

of Parliament or the country would accept any such course.

We submit, also, as one of the most weighty testimony to the same effect, the admirable letter which the late Public Orator of Cambridge has addressed to the *Pall Mall Gazette*. It comes with peculiar authority from an eminent scholar who honourably resigned his fellowship rather than continue to be bound by the existing tests; and nothing can be added to its convincing reasoning:—

The third recommendation of Lord Salisbury's Committee on University Tests is as follows:—"That tutors, assistant tutors, deans, canons, and lecturers in Divinity be required to make the following declarations: 'I, A. B., solemnly declare that, while holding the office of —, I will not teach any opinion opposed to the teaching and Divine authority of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.' This recommendation, which the Bible among its authors would doubtless have preferred to put the Thirty-nine Articles, is thus framed oppositely with a view to gain the admission of 'orthodox Dissenters.' But I trust that all who here, on principle, strive for the abolition of old tests will resist the imposition of a new one.

The great majority of 'tutors and assistant-tutors' are engaged in teaching some branch of 'mathematics' or 'classics'—subjects in which it would be very difficult to introduce any allusion to 'the teaching and Divine authority of the Old and New Testament.' Never did I hear that any one had been accused of doing so. In their case the test is obviously not required. 'Lecturers in divinity' are, so far as I know without exception, clergymen, who, as such, have already declared their 'unfeigned belief in all the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.' In their case, too, the test will be superfluous. Teaching is no part of the duty of 'deacons,' at least at Cambridge. As for 'canons,' the canons of Christ Church, Oxford are so called. The only 'canon' at Cambridge is the officer who has charge of the non-collegiate students. He does not teach.

The persons, then, whom the test will affect are the few tutors and assistant-tutors who may be engaged in teaching some branch of physical science and moral philosophy (taking the latter term in its widest sense). Assuming the measure to work one so smoothly—assuming that it does not in a single case produce the college from employing its best qualified teacher—it is worth while to put so vast and universally taxative a machinery in motion for the sake of so small a result. And it is certain that all whose courses would allow them to make this declaration would, without any declaration at all, furnish a sense of duty and from sincere belief, comply with its provisions. But I am persuaded that the measure so far from working 'smoothly and well,' would work destructively if, and that if any persons were found willing to qualify themselves for the office of teacher in physical astronomy, animal physiology, geology, jurisprudence, or international law, by so solemnly declaring that they would follow the teaching of the Old Testament, they would be persons not otherwise qualified for the task they undertook. No student of science, animated by love of truth for truth's sake, imbued with self-respect, and having a due comprehension of scientific method—and such men alone are fit to teach—would submit to fetter himself by a declaration like this.

From those whose subjects could not bring the test conflict with Scripture many would refuse to make the required promise. For there it, be it right or wrong, a wide spread and growing opinion, especially among the younger men, from whom the colleges most recruit their forces, that the imposition of any test is immoral, and the taking of any test humiliating. Even those who do not object to tests on principle may well object to take such a test as this when they call to mind for how many centuries men have been contending as to what 'the teaching of the Old and New Testament' really is.

Already in many colleges, particularly, I am told, at Oxford, it is found very difficult to induce a sufficient number of the junior fellows to reside and take part in the tuition. If this additional impediment be thrown in the way, I feel sure that the difficulty will become an impossibility. And so Lord Salisbury will have effected the temporal destruction of the committee for whose spiritual interests he shows such mischievous zeal. It will not be the first time that the Universities have been brought to the verge of ruin by the religious persecution of the State.

WILLIAM GEORGE CLARK, Vice-Master.

Reviews.

The Descent of Man; and Selection in Relation to Sex. By Charles Darwin, M.A., F.R.S., &c. John Murray, Albemarle-street.

[From source.]

Jam non progredis cuncto demittitur alto. In passing this and similar lines, which are, by the way, so nearly, if not completely, in accord with the modern theory of evolution, Virgil no doubt meant to characterize the age in which he lived as a period of transition of the first magnitude in relation to the affairs of civilised man. And the history of centuries has borne out the truth of his view. But the present age has been surmised, not without reason, to be a period of transition hardly less important in human thought and human affairs. If the truth of this opinion posterity will be the judge. But the new power which presents itself as exercising, or about to exercise, an influence of the first order in intellectual matters, is science; into whose mysteries everyone now rushes to be initiated, according to his capacity, with something of the same ardour as brought the Jews of old to the man clothed in camel's hair upon the banks of Jordan, or the young Athenians to the mystic threshold of Eleusis. This power, by a sort of European consent, is viewed, for the time being, as impersonated in Mr. Darwin; who has succeeded in indelibly attaching his name to what bids fair to be regarded as the greatest discovery of modern times, and in a manner the crown and summit of all our other discoveries in relation to the organic universe. And what portion of the universe, it may be asked, is not organic? This question may be entrusted to Mr. Darwin and his friends to answer. We may remark that scientific thought in general has passed through two or three well-marked stages. Its first great movement, after the liberation of Europe from her medieval thralldoms, was directed towards mathematics, and towards the parts of physics, such as astronomy, and mechanics in the most general sense, which are especially controlled by mathematics. If to these we add geography, we shall discern the outlines of the first movement in the sciences of observation and reasoning, with which the names of Newton, Leibnitz, Kepler, Descartes, Galileo are associated. Afterwards chemistry and mineralogy assumed a prominent place; and the law of combination in definite atomic proportions became, for a time, the central truth, and symbol of man's highest advance in the comprehension of the outward universe. No doubt these sciences are still running an honourable course fruitful in material benefit. But latterly, and for the last thirty years or so, a new current of popular interest has aided scientific men in bringing into the foreground, and giving the chief place in public estimation, to the subjects of zoology and botany. And the new and favorite science of geology has constituted itself as a union of the three preceding; while, by the immensity of its perspectives into past time, it has brought home to us the fact that science is concerned, not merely with giving an account of things as they now are, but that it also has to explore their changeable history during a development whether of hours or ages; and their becoming, as it were, in Greek philosophy, for as far as he can decipher them, the vast annals of the unfolding universe. In an age too careless about the study of antiquity, suddenly here reawakened and yet remoter antiquities have disclosed behind the old, like mountains beyond mountains, Greece, Egypt, India, no longer adequately represent man's early history. Behind these are Etruria and Palægia; behind these are Nigritia, Celtic land, Turania, and Malaya; farther on, the Europe of the lake-dwelling, and cave-dwelling, and the rise-ear period; the age of iron and of brass, then the later stone age, the earlier stone age, or period of the first-hatchets, and man contemporary with the mammoth. Nor is this all. We now hear from Mr. Darwin of our 'semi-human progenitors,' with tails and pointed ears, dwelling in trees; and beyond them we can discern the grotesque Stone and bitaric communication of Ape-land. Strange and visionary for modern man in the month of his intellectual power! Is it after all so true, then, that we are made out of the dust of the ground? Surely this discovery, furnished as it may have often been in connoisseur or poetry, must have been reserved for these later times, in order to check some super-abounding arrogance.

It is not for nothing that the man of the nineteenth century finds himself suddenly bracketed almost on a level with the monkey, in the matter of classification of our naturalists. What, shall they share the same honours? Did God communicate secret of His resemblance to the animals? Was the spiritual breath of life charged, from the first, with traces of the Divine image? Who can say? But humanity, like the rhyler in the forest, cannot covetous over masters, bearing, amidst its laud of monkey luxury, the proud recital of an unsuspected affinity to the beasts that perish, thinks with sadness that it is only too true; but scarcely knows whether to lead with praise or with execrations the Ophan herd, who has touched his lyre to such a strange purpose, that it seems rather to untune the heavens. Surely nothing more serious can have assailed the human mind and spirit, since that sound amid the trees of the garden, which convinced Adam that he was naked.

Yet perhaps those new views, which are now so demonstrated as to seem almost irrefragable, are yet the falliment of many an old pronouncement. Nay, what are they but the latest and most authentic form of that cynical commentary which Nature, together with the wisest and most intelligent, has always seemed to delight in appending to the overweening estimates of human greatness? They remind us of the fact, the dry unpalatable fact, Truth, said Goethe, has always an respectable side. The truths that have fallen from the lips of saints and sages, shall they be withdrawn, gismind? 'No,' nature and science seem to say; 'let the old errors remain; but take this as a qualification.' Whether you are Heic, Christian, prophet, saint, or sage, you must come down from every unreal eminence. At least, both sides of the question must be stated. In man, in Hamlet's mouth, the 'beauty of the world, the paradise of animals, infinite in faculties'—Instantly he becomes 'that creature of dust,' 'Imperial Caesar,' according to the same speaker, 'Imperial Caesar, dead, and to be laid to clay.' Might you a hole, and keep the wind away.

And so on. The old Heic also was the bait of sarcasm, in the midst of his real moral elevation, or imaginary greatness!—

"Supra nos minor est Jove, divas, Liber, honestas, pulcher, sed desique regni." *Præcipue scens, nisi quoniam pincas volens est.*"

And so as to this new theory of our semi-human or 'ape-like' progenitors, which so strangely lengthens out our pedigrees at the expense, perhaps, of our veneration for our ancestors. If it can be rendered fairly probable, or demonstrated with that degree of agency which is compatible with the nature of the subject (and for the present we assume that it can be, we shall simply have to inquire what new morality it involves. If any; in what way a truth of the investigating intellect will verify itself to the reason and conscience, and what are the limits of its legitimate influence on those higher subjects of thought which relate to the pursuit of a moral ideal, and the working out of the great ends of human society. But we must not refuse to science the right of establishing the dogma or doctrine, which she so clearly seems to establish her to set her own house in order. For we are firmly convinced that without this doctrine at the centre, modern zoology must remain an irrational bewildering chaos, merely because of some incidental injury that it may seem to carry with it to opinions that are retained, rightly or wrongly, in the household of faith. Recovering from the first shock, we should do well to calmly estimate the substance of the message that is daily sounded in our ears. Are the heavens, when all, in any considerable degree untuned? Or is it only human pride that has received a wholesome admonition? Here we shall be a good deal aided by the very gentlemanly, temperate, skillful, and conscientious manner in which Mr. Darwin has brought the subject before what must be deemed a reluctant public. Mr. Darwin, like all thorough scientific men, is perfectly frank in his statements, and above disguise. Yet his pages are not overflooded with theoretical or general statement. He has consoled at once the taste of true and careful scientific induction, and the taste of his readers, by filling his books with facts and details, new to a great extent, and in themselves fascinating to every naturalist. These, of course, acquire a much higher interest when seen in relation to that theory, which has attracted the attention, we might almost say the deliberate adhesion, of two-thirds of scientific and semi-scientific Eu-

type, under the name of Darwinism, and to the elaboration of which almost every zoologist of science has lent a hand; together with many who are not so eminent. Indeed, the general verdict of scientific men is now to be unanimous (although Mr. Darwin modestly conceals this point, and the circumstance is not at all appreciated in England as it should be), that the thoughts which he has many years ago in this particular direction, that we might hold ourselves, as mere laymen, almost absolved from the duty of attending to the evidence. Mr. Darwin specially cites, as among his pledged supporters, the honoured names of Wallace, Huxley, Lyell, Vega, Leebrock, Hichens, Hille, Huxley. He might, we are convinced, have added to the list, to that of the near-by of those who ought to know has told us what we are to believe. And even archbishop Owen seems to have virtually abandoned the academic position to which he so long clung, free from temper, we believe, than from conviction. At any rate, his occasional charges to the inferior clergy have been of a most profitable effect. And we think that the theory of evolution, or specially, of the modification of animal forms and species by the twofold process of natural and sexual selection, proposed, in Mr. Darwin's pages, on a much more solid foundation of probable and inductive evidence than was ever before arrayed in its favour by any naturalist; even although the "Vestiges of Creation" is, in our view, in spite of some errors and crudities, a powerful and convincing volume. But knowledge of the facts bearing on the subject has been much enlarged since that work appeared; and Mr. Darwin's book is a much greater practical success; for he, and he alone, has found the way to riveting the theory in the general and popular mind of Europe. And it was the publication of the present volume, if we mistake not, that the history of science will date the first establishment of a principle, which Mr. Darwin, after all, has been the first to bring into a really intelligible and acceptable form. He has grappled successfully not only with the other great difficulties of the subject, but also with the deep-seated objection which has been felt, particularly in this country, and most of all, perhaps, by his countrymen, would it be to a large extent, or cosmological species, latencies whatever. Great patience, great prudence, and a determination to submit to all the toil involved in approaching the subject by the strict method of experiment and observation, have been necessary to effect this. And the aid derived from numerous co-workers, in England and on the Continent, particularly perhaps from Professors Huxley and Haeckel, must not for a moment be out of sight. At last, however, Mr. Darwin finds himself in the proud position of being able to say that he has "all but demonstrated" the great principle of the evolution of species from their primordial archetypal forms. This language, we are sure, is not lightly used. At the same time, while fully agreeing that Mr. Darwin has furnished a reasonable basis of belief, we cannot accept his statement without that no more evidence, either desirable or possible. His investigations, we admit, give him the right to speak as he does. But that which is "all but demonstrated" may still admit of a great deal of additional confirmation, when it rests in part, as this does, upon cumulative evidence. It is probable that a great deal more evidence exists in the archives of nature, and that from reports of the same kind, but not yet forthcoming. We abound of course to that portion of the argument which consists in supplying, either from the present resources of zoology, or from the records of the geological past, primitive or intermediate forms, or common ancestors, first, for species in relation to contiguous species; then for the genera, in which those are included, in relation to contiguous genera, and so on; but the intervals between the forms thus referred to a common ancestry becoming wider and wider, and the presumed period of divergence from that common ancestry being pushed continually further and further back, till we succeed in establishing a similar affinity even between orders and orders, and between the great classes themselves into which animals are customarily divided; so as to detect, with Mr. Darwin, the germinal or embryonic form of all the vertebrata in a common ancestor, such as the lancelet, and the common starting-point both of vertebrate and invertebrate forms in a small animal like the free-swimming larva of the present mollusca. The missing links, in such a

that and complex system of genealogy, must continue to be incessantly numerous. It is idle to suppose that we shall ever obtain the full material, or even that our minds, limited as they are, could avoid being lost and baffled in the intricacies of the subject; or could easily conceive, even hypothetically, of the various phases of this descent, or even that we could possibly have those as known or plausibly conjectured, seem to be well calculated to astonish. But it is not unreasonable to suppose that several of the missing links will be supplied. Already sufficient has been made clear to warrant us in concluding to the existence of the general law, which assigns consistency of descent as the real cause, and satisfactory explanation of the close affinities of structure, which strike us in every department of the animal and vegetable creation. It is the admission of this law which releases modern zoology from a state which we feel tempted to designate as little better than filipical inertia. But whatever further evidence of this sort be procurable, it will probably be of a secondary character, and of a secondary value with problems for the future. We doubt if much more will be done in unravelling the history of species, till clearer conceptions are attained of the past history of the changes of the earth's surface, and of their effects on organic life. This side of the subject appears to await investigation. It may be said, upon the whole, that Mr. Darwin has presented the subject as clearly and as convincingly as it is likely to be presented in a popular form to the present generation. Of course the principle of the argument consists in the exhibition, as existing in nature, of gradations of closely allied forms, not differing from each other by wider intervals than those which can be seen to be artificially arranged, and the changes caused in animals under artificial selection. It is then shown that the forms concerned in these changes, and whose action is expressed in the "law of natural selection and of the survival of the fittest," have been operative from time immemorial in a state of nature, and really concerned in modifying not only the structure, but the mental habits and characteristics of animals; so that the wide structural and mental intervals, which we meet in nature, are really the differences so produced. We must, of course, assume a force tending to produce slight variations, which, when guided and regulated by the principle of selection of the fittest, under the conditions of the struggle for existence, becomes a growing and developing power, capable of producing that "long continuation of the animal kingdom in the world of Nature" which the author of the "Vestiges" gave us as the first words of the summary of his thoughts. Now the element of paradox, which is so often used to bring this theory into discredit, is very much lessened by the consideration of a certain class of facts. Indeed, this is the chief use of the argument from embryology, with which Mr. Darwin opens. When we think of the inherent impossibility of such forms as the corns, the deer, the lion, or still more, the mammal, the bird, the fish, being derived from a common parentage, we are apt to forget that we are comparing these animals in their mature form. If we direct attention to the early and immature states, through which they pass in their development at sea, in order to arrive at that mature form, we shall be struck, in each case, with a wonderful series of transformations, in the earlier periods of the embryo, which are so widely different in animals as scarcely distinguishable from each other. This fact alone removes the inherent improbability. If, in the process of ordinary reproduction, the most different animal forms are thus wonderfully drawn together at the outset, why should they not have been drawn together in antediluvian periods, in those common ancestors, which presented in one and the same organism the just susceptible features of all the succeeding races? This part of the argument, resting on facts which are fully verifiable, and always within our reach, is of great importance as doing away with the inherent improbability which seemed to attach to the theory, and securing a fair consideration for the more direct evidence. We regard the theory of relation and natural selection as in itself intrinsically acceptable, suitable to the actual state of modern knowledge, and to the general tendency of our perceptions, and likely to take ground if it has not already taken, a controlling and co-ordinating position in comparative physiology, like that which Dalton's discovery of the law of definite proportions has taken in chemistry,

and the Newtonian principle of gravitation in regard to astronomical science. It is a principle that will tend more and more to be received as self-evident, and almost as a necessary axiom, by scientific students. And the time cannot be far distant when it will be a received article of popular belief. Perhaps room may be made in the theory for the occurrence of changes, in possible instances, those at present contemplated. And the principle of the "correlation of variations" will, we doubt not, receive further attention. But even now, no scientific journal of any standing ventures to impugn the theory; though the scope and details of any particular presentation of it are the fit subjects for a searching criticism.

This being so, why not, as we have said, look at the matter calmly? We propose nothing further in this article than to endeavour to indicate the place of the new theory on the field of thought, and in relation to existing beliefs and sentiments. There is enough of prejudice in respect to it, to say nothing of more reasonable misgivings. The Archbishop of York, in the address mentioned above, for its ability, delivered by him the other day in Loughan-place, took the ground that in opposing the evolution theory he was opposing "materialism," which is, we suppose, something extremely dreadful. Now this appeal to a vague sentiment, which is pretty widely diffused both among the clergy and elsewhere, ought to be examined, and its precise meaning ought to be, as possible, ascertained. We hold the word materialism to be unfortunately ambiguous. Materialism, in that sense in which it is deserving of moral reprobation, and is a fit subject for clerical protest, must correspond to a tendency of decadence in society. In most men, in an over-refined civilisation, the deliberate preference of luxury to duty, things outward to things inward, the sign to the thing signified, and of what is pleasurable to what is arduous. It must mean the disbelief in virtue, the judgment according to appearances, the laying out of treasures "where moth and rust corrupt." But we fail to see that these various delinquencies, or any one of them, are at all implied in the present tendencies of science. If science, or a scientific theory, is spoken of as materialistic, it must be in quite a different sense. It is primarily concerned with the study of the elements that occur in matter, and is organic structures. Through these changes it studies the action of invisible forces, without which material structures would not be so much as conceivable, and of which it is the more or less transparent veil. It views matter as an effect, of which force is the cause; and all the complex conditions of matter as indicating a corresponding complexity in the play of incident forces. We are compelled by our mixed bodily constitution, and by our relation to the world around us, to take note of these facts, to embark in these researches. But, apart from that, what is there low or debasing in our recognition of the part which matter, in obedience to disposing forces, or in its unresisting contiguity as the wonderfully diffused recipient of the vital force, has been ordained to support in the great drama of the universe? What is there in this that is unfavourable to virtue or to spiritual faith? A new conception of matter is in fact contained implicitly in our science. It is a truth too much lost sight of, that the distinction so often taken between spirit and matter does not correspond in the least to the old distinction between good and evil. It is a complex, and in some practical instances to substitute, as we so often do, the former for the latter. The distinction between the spiritually good and the spiritually evil is, with certain reserves, valid enough within the sphere of moral and spiritual experience. Not so with the much abused distinction between the spiritual and the material. It is noteworthy, that the absurd opinion that matter was essentially evil was, in ancient times, the cause of a sect at Alexandria, who distorted the leading principles of Christianity by the extreme vehemence of their reaction against the Old Testament, and against every Jewish; we allude, of course, to Marcion and Basilides and their school. Matter, in fact, is in moral problems a simply neutral element. Materialism, therefore, in the sense in which it is blame-worthy, is not predicable of science. In the sense in which it is predicable of science, on the other hand, it is not a term of reproach, but a term of commendation. More materialistic than the first chapters of Genesis. But it may be said, it is dishonourable to the Creator to suppose that man was descended or modified out of a "man-like ape," and this we see

peel to have been really the archeological thought, but why more disabuse than to suppose, with the inspired writer, that man was formed "out of the dust of the ground?" We cannot see the least real contradiction between the two views; they both unite in the admission of a pre-existing material; but the oldest consequent depression that material as low as possible. The manner to call the sovereign efficacy of that "breath of life," without which, after all, the modern theory of evolution must be (just as powerless for any practical purpose, as if it had never imagined such intermediate forms as natural selection, and the preservation of favoured varieties in the struggle for life. Science, no doubt, now fills up with definite ideas the blanks left by the older theory; it seeks to trace the methods of the Divine action, where religion was contented to point to that Divine action as an object of unreasoning faith; but apart from that, the difference merely occurs in the use of a different set of phrases to cover the same ultimate mystery. Nor will there be any conceivable advantage for man, as far as we can see, accruing from the circumstance of his having been produced directly from the dust of the ground (if that could be substantiated). For such a circumstance, far from being especially honourable, would seem to assimilate him to the very lowest types of animals, or rather to the automata; and to remove him from the more creditable association with the higher mammals, who all seem to have sprung from highly respectable progenitors, nearly resembling themselves in dignity, and in organic status. So that it is difficult to mend matters by recurring to the text of Genesis.

Yet let us learn to bear this new and grave calamity. We are not called on, like the Chinese, to worship ancestors; especially if that proclivity should turn out, curiously enough, to be much the same with the Egyptian superstition, and to lead logically to animal-worship. We suspect that mankind's ancestors, with singular unanimity, in the new light thrown upon their remote antecedents. We believe our children and our grandchildren will come to regard their descent from British ancestors as probably true, but very positively unimportant. Virtue and vice, the ideal and the real, the character of Hamlet, painting and sculpture, the Aristotelian ethics and the Kantian categories, say nothing of the Christian testament, all remain pretty much where they were. The ode of Horace and the epigrams of Martial still have a flavour, and so have the songs of Shakspere, and the effusions of Tom Moore. Will you betray your close proximity to the apes by shrinking from them? Should a great man damn his poor relations? It is for those not quite secure in virtue to be affronted at the chance proximity of the vices. You have a right to bear the transgressions of a king of the monkeys, and to insult the valliant Humanist himself among your ancestors? Well, why hasten your beard about that? By the way, that beard, that russet beard, that rufous, that yellow or orange-lavender beard, where did you get it, how did you come by it, my good Sir? Under what circumstances, where, and how long ago, as measured by the promisee of the equinox, was it prepared for you by sexual intercourse? Be sure of one thing, that the end justified the means, if nature, after such a profuse expenditure of generations, has arrived at last at you. *Egyptus exco, epeo dæmon*, was the watchword of the old initiation; let it be ours also. The first man was of the earth, earthy. We need fear no contamination from the facts of our evolution or origin. The apes have mere to gain, than we to lose, by those facts as they see now elicited; and by applying to Mr. Darwin, who may certainly bear of something to their advantage. By this time we are something more than semi-human; we, indeed, shall we say, three parts towards it? If, indeed, I do not bite nor read, if I neither frisk nor climb nor swing, if I exhibit no palpable reversion to a remote ancestor, if I play no pranks, if I dance no polkas in mid-air, if I steal no fruit, if the green bogles do not cover me at night, if I know how to crack nuts with nut-crackers, then, even though I am not a king of the monkeys, and, in fact, it is clear I am not exactly a chimpanzee, I have assimilated in the course of ages. What matters it, if that be so, whether the fierce gorilla, or the mild Hylobates, or the eocœtic orang, be regarded as my more immediate ancestor? I can look without repugnance upon the portrait of the almost-human Aëleus; and in the private sanctuaries,

where I think it right to pay a certain amount of respect to the memories of those who have preceded us.—
Effluës sancti atque aëroscopit.

LITERARY NOTES.

THE REV. JOHN HARRARD TILLEY FARRER, of Trinity College, formerly Fellow and tutor, has been elected Rector of the new University of Toronto.

MESSES. WILLIAMS AND NORGATE will publish by subscription, in September next, a work by the Rev. Edward Higninton, entitled "Eosa Messias; or, the Hebrew Messianic Hope and the Christian Reality." We extract from the prospectus the following passage as the nature of the work:—

"The title of this book will probably recall the 'Eosa Homo' of a few years past, and also the various insinuations and allusions which it contained; as the 'Eosa Deus,' 'Eosa Agnus Dei,' 'Eosa Spiritus Sanctus.' It seems strange that the great Scriptural All-hail Messias should not have been put forth in that sequence; for this is pre-eminently the Scriptural theme of Jesus of Nazareth. 'Who think ye of Christ?' 'Of a truth this is the Prophet.' Others said, 'This is the Christ.' But some said, 'Shall Christ come out of Galilee?' What was the Jewish expectation as seen in the Old Testament; and what the Christian realization as claimed in the New. To this investigation the present volume is devoted. It is an new subject of inquiry with the author; and the revival of intelligent religious discussion in England has led him to put into writing the mature thoughts of many years, in the hope of contributing to a reasonable and reverent opinion on the subject."

THE CHURCH COMMISSION.—A meeting of the Executive Committee of the Church Congress was held at Nottingham on Friday last, the Ven. Archbishop Trollope presiding, and the Ven. Archbishop Emery being present as the Standing Secretary of the Congress. The Subjects Committee reported that they had completed their list of subjects, of which the following are the heads:—Evidences, "Christian Evidences," "Church and State," "Origin of Church Endowments," "Parochial Councils," "Pneumatology of Unity," "The Influence of the Declaration of Papal Infallibility," "Foreign Missions," "Church of England," "Church Patronage," "Hymnology and Church Music," "The Moral State of Society," "The Deepening of the Spiritual Life." The Bishop of Lincoln will preside. The Bishop-Suffragan of Exeter, the Earl Nelson, the Dean of Durham, the Rev. Professor of Divinity at Cambridge; Dr. Lightfoot, Canon of St. Paul's; the Rev. Canon Professor of Divinity at Cambridge; Dr. Barry of King's College, London; Dr. Benson, of Wellington College; Mr. Farrer, of Marlborough College; Rev. Canon Gregory, Har. Prebendary Harris, Rev. Prebendary Moolenaar, A. J. Beresford Hope, Esq., M.P.; G. S. Welby, Esq., M.P.; the Revs. J. C. Hyde, H. H. Bickersteth, G. H. Wilkinson (St. Peter's, Finsbury), G. Body, Benjamin Hawk, Esq.; J. Clabon, Esq., and others have undertaken papers or addresses. The Congress will be held at Nottingham, on the 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th of October.

A METROPOLITAN CHAPEL is about to be opened in Rome. This will be the western heretical temple which has been started by the Revolutionary party, under the eyes of the Chief of Catholicism.—*Westminster Review.*

THE ARCHBISHOP OF NOBIS has paid a visit to Oxford, where he visited the principal objects of interest, and was very cordially received. On Monday evening he was entertained at dinner in the hall at Balliol, and among those who met him were the Master (Professor Jewett), the Rev. Dr. Payne Smith (Dean of Canterbury), K. Palmer (Latin Professor), Woodhouse, Rawlinson, and Canon Oakley of Balliol, who acted as viceroy, who directed the hall for the first time since his old days in Angliens. The Archbishop is engaged in writing a work in Syriac on the testimony of the East to the supremacy of the West.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF EXETER, in a charge delivered on Monday to the clergy and churchwardens at Chalmers, speaking of the Borgia B&I, said he would not deny the Dissenters the privilege of bringing their dead into their churchyards, nor would he force upon the Dissenters the solemn and beautiful service of the Church; but still it was too much to demand that persons almost of any creed should, under the walls of their churches, have the right to use ceremonies and utter professions shocking to all devout Christians, and which might almost be said to desecrate the place where they were spoken.

Our Contemporaries.

MR. MIALL'S DISSENTMENT MOTION.

THE Times of Tuesday observes that Mr. Miall has exhausted on his motion all his powers of oratory, without approaching the issue of the question. With almost feminine eagerness, he urges Parliament to do the desired work "at the earliest practicable period," without stopping to consider what is meant by a period of time, or in what sense a period is practicable. But this sort of the word betrays, what Mr. Miall cannot wholly ignore, that the work is an affair of time. In fact, the Church of England is being disestablished, piecemeal, indeed, but effectually, and not slowly. The more jealous and sensitive members of the Church of England already feel themselves the subjects of a painful and tedious operation, which some of them would wish as to interrupt, others to finish altogether, so as to put them out of pain. But that the work of disestablishment is in progress, even this very session, cannot be disputed, the only question being as to the pace, which is not fast enough for Mr. Miall. That really is the question for Parliament. It is scarcely possible to doubt that this century will see the consecration Mr. Miall so devoutly wishes. In the face of the great changes at home, and the still greater changes abroad, in the new of Full Disestablishment itself, we cannot expect anything else. At things are, the Church is being trained to independence; it is being weaned from supremacy and dominion; one by one it is losing its titles, weapons, and prerogatives. Wait till its education is completed. The real grievance is set the pettinal one. It is the social form of it. No probable parliamentary measure, as conventional Dissenters, will show the social grievance. The Church of England will hold its ground under any circumstances, and assert its superiority much as it now does, a little too much, perhaps, in the pride of exclusive caste, high culture, and good connections. It would not be improved in these respects by any amount of deprivation, spoliation, or humiliation in worst case could inflict on it. Turn a good man out of doors, and he becomes, in spite of himself, an ascetic, a confessor, a martyr. He will be and do a great deal he never thought of when he was the institution of his parish as the pillar of an establishment. Of course Mr. Miall will leave all this. He sees no terror in a whole army of ousted, hungry, and persecuted persons. They will only condemn themselves if they break out into field preaching or other excesses. Possibly this is just what Mr. Miall hopes and desires. It is the element he hopes to live in. But the Times cannot think Parliament will be equally charmed with the prospect. Even successful capitalists have ideas about village churches, and wish to spend the rest of their days in peace and quiet. They certainly will temper this sweet agitation if they turn the Church of England into the streets and lanes.

The Daily News maintains that the principle laid down by Mr. Miall that a man "suffers injustice at the hands of the State when the State places him at a disadvantage on account of his non-conformity with its religious profession," is fundamental to modern Liberalism, and is fatal to Church Establishments. It is a vital principle of modern thought which is gradually weaving away the very foundations on which all religious exclusion rests. Very few who heard Mr. Miall, and saw the reception his speech met with on the Liberal benches below the gangway, would have much doubt of the eventual adoption of the policy he recommended. There was probably a widespread conviction in the House that Mr. Miall was merely before his time; that his motion pointed out the path in which the legislators of some years hence will have to walk. On the Church side the Union between Church and State is breaking down. It is no longer one of affection, or even of prudence; it is one of bondage. As to the result in the State of the dissolution of the union, there is hardly room for the slightest doubt. There is a political loss, under the existing system, is incalculable. The mere waste of legislative time over ecclesiastical squabbles would need a great advantage to outweigh it.

The Dispatch remarks that if the same terms were granted to the Church of England in the event of disestablishment as were awarded across the Channel, the English Church might be set free from the control of the State save concerning its eighty millions sterling in its offices. Does Mr. Miall really believe that the separation of Church and State under these circumstances would necessarily make the Church of England more tolerant or put her really on a social equality with the Non-conformists? Another

Reviews.

The Descent of Man; and Selection in Relation to Sex. By Charles Darwin, M.A., F.R.S., &c. John Murray, Albemarle-street.

[RECEIVED.]

We have dwelt the rather, in the first part of this article, upon the hypothetical materialism, to be taken as it is a strong that it is often harped on, and because it seemed a pity for an influential member of the episcopate, together with the clergy under his guidance, to be taking up a position from which they will certainly have to recede. It might be said with great truth, that the only line-theory implies line-theism. But pantheism is a religious ruse which has followed in all ages from the intellectual contemplation of the universe. We also deeply regret the existence of so wide a gulf between the teachings of the pulpit, and the practical intellectual interests of the modern world; a gulf which, we fear, the address now being delivered in Langham-place, however well-intentioned, will go but a short way towards removing. We suppose that the development-theory in science is part and parcel of a reformation of thought, which will witness to religious scepticism, and even to fanaticism; notwithstanding that it is not essentially religious theology as well. No scepticism can be forged against it which do not derive the main portion of their strength either from prejudice, or from inadequate appreciation. Indeed, the natural principles, which it has introduced into the study of nature, such as vast historical significance, are simply those which have been perfectly familiar, for a long time past, both to those engaged in the profession of gardening, and to the fanciers of animals. How is it that the flowers of our present gardens differ so remarkably from those which we can see by any botanical engravings of a former period, forsaken in the parterres of our great-grandmothers? The taste of the public has demanded little less than a revolution in this domestic form, and the skill of the professional gardener has responded. We have little doubt that the old saying, *Omnia mutantur, nihil interit*, in which the ancient physicians summed up their wisdom, has received an enlarged and a deeper meaning, now that a new generalisation, founded upon a much vaster array of facts, has finally broken up the superficial and religious opinion, which viewed the latest reality as a mere accident, or the result of an eventful history, destitute of a living and creative breath, and given over to isosonality and stagnation. The doctrine of progress, and of an ascending movement in the universe, has been rendered valid through unnumbered ages, and implicitly extended to the present, and the future time. Yet this is received with mere apathy, or antipathy, by those who minister at the altar of a God who declared His purpose to make all things new!

Before the appearance of the present volume, remarks such as those might have been pronounced. The theory was, it is true, so demonstrated to scientific men, that very few of them refused it. But for a wider public, there were reasons which might justify a suspension of the judgement. Indeed the difference is immense, in one respect, between Mr. Darwin's first presentation of the subject, and the fuller and more penetrating view now laid before us, accompanied with such a wealth of illustrations. Is the "Origin of Species" we heard of little except conflict, the law of battle, the struggle for existence. It is quite true that this, as a recent writer (Mr. R. H. Huxton) has remarked, gave a higher meaning and a new sense, a real cause, to a class of facts that have always been held to be embarrassing from the natural theologian's point of view. Still, that aspect of the evolution-doctrine had in it something depressing; it stigmatised creation with a somewhat sordid hue. We may even say it was a Brahminic aspect. But now, Mr. Darwin has introduced a new element. We can fall to see in the principle of continual life, acting by sexual selection in remote ages, the elements of a truly demigurgic angel? Who can fail to see that the preference of the opposite sex, upon whatever characteristic founded, must have been a chief demeritising element, with regard to the power of the individual? We have beheld a numerous progeny? Mr. Darwin has developed in an admirable manner this inviting theme. We seem to see again in his page the young Love of the mythology, emerging from the primal egg-shell to shed a tender light on chaos; again assuming the power to create

animals and men, even if not gods and demones. There is much complexity and much difficulty inherent in the attempt to estimate the various modes in which sexual selection may have acted as a formative force. The magnificent development of cranial plumage in birds, as seen in the eye of the peacock, and the polyphren, and the ball-and-socket craniums of the Argus pheasant, are traced by Mr. Darwin to this cause. The whole discussion throws an unexpected and a not unpleasing light on the characters of the higher animals, particularly birds. But before we can do justice to the richness of the material which he divides that the separation of the sexes was itself, in a sense, gradual; and that even animals high in the scale retained various traces of a former androgynous condition. It is thus that Mr. Darwin, in a brief and a concise manner, explains the fact, which he thinks he sees his way, that for a long time the male mammals produce milk, just as the females, for the nourishment of their young. Of course the lower members, both of the animal and the plant-world, place greater stress on the fact of a primitive union, not requiring the separation of the sexes. Thus Venus was born, and Leda was born. But if the bright colours of animals came from sexual selection, whence, we would ask, those of flowers, or the equally bright and curiously shrewd and intelligent, which we find in insects? It can scarcely be said that oxen and peepers, and chaldreys ever indulged in the follies of mutual admiration, like the Argus pheasants. We suspect that nature is not only a very great colourist, but that, like certain artists of our day, she has a taste for one colour, and that her one method of laying on, but little, and that she can colour fairly well, without being at the same time engaged in superintending a divination. It is needless to remark that in the attempt to decipher the past history of animated races on our planet, a great deal will be brought forward that is more or less conjectural; but we are not for that reason to suppose that the main pillars of the whole theory rest on an insecure basis.

We confess, however, that we feel better satisfied about the general theory of evolution, than about many important points which arise in connection with the descent of man. We admit that Mr. Darwin has done us great good, in his probability, we do not mind saying the probability, of the descent of a human from a Simian stem. There are some curious anatomical facts bearing upon this question. We see no reason to believe that the animal world was ever cut up into distinct groups as a chess-board is divided into black and white squares. Many facts adduced by Mr. Darwin prove that the variations between individual and individual have a wider range than is usually supposed. At the same time, the process of integration which constitutes a separate species must be viewed as a fact of the first importance in the plan of nature, since it is this which has prevented separate lines of development from interfering with each other. But the particular question, at what points, or at how many points, a semi-human may have diverged from a Simian stem, and the further questions as to the general character and nature of the various races of man, do not seem to us well cleared up. Mr. Darwin's book, and still less, in the scientific opinion of the times. And we cannot help owing to an opinion which we think we could justify if space permitted, that science has not yet succeeded in making a true and sufficient statement of the difference which separates man from the lower animal. The anomalies which seem to result from the attempt to solve this question simply from the data of anatomy, are such as to suggest the further question, whether that method of classification is not over-extended over the whole field of zoology? Is it not a living structure? That a vast difference in the disposition of a cast structure, and in the nature of a living animal. Why should the former process be almost exclusively relied upon by science? The main physical difference between man and the quadrumanus must lie in the cerebral system. But how could it be possible to observe the brain in action in a living structure? That we are in reality ignorant of the chief structural difference between man and the quadrumanus, we should have thought followed as a matter of course.

If now we glance finally at the relation which in these new degrees, promulgated from the very Capitol of European science, bear to the traditional elements, with which they seem to come in

contact, we shall find that much misapprehension has arisen on this point. Towards the older cosmogony, we may say that there has never been no direct relationship at all. It would seem that the religious sentiment, or doctrine, has, in the absence of any genuine science, from time to time occupied ground beyond its own pretensions, which it has, strictly speaking, no need to occupy, but which it seems to have occupied as the legitimate cultivator. That trust it may be long liable to relinquish. If it be said, however, that we need no system, no definite ideas or beliefs, upon the subject in question, and that we have nothing to do but to continue our ignorance, the same consequences may serve to refute the notion. They certainly were not written from any such point of view as that. Mention it is a well worthy of remark, though it has been but little dwelt on in connection with the subject, how much modification of cosmogony there has already taken place, within the sphere of religion itself. Taking the Mosiac system as our starting-point, it would not be difficult to show that the direction of divergence, among religious thinkers, has been almost always towards a view like that of evolution. The first stage of divergence may be that prescribed by the Hebrew Bible. It is remarkable, although seldom noticed, that this body of psalms, the composition of the most various authors, although replete with sublime allusions to the creation, never once mentions the theory of the "six days"; which seems to have dropped out, as if by a coincidence, from the earliest of the Hebrews. And the doctrine of "windows," in the Apocrypha, equally anomalous to an innovation on the old cosmogony. Again, Philo, though in his treatise "De Mundi Opificio" he has gone considerable lengths in the distance of Moses, indeed, it be to Moses himself that the sublime cosmogonical picture, predicated to the great historical and legislative documents of Israel, is to be attributed—yet did not so support the old cosmogony as to abstain from placing a new one by its side. A similar allegation, without doubt, may be sustained as to the writings of St. John's Gospel and of the Pauline Epistles. Indeed, the Christian development became responsible for an entirely new turn of thought, and constitution of doctrine, with reference to cosmogony; one which brought with it, in course of time, an attention, which has been almost entirely in the writings, already alluded to, of the Greek Fathers, in view of such a doctrine as that of the "first-birth of creation" (*apexoresis elexis creatio*), what became of the "six days"? Clearly they were held as superfluous by another, and a sublimer metaphysical agency, in a creed which seems to say, "here, not made, but with reference to all the phenomena of the universe. Yet this has never been argued as a triangular controversy; but Christians have been contented to assume their case to be contained in the first chapters of Genesis. But the cosmology proper to the Christian faith is, we contend, that of evolution first, or through a first principle; and its tendency is to contemplate the mystic results of creation as flowing from, or included in, a single original creative act. Now, the Darwinian theory bears the same sort of relation to the older speculations of the old zoology, which the Christian cosmogony, thus defined, bears to the Mosiac cosmogony. It is as if the mind of the "six days" of Moses were disabused in the mind of the cycles upon cycles with which Oriental imagination had mystically loaded spiritual thought. Yet the special creative facts would correspond tolerably well to the special births of species which Greek and Roman speculation attributed to the tearing wounds of a when, as Melissus, the "grey clouds now calved." It may be said of those, whether ancient or modern, who remained satisfied with this sort of cosmology, that they were but very imperfectly acquainted with the real nature, and the multitudinousness of the facts to be accounted for, in the development of zoology. The ancient naturalists, Aristotle and others, viewed the facts of zoology as a single, and the same, between the smaller animals, and the minor points of differentiation in the large ones. In such a state of mind, the separate animal species whose existence had to be accounted for, might present themselves as about forty or fifty. The immense num-

ber of specific forms, the closeness of their gradations; above all, the *means/objects* of their institution, which renders a circular arrangement possible from whatever point we start; and finally, those dominating facts, which almost force upon the mind the doctrine of development, were not really above the horizon either for the classical or the medieval world. It could not appear to them, as it does to us, as absurd to suppose the animal series to be the juxtaposition of distinct births, or flats, as it is to suppose a spiritual series of a man's life of distinct points. What we expect to see in nature, even a priori, is a continuous variation, not a succession of discontinuous states. We find that underlying unity, *plus* a modifying principle, has been the real reality taken by nature for the production of almost infinite variety. And we cannot doubt that a unity more efficient than any which the wit of man could have devised. In all things all cosmogony agree, in asserting the essential unity of the universe as rooted in a spiritual force. This is the postulate of religion. We may further observe that Scriptural religion, and the great moral interests which are inseparable from it, are based upon the doctrine that man came into the possession of a spiritual nature, and that he was "in the image of God"; but so to how this occurred, and after what antecedent changes, Scripture is nearly, or wholly silent; the fact itself, of man's ultimate constitution as a spiritual, intellectual, and moral being, is, therefore, the proper and sufficient basis of its teaching.

In the above remarks we have entirely abstained from introducing the special criticisms of Mr. Darwin's voluminous observations than incidentally. To have brought even one small sub-section of his argument properly before our readers would have required our whole space; nor do we feel qualified to enter into the scientific criticisms of his statements. We have essayed a look more in harmony with the aims and character of this journal, by sketching the general outline of his theory, and marking some points whether of harmony or of contrast, which either assimilate it to, or separate it from, views and theories that have previously prevailed. And we have sought, however inadequately, to abate the force of some prejudices and prepossessions, and even to indicate some rather decided advantages, which the theory possesses from a moral and religious point of view. But as we have been able to put down scarcely a title of what must occur under any one of these heads, to a reflective person, we commend the subject to the further consideration of our readers.

We shall conclude by giving an interesting summary of Mr. Darwin's position, in his own words:—

"The main conclusion arrived at in this work, namely, that man is descended from some lowly organism, will, I regret to think, be highly displeasing to many persons. But there can hardly be a doubt that we are descended from brutes. The ascertainment which I felt as first seeing a party of Purgians on a wild and broken shore will never be forgotten by me, for the reflection at once rushed into my mind—such were our ancestors. These men were absolutely naked and debauched with paint, their long hair was tangled, their mouths frothed with excitement, and their expressions were wild, startled, and fearful. They possessed hardly any arms, and had animals lined on what they could catch; they had no government, and were careless to preserve out of their own small tribe. He who has seen a savage in his native land will not feel much shame if forced to acknowledge that the blood of some more noble creature flows in his veins. For my own part I would as soon be descended from that heroic little monkey, who braved his dreadful enemy by riding on the side of his keeper; or from that old baboon, whose, descending from the mountains, carried away in triumph his young consorts from a crowd of astonished dogs—as from a savage who delights to torture his enemies, offers up bloody sacrifices, practices infanticide without remorse, treats his wives like slaves, knows no decency, and is haunted by the grossest superstitions."

Man may be excused for feeling some pride at hearing religion, though not through his own exertions, to the very summit of the organic scale; and the fact of his having thus risen, instead of having been abjectly placed there, may give him hopes for a still higher destiny in the distant future. But we are not here concerned with hopes or fears, only with the truth for as our reason shows us to discover it. I have given the evidence as it seems to me, and that man, with all his noble qualities, with sympathy

which feels for the most debased, with benevolence which extends not only to other men, but to the lowliest being of creation, with his god-like intellect, which has penetrated into the secrets and constitution of the solar system—with all these exalted powers—man still bears in his bodily frame the indelible stamp of his lowly origin.

B.

SHORT NOTICES.

*Three Hymns. Set to Music by Russell Martinson. No. 1, "Beneath our Feet," No. 2, "The Christian Warrior," No. 3, Holy, Holy." (Novello and Co.)—*Considerable skill and feeling are manifested in these three compositions, which are of a somewhat elaborate character, and they are well worth the trouble requisite to master the occasional difficulty proposed. Of the three pieces we prefer No. 2, which is, perhaps, the simplest; No. 1 being a more important composition, including solos for alto, tenor, and bass, with trio and chorus. No. 3 exhibits some effective fugal writing, and is especially relieved with passages for the voice alone, which require good singing to ensure their success. We hope Mr. Martinson will be encouraged to further efforts, and that we may soon see his name attached to works of a larger calibre.

Thoughts Suggested by Mr. Vespey's Address in Glasgow is a generous reply, by the Rev. J. Page Hippie, to some of the Orthodox criticisms on Mr. Vespey's recent utterances. Mr. Hippie has quite the best of the critics, but we cannot but express the opinion that Mr. Vespey would entertain a higher and more lasting influence if he dwelt rather upon his great affirmations than upon mere details.

*Reveries; or the Poet's Daughter. A Poem. By James Craigie Guthrie. (Hodder and Stoughton).—*The ordinary criticism on this poem, which requires good singing to ensure their success. We hope Mr. Martinson will be encouraged to further efforts, and that we may soon see his name attached to works of a larger calibre. *Reveries; or the Poet's Daughter. A Poem. By James Craigie Guthrie. (Hodder and Stoughton).—*The ordinary criticism on this poem, which requires good singing to ensure their success. We hope Mr. Martinson will be encouraged to further efforts, and that we may soon see his name attached to works of a larger calibre.

*Emancipation of Gilippee (Present).—*This is an analytical criticism, by Mr. T. S. Barrow, a member of the London Dialoquists Society, of the arguments in favour of the existence of a Great First Cause, as developed by a Scotch metaphysician, Mr. W. H. Gillespie, in his work entitled "Necessary Existence of God," not long ago reviewed in these columns. Mr. Barrow advocates the a posteriori theory, and denies that the belief in the existence of a Deity is a kind which never has been, and, probably, never will be, settled on purely logical grounds.

LIBRARY NOTES.

The famous journal the *Revue des Mondes* has been approved by the Committee of Public Safety.

The Rev. J. A. Farrow, the historian, has taken himself off his clerical designation.

The Rev. B. Dugan, author of the "Life of Luther," is preparing for publication a "Life of Tyndale," the first translator of the English Bible. The work will contain many original documents which have never been printed before.

A Roman archbishop has translated the protest of Dr. Dollinger against the dogma of Infallibility, and published it with a commentary of his own. In the preface he says that he wishes to be understood that the Jews were worthy even, but that his belief in their sagacity was completely shattered by their conduct at the General Council. "They must be blind indeed," he proceeds, "who are so incapable of making use of the spirit of the times to advance their own ends. Scolded as they are, and committed to social as set as the holy fathers had in his country, for in their wish to throw dust in the eyes of the Catholic world they have passed the road to its reformation, and taken the first step towards filling up the cavern of obscurantism. The wheat will be cleared of the chaff, and the mountain which has so long pressed on the hearts of true Catholic Christians will totter on its base when men like Professor Dollinger and his brave followers fight for the truth against falsehood."

Our Contemporaries.

THE DISSENTMENT BROTHER.

The Spectator thinks that Mr. Miell and Mr. Leatham represent respectively the statesmanlike and the rhetorical arguments that may be urged for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England; and of both of them it may be said that there is an indefinable weariness,—not of intellectual ability, or of energy of action, but of nervous, not of pungent expression, but of which nervousness the effect of a want of faith in the popular forces behind them, and therefore diminishes the moral effect of their speeches, giving to very considerable extent the air of partial failure. In both speeches, with all their high measure of success, there was a marked absence of what, for want of a better word, is usually called *popular appeal*—not an elevation, or breadth of view, or taking an effective form,—but that sense of entering the full and earnest belief of a large and increasing multitude which often vivifies a very poor speech into importance, and the absence of which will sometimes make a very able speech details into comparative insignificance. Now, Mr. Miell and Mr. Leatham, on the contrary, the air of striving in their own minds to do better than their principles had taken a rusty groove hold on the imagination of the nation than they really had, and when Mr. Miell concluded his brief reply by emphatically prophesying the near triumph of his cause, he gave the impression of a prophet who was waiting to make up by the intensity of his personal faith for a corresponding disappointment in relation to the visible and earthly signs of any approaching fulfilment of his prophecy.

After remarking on the unnatural division drawn by Liberatorians between secular and spiritual interests, which has necessarily the effect of shutting our eyes to the spiritual elements really present in secular affairs, the Spectator adverts to the theory of a widely comprehensive Church:—

Could not the Church be widened so as to again comprehend the larger part of the nation, instead of making the growth of the nation a reason for reducing the Church in number? We confess that this is the solution to which we will look, and look hopefully. It may be quite true, as Mr. Miell said, that the Church has not carried into our rural parishes as much "sweetness and light" as we might have hoped; but it is also true, as Sir Roundell Palmer said, that it has done not a little to sweeten and enlighten the bare and rugged soil of the people of our rural parishes, and that if his influence were withdrawn our villages would far be less than they are now. And one thing is certain, if the Church does her work imperfectly, she does it less imperfectly than she did, and that this is greatly owing to the competition of the Dissenters. Disestablish the Church, and we doubt if the competition of the various sects among themselves would be half as serious and energetic as in the competition of these sects with the Establishment now. If you want a really energetic and healthy competition, you must have a standard, and a conspicuous standard, of comparison. What would the Opposition be without a Government? You must have one body which bears a greater burden of responsibility, has a higher opportunity of success, and a greater culpability in case of failure, than the others, if you would have real and efficient competition. It is not certain that what Dissenters now aim at is to discharge their responsibilities so as to stand out in distinctness, and that they think comparatively little of such a thing. We should lose this advantage,—and it is a very great one,—if we destroy the one body on which the State imposes a heavy responsibility, even if it also bestows on it a certain canonical dignity; and we do not see what we should gain except a vicious enhancement of that spurious and artificial distinction between things spiritual and secular, which is even now beginning to infect the minds of our social and political life.

The Examiner urges that the separation of Church and State must become a withdrawal of the Liberal party, simply because it is always the first to recognise the changes demanded by the progress of society. In the interest of all parties,—of the clergyman, of the people, and of the Government,—there should be a fair field and no favour, there should be no bribe to clever men, no premium on certain opinions. To this—a free Church in a free State—the progress of society is rapidly carrying us, and Mr. Miell's temporary check will, before long, be converted into a victor.

The Church Visitor (Hampstead) writes:—We are not in the least afraid of disestablishment. The manner in which the Catholic school has been