

criticism <sup>that arose</sup> which ~~would have resulted~~ <sup>ever</sup> when such an event had occurred in Darwin's own day and was puzzled at the ~~changed tone of society~~.

I was interested to read an account of a university person who had met George Eliot when she spoke at his school. George Eliot is well known as the translator of German Rationalist works into English and as one who gave up all orthodox beliefs. Yet she had an attachment to ethical ideals of a type that is hard to understand in our day. The observer describes how she spoke about the great claims of "duty" and what a beautiful and vital thing "duty" was in life. She said she sounded like one of the sybils of old as she spoke. George Eliot's attitude was a result of the previous great influence of the Gospel and is hardly to be paralleled today.

The great forces of the evangelical movement had to a large extent spent itself before the beginning of the Victorian era. People were living in the society which had been molded by the Christian influences of the previous generation. Hardly an ecclesiastic would deny a fundamental doctrine of the Faith. Orthodox teaching was firmly established in people's minds <sup>but</sup> ~~by~~ its effect upon their hearts had decreased greatly and to many it was a thing of mere words without power. Multitudes were chafing at the restraints of the Victorian era and yearning to cast aside the shackles of inherited Christian standards. The rise of inchoate and unorganized unbelief is seen in the writings of Matthew Arnold and particularly of Clough, who felt as if faith had departed and longed in vain for something to take its place. Into this situation Darwinism came ready to meet the unconscious desire of many.