

the Incarnation.—Mr. Drummond, avowedly a Christian, gives in his adherence to what even Huxley confesses is a mere Hypothesis!—Mr. Drummond has fallen from grace; I have lost all faith in him!"

Of course (as indicated by the dashes) he did not say all this continuously: I ventured to put in a remark here and there, though with the utmost caution. Now, my interviewer was a scholar and a man of culture; he was not of my own communion, but a Scot by birth and a co-religionist of Professor Drummond's. I quote his expressions, not because they were peculiar to himself, but because I am certain they voice the sentiments of very many religious people, who, after having been charmed and edified by the Professor's previous utterances, felt a shock and a revulsion of feeling when they read this last book and discovered him to be a thorough-going evolutionist. But they need not have been surprised if they had fully appreciated his first popular work.

At the time that "Natural Law in the Spiritual World" appeared, there was much uneasiness in the air concerning the conflict between religion and science; and many men's hearts were failing them for fear lest these new departures should unsettle the Faith. But when they found that a learned Professor of Physics had written a work which combined science and piety, these good souls felt relieved; the very title of the book caught the fancy, which the charm of its style riveted. Everybody read it and was delighted; everybody breathed a sigh of relief to think that among the very experts of science a doughty champion had "come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty."

But among all the people—godly men and devout women—who read that book, and quoted it, and hugged it with rapture, there were very few, it seemed to me, who detected that its author was propounding therein the principles of this so-much-dreaded "Evolution." One old gentleman of my acquaintance, who was somewhat of a *litterateur*, and, therefore, of course, deemed himself a competent judge on all matters theological, was specially jubilant. "Here is the book that puts to the rout all these scientific agnostics! Here is a Christian Professor of Science who can quote Huxley to confute Huxley, and makes Darwin overthrow Darwin, and Herbert Spencer disprove Herbert Spencer!"—and so on. When I ventured to suggest that the brilliant author was himself an evolutionist, the old gentleman looked at me, at first with astonishment and then with dubiousness, evidently making up his mind that I myself was not "sound."

About the same time I wrote a letter to THE WEEK (it appeared in the issue of 3rd September, 1885) in which I expressed the opinion, drawn from his own words, that Mr. Drummond's religious views were undergoing metamorphosis and hoped that in time those views would be enlarged into what we High Anglicans call the "Catholic" aspect of Christianity. I feel proud of that letter now; as proud as a weather-prophet when one of his predictions happens to be verified; as proud as a man always feels when he can say: "I told you so!" For this expansion of Prof. Drummond's spiritual outlook has taken place; it is evidenced by his delightful booklet, "The Programme of Christianity."

To make my meaning clear, let me state that there are two divergent lines of Christian thought which I will call—not invidiously but for convenience—the Puritan and the Catholic. The "Puritan" conceives of Christ as having come into the world to save from future suffering (by taking upon Himself their burden) a certain elect few of whom he is one. The "Catholic" dwells rather on the conception of Christ as having come into the world to save mankind at large from suffering both here and hereafter, and effecting this purpose "not only by working in them personal religion, but by joining them together in a body, or family, or kingdom, or church." (Sadler's "Church Doctrine Bible Truth.")

Hence the "Puritan" conception of Christianity is essentially individualistic, egoistic; the "Catholic" mainly collectivist and altruistic. Of course, as in the natural world, the egoistic emotion must first arise, as "The Data of Ethics" has shown; or, as "The Ascent of Man" puts it, nutrition must come before reproduction. The Puritan's dominant thought is expressed in the burden of one of his favourite hymns:

"I am so glad that Jesus loves ME."

But the mind which rests content with this egoistic sentiment shows a case of "Arrested Development" in the spiritual world. The more altruistic one becomes the more he will value

the collectivist or "Church" idea of corporate Christianity, and the less altruistic and the more egoistic he becomes (for there is "Degeneracy" and "Atavism" in the spiritual world too) the more ruthlessly he views the breaking up of the corporate unity of the church. I suppose we have all heard the story of the old Scottish couple who separated from this communion and that, not finding any to their liking, until at last they formed "a wee kirk o' their ain." When someone asked the old lady: "Do you think you and your husband are the only two in all this town who will be saved?" she replied: "A weel, I hae ma doots about Jock!"

Now let any one study "Natural Law in the Spiritual World" and notice the utter absence of the "church" idea therein. Let him take, for instance, the chapter on "Growth" and see the "believer" after the Puritan ideal, growing without effort in the "effectual calling" which came to him without desert, and viewing with calm and indolent self-complacency his own "assurance," while all around are rotting in "total depravity." And then, by contrast, let him take up the charming little essay, "The Programme of Christianity," published seven years afterwards, which so lucidly sets forth the "church" idea and he will see how Mr. Drummond has enlarged his view of the spiritual world.

But still the question recurs: How can men hold the doctrines of Christianity along with those of evolution, as Professor Drummond seems to do? This is the question which perplexed my friend who interviewed me, and which, I am sure, perplexes very many thinkers in his denomination and in mine, and I presume in others also. To put it in his own terse way: "What place is there for the incarnation in the scheme of evolution?" I did not answer the question at the time. I was "diplomatic," as I said before; but this is a question that all theologians have got to face. To ignore the wide-spreading acceptance of evolution, to act as if nobody of any account held it and to go on preaching platitudes, is an ostrich-like policy. To fancy that the "Hypothesis," as they love to call it, is becoming discredited, or dying for want of verification, is a fond dream of some divines who have not kept pace with modern investigation, which dream "The Ascent of Man" will do much to dispel. If theologians insist on the premise, "evolution is contrary to Christianity," of course it is their business to oppose evolution; but a vast number of thinkers will only conclude: "Then so much the worse for Christianity."

My answer to my friend would have been, if it had been timely: "I can find no place for the Puritan idea of the Incarnation in the scheme of evolution; but on Catholic lines it fits in admirably; and this is the teaching of that book so much discussed, so little understood, so bewildering to many, "Lux Mundi."

"Ah!" will say the agnostic or skeptical reasoner "you so-called 'Catholics' have a protean kind of theology. You can adapt your faith to suit all circumstances and conditions. Your Elizabethan compromise, as the Church of England has been called, can, like the coat of the Jewish pedlar, be made to fit any customer by giving it a twitch here, and a pull there, and a tuck somewhere else." I have heard and I have read such expressions concerning the Anglican Church many times. I have only to reply: "Softly, my friend, softly: you confound theology and faith." I must ponder on this later on. In the meantime let me say: the Catholic faith deals with certain facts; theology with the rationale of those facts. The why and wherefore are fit subjects for theological speculation; the fact remains as the object of the Christian's faith; and that fact is, "The Word was made Flesh." "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners."

GEO. J. LOW.

* * *

Genius: in Science, Literature, and Art.

GENIUS is a term derived from the words *gignere in, ingenium, quasi ingenitum*, to engender or produce in us. It follows the sublime reason that steadily pursues the Supreme Being, to seek and discover His procedure in the universe. No one appreciates the power of reality, but by employing or imitating the resources of nature: but by studying her ways and observing her affinities. Genius interrogates the laws of nature; by them she unveils to our view, and the soul receives the mould and impress to organize in its turn.

The profound secrets of the human heart in morals and