nature, but it contains nothing to shake our belief in its reality.

Nor does it militate against the doctrine of the Fall of Man. The moral and spiritual degeneration of races is an important fact in history. Says Prof. Lankester: "The traditional history of mankind furnishes us with notable examples of degeneration. Many savage races, as we at present know them, are actually degenerate, and are descended from ancestors possessed of a relatively elaborate civilization. Degeneration has a very large share in the explanation of the most barbarous races, such as the Fuegians, Bushmen, and even the Australians. They exhibit evidences of being descended from ancestors more cultivated than themselves." If evidences of degeneration are spread so widely over the world, there is not a very solid basis for an argument from evolution against degeneracy in the race and so of the Fall of Man.

And how has evolution affected the doctrine of Teleology, or the Argument from Design? It has greatly enlarged and strengthened it. Dr. Iverach, author of a work on "Christianity and Evolution," admits that Prof. Huxley has proved that the intelligence which was needed to produce a watch which evolved other watches, is immensely greater than that of Paley's watchmaker. He admits that "no one ever strengthened the argument from design as Darwin has done. Evolution," he says, "has widened it beyond measure, and the universe, its history and its order are seen to be worthy of a presiding and guiding Intelligence even of an infinite order."

Modern science teaches us to believe that "insects, animals and birds were made for their own pleasure and enjoyment, irrespective of any use or benefit to man," that "the leaf and the flower and the fruit and the animal's joy in existence are at the same time ends in themselves, and yet minister to other ends"; and so while correcting, in some respects, it has enriched and emphasized the evidences of design.

Evolution throws much light upon the mystery of pain and suffering. It claims a place for them in the *order*, not in the *disorder*, of the universe. It shows that they have always been necessary for the higher development of our race. "Without the shadows, no beauty of landscape or human countenance; without the dark shad-

ows of sin and suffering, no moral beauty, no ethical advancement," says one of the most decided evolutionists. "Suffering is the badge of all the tribe of sentient things. It is no accidental accompaniment but an essential constituent of the cosmical process," says Huxley. This agrees with St. Paul's declaration that all creation is groaning under the pains and struggles to a higher life. The teaching of Christianity and the theory of evolution are the same "Perfection through suffering."—Rom. viii. 18; II. Cor. iv. 17; Heb. v. 8.

What has all this to do with the "attitude of the Church," or churchmen, as I take it, towards evolution? I think, very much. We should have at least a *friendly* attitude towards it. We should have our minds open to conviction, ready to accept truth from whatever source it may come, glad to receive any light which may be thrown upon the great problem of the universe. The truths of Revelation and the doctrines of science, when properly established, cannot come into conflict. Both have God for their author.

I will close with two quotations: the first is from Prof. Fiske, an avowed Evolutionist: "The doctrine of Evolution makes God our constant refuge and support, and nature His true revelation; and when all its religious complications shall have been set forth, it will be seen to be the most potent ally that Christianity has ever had in elevating mankind." The other extract is from Dr. Iverach, who does not seem to have much love for Evolutionists: "What is essential is that we maintain and vindicate the continued dependence of all creation on its Maker, and that if things are made so as to make themselves, God is their Maker after all, and if evolution can tell us anything of the method of creation, and the order in which the different forms of life appeared, then we ought to rejoice in it."

THE CONTINUITY OF LIFE.

BY JOHN WATSON, M.A.

From *The Expositor* (London), May, 1895.

WHEN William Blake, the painter-poet, lay dying, "he said he was going to that country he had all his life wished to see," and just before he died "he burst into singing of the things he saw." It was the passion of a saint, whose heart had long been lifted above the present world; it was the vision of a mystic, whose imagination had long been exercised on the world to come.