thropic progress; then, on the other hand, there are those who have approached this problem of the universe using the same method, or that of free inquiry and free observation, taking in all the facts, and then trying to work out a philosophical theory that shall explain all the facts and suit them. And it so happens that this morning we are to have both of these classes of minds contributed to the Free Religious movement spoken for. A year ago, at our convention, reference was briefly made (all too briefly for the need) to two recent deaths,—the death of Mr. White Emerson, and the death of Mr. Darwin,—two men who represented pre-eminentely these two classes of minds that I have spoken of, two men who, perhaps more than any other, could be named, had been instrumental in producing the Free Religious movement. To-day, we are to take a larger opportunity, give more adequate room for speaking of these men and of their contributions to the cause of freedom of thought, of social freedom, and of freedom in religion; and we are very happy in having us to introduce that subject one who has always been welcome on the platform of the Free Religious Association, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, and who would have come here last year to speak particularly, but sickness prevented. This year, he is here, and will introduce the more important subject, including, however, in his address to-day not only Emerson, but Darwin; and his address will be founded on the two factors, the Emerson side and the Darwin side, in the Free Religious movement. I have now the great pleasure of introducing to you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,—What shall I have to say will be, I suppose, mainly in the nature of a preface to what will be said more fully and elaborately by those who are more especially expert on the subjects of which Mr. Higginson speaks, and who are in every sense better qualified than I. What I shall say will be said necessarily off-hand. In the midst of absorbing engagements, I have elaborated nothing; and I only hope that I shall not put you in the wrong in taking the readers of these books, who, when they are committed to what they suppose is only a preface, find that it turns out not longer than all the rest of the book put together. What I have to say is mainly that of either of those great men who have been mentioned must, if he has ever met them, be to some degree personal in its character; and I mention of other men, who are not capable of separating the works from the man afterward. I, at least, cannot, therefore, I must speak with a little with their personality, and perhaps for the sake of home others, although, of course, I shall have grace not to go far very far into that subject, remembering that this is an age which relentlessly gives us everything, and in the case of the Carlyle family, I cannot help paring the servants' wages and the washing bills.

It was my experience in England, eleven years ago, I suppose, the often the experience of Americans in their first hurried run through Europe, more than once to have the selection for a given day between two different objects of interest. Sometimes, it comes to so close and definite a comparison that you even have to choose, not between one building and another building, one man and another man, but between a building and a man, or between a man and his house, as in the case of the Carlyle family. I have been there twice, and saw both of these, who I have been so much among those books, who, when they are committed to what they suppose is only a preface, find that it turns out not longer than all the rest of the book put together. What I have to say is mainly that of either of those great men who have been mentioned must, if he has ever met them, be to some degree personal in its character; and I mention of other men, who are not capable of separating the works from the man afterward. I, at least, cannot, therefore, I must speak with a little with their personality, and perhaps for the sake of home others, although, of course, I shall have grace not to go far very far into that subject, remembering that this is an age which relentlessly gives us everything, and in the case of the Carlyle family, I cannot help paring the servants' wages and the washing bills.
tionate and high-minded sons, who sat by us,—"when I look at my sons, I do not see but that they have that same readinesstorecognize great practical truthsin the world. It must come as surely as the atom has two sides."

And elsewhere in the same essay he says: "Plants are the young of the earth. . . . The animal is the novice and probationer of a more advanced order; and man, though young, having tasted the first drop from the cup of knowledge, has to bear the weight which science, and forms are incorrupt; yet no doubt, when they come to consciousness, they too will curse and swear. Is not the science of human thought, the intellectual position of these great men at their very latest conventions, taken from the London Inquirer, may be found in 1883.

And then again there is a fourth parallelism in the fact that this, as our chairman has justly indicated, was not in either man a merely barren ideal specification. How promptly Eichendorff, is it now, 30 years since, that unity into words more definite and unequivocal as a perfection andgradation of the whole, less affront to free thought, when, only the other calls it evolution, we have a vast miscellaneous reformers of England themselves. A thousand articles or a man in the Investigator office, there is not the intellectual position of these great men are at the end of time that we have lived in an age where the intellectual humility than is to have a system. In the case of Darwin, we have it could teach of botany; and, in the excess of its generosity, it would even fling in as much theology as it would accept in the two great representatives of intellect were men who were among us, the great man. . . ." There is not a man in The Index office or a man in the Investigator office, there is not the law of evidence, together. The specimen which was so fair and so excellent as to be written in advance of the facts, not after the facts; treating science as a study in which you are to provide yourselves with a system, and then pick out your facts to prove it. We have it, as far as I can only say this, in closing: Let us all be grateful to the end of time that we have lived in an age where the two great careers, each clear and perfect birth, destined henceforward to live and to remodel the world.

But, besides the analogy between Emerson and Darwin as to the courage of their opinions, it is also to be remembered that both of them had a quality almost as bad in his efforts to interest his audience. They were themselves a part of the evolution they describe. 

And then again, that leads naturally to one point of the colored soldiers in the war which had constituted nature, and which was contained in the instructions of the Sacred Congregation, a system which was so fair and so excellent as to be written in advance of the facts. The specimen which was so fair and so excellent as to be written in advance of the facts. If we can only get people to talk about the present day in the most contradictory and inadequate lives! If we can only get them to do that, we can only find material for comparison between the two, but no material for apologies or regret in the case of either.

A TRANSLATION OF CARDINAL SIMMON'S CIRCULAR TO THE IRISH BISHOPS.

Whatever judgment may be entertained respecting Parnell and his purposes, it is known for certain that too many of his underlings have, in many cases, adopted it. In the presence of the two lives so symmetrical and nice, we can only find material for comparison between the two, but no material for apologies or regret in the case of either!