look on this as unsound and perilous doctrine, not morally superior to the theory of those Neapolitan tribunals which Mr. Gladstone denounced many years ago. And it is this evil system, not any particular offender or offenders amongst the judges, that we intended by the name of "Haman." The Judicial Committee of Privy Council, as now constituted, is in fact the old Star Chamber back again, with its old unconstitutional vices of packing, secret voting, and—as Mr. Finlason has shown in a useful treatise on the Court—subservience to the Chancellor for the time being, and is in need of equally drastic treatment. The great Minister who has grappled with still more difficult measures surely cannot feel this above his powers, and as it is at least the theory of this country that there is a remedy for every wrong, we look to him to devise one for that worst of public wrongs, the wresting of justice under the pretext of public policy, but with the true underlying motive of private ill-will.

MR. DARWIN.

THE death of Mr. Darwin yesterday week marks an epoch in the history of modern thought. The publication of his *Origin of Species by means of Natural Selection* gave rise to something like a storm of disapprobation, but the three-and-twenty years which have since elapsed have not only seen the religious world regain its equanimity, but have won for the daring speculator something like universal admiration and respect. The chorus of regret which his removal has called forth seem to us to have been well earned; for nothing could possibly have been more deserving of praise than the industry, the patience, the acuteness, and the ingenuity with which he prosecuted his researches, except the calmness and moderation with which he has stated his views. Notwithstanding the obloquy and derision which his great work at first brought upon him, we cannot recall a sentence in his writings which betrayed any tinge of polemical bitterness.

The real nature of the Darwinian hypothesis is often misrepresented. "Its lamented author did not originate the doctrine of Evolution—the theory, namely, that the innumerable varieties of animal and vegetable life which we see around us, so far from having always existed, are but modifications of a few types, or even of one primordial type. Something of the kind had been taught by Lord Monboddo, and in a more thorough form by Lamarck and the author of *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*. What Darwin did was to devise a reasonable, or, at least, a plausible, theory for the changes in question. One of his suggestions is based upon the fact that the reproductive energy of almost every form of life transcends the means of maintaining the individuals actually or potentially brought into existence. Hence it follows that a vast proportion of the creatures that are born will necessarily perish before they come to maturity; and that those which survive will be such as possess some accidental advantage which may enable them to win the battle of life. Evolution has no atheistic or deistic tendency whatever. In the first place, it does not get rid of the primary difficulty—the origin of life in any form. We may judge of the distress to which scientific infidelity was reduced, from the notable suggestion that the first living germs might possibly have been brought to this earth on an aerolite! As if it were not at least as easy to conceive the origination of life on our own planet as on any other. It is, in truth, impossible to think of life arising out of no-life by any process other than creation; at each great step in the process of Evolution, it is as necessary to bring in Supernatural interference, as it is to appeal to it in order to explain the beginnings of life. For instance, it is impossible to account for the origin of any one of the senses in any other way. For an ascidian to begin to see or to smell was surely as great an innovation as for a particle of dead matter to become vitalized. Mr. Darwin has made a great deal of the hypothesis of the cross-fertilization of flowers; and nothing can be more charming than the popular writings of Mr. Grant Allen on this subject. By a use of the figure of prosopopœia, almost as bold as that to which Dr. Erasmus Darwin resorted in his *Botanic Garden*, Mr. Allen represents the various blossoms as outdoing the most enterprising human tradesmen in advertising their wares to the insect world—to wit, the little drops of honey which they offer to their visitants as their fee for carrying pollen to other blossoms. But why should it have been better for a flower to be fertilized from other stamens than its own? Again, the notion that the gorgeous colours of certain male birds and insects have been perfected by the preference which their mates have shown, through long cycles of ages, for splendidly attired wooers, seems contrary to notorious fact. We have never heard it contended that the female has had any option. No doubt, the motto of Nature is "*Detur digniori*;" but the question which is the more worthy is settled by combat *à outrance* between the suitors; and the prize goes contentedly with the victor, whether he be Palamon or Arcite. We were going to say that Mr. Darwin had introduced into the discussion a purely human consideration, but we doubt whether even that could be a fair description of the matter; for it may be doubted whether even now, in any but an insignificant minority of cases, it is true that women select their mates at all, much less select them for their personal comeliness.

In fine, it seems to us that the Darwinian theory has as yet received nothing like satisfactory proof. The most that has been done is to make out a plausible case for it, and even then the evidence does not seriously touch the enormous difficulties with which it has to contend. Nevertheless, if Science should ultimately accept the hypothesis, it would not in the remotest degree infringe upon the solemn verity that God the Father Almighty is the Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things visible and invisible. It would only present to the mind a new and, if it were reverent so to speak, we should say a nobler and more worthy idea of creation than is suggested by what we may, for convenience' sake, call the Miltonic view. To invent a steamboat, a locomotive engine, and a navigable balloon would each be a great achievement; but to devise a steamboat which, when it reached [illegible] would turn itself into a locomotive, sun and moon and stars revolve. That notion is adopted without much, or, indeed, without any, real investigation at all; but it remains for ages unchallenged. At last, the man of science comes forward, and says it is all a mistake; but, instead of being calmly listened to, he is denounced as impious and heretical. He may even think himself lucky if he escapes with his life; and yet, after a few years, everybody comes round to his side, and stigmatizes his persecution as the very last possibility in the way of dulness and stupidity. It may perhaps be said that "all's well that ends well;" but, unfortunately, the adage does not apply in such cases as these. If the upholders of revealed truth insist upon including in the cycle of essential verities notions which are demonstrably false, the unreasonable defence of religion creates an equally unreasonable repugnance to it, and that repugnance does not disappear when the anti-scientific dogma is withdrawn. There can be little doubt that the present epidemic of atheism and free-thinking has been produced by nothing so much as by the foolish and shortsighted manner in which modern discoveries in geology and other branches of natural philosophy were received. Obviously the right way to deal with the setter-forth of any new thing is to give him a patient and respectful hearing. If he has nothing to tell but a falsehood or a fallacy, he will soon be detected, and cease to attract notice.

It should not be forgotten that even heresies, like hunger or pain, have an important function to perform; for they show that there must be something wrong in the manner in which the truth is just then taught. Thus if we grant all that can be said in disparagement of the Wesleyan movement, the very fact of its success proves that in the eighteenth century there must have been a painful lack of personal religion. But if so, does it not follow that the zeal of the first Wesleyans ought to have been utilized by the Church herself? Or, if that could not have been done—and there is some reason to think that the imperiousness and self-will of the Founder would have made him very difficult to guide—would not the proper way to deal with the movement have been, to meet it not with ridicule or abuse, but with a better style of preaching in the churches, and with a more Christian way of life? And so in our own times, if the Bishops, instead of joining in, or even fomenting, the howl with which the *Tracts for the Times* were greeted, had but dispassionately inquired what it was that the Tracts taught, and what there was in their teaching that was certainly true, the whole face of English society, and perhaps of Christendom, might ere this have been changed. What was there in the doctrine that the Church of England was not the creation of a Tudor King or a Tudor Parliament, but a Society of Divine origin; or that the Sacraments were really means of grace; or that churches were places of worship and should be arranged as such; or that the people should say their own prayers, instead of delegating the duty to an ignorant parish clerk, with or without an *obbligato* of still more ignorant school children—what was there in any one of these propositions to excite animosity, except that it seemed novel? That all of them were reasonable, right, and true is proved by the fact that Bishops would no more think of challenging them now than they would think of disputing not because it is a novelty, but because we have seen it so often already. There is in truth, no substantial difference between Mr. Booth's method and the various forms of Ranting revivalism which preceded it. We believe that it owes its present celebrity almost entirely to the opposition it has met with; and that when the "roughs" are made to let it alone, or when they get tired of meddling with it, the Army will dwindle into obscurity. But, however that may be, the duty of Churchmen, and especially of those in authority, is the same. They should make Mr. Booth's organization the subject of careful study; and if they find that it indicates a missing link in our own system they should do their best to repair the defect. If it suggests any really efficient way of dealing with the masses that the Church has neglected, they ought without loss of time to take the hint. But let us never, again repeat the old blunder—abuse a new thing as Mr. Darwin's book was abused, and twenty years after vie with one another in devising compliments to pay it.

CHURCH NEWS.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Rev. A. B. Abbott, B.A.; Vicar of Gorleston with South Town (otherwise Little Yarmouth and West Town annexed), Suffolk. On his own petition as Patron.
Rev. H. Barber; Minister of All Saints' Temporary Church, Forest-gate.
Rev. H. Brown, M.A.; Perpetual Curate of Cauldon and Waterfall. Patrons, the Trustees.
Rev. F. C. Bicknell, M.A., Curate of All Saints', Margaret-street; Vicar of Fowland.
Rev. W. J. Canton; Vicar of Dinting Vale. Patrons, the Trustees.
Rev. W. B. Carpenter, Vicar of Christ Church, Paddington; Canon of Windsor. Patron, the Queen.
Rev. D. J. Carver, B.D., Honorary Canon in Rochester Cathedral.
Rev. G. H. Chase; Vicar of St. Mary, Ambleside. Patron, Mr. J. H. Fleming.
Rev. R. Collins, B.A.; Vicar of Kirkburton. Patron, the Bishop of Ripon.
Rev. W. de L. Evans, M.A.; Vicar of St. Andrew, Leeds Patrons, the Trustees.
Rev. G. H. Fraser, Rector of Tulla; Acting Chaplain to Her Majesty's Troops in Garrison at Tulla. Patron, the Secretary of State for War.
Rev. E. F. Gilbert, M.A.; Rector of South Wootton. Patron, the Queen.
Rev. C. E. Grenadle, M.A., Curate of St. George's, Hanover-square; Rector of Kinsley. Patron, Mr. A. W. Saville, of Rufford Abbey, Notts.
Rev. S. Henderson; Rector of Bucklesham. Patron, Susan Brown, of Tunbridge Wells, Kent.
Rev. R. C. Hislop, M.A.; Chaplain of West Riding Pauper Lunatic Asylum.
Rev. H. Hetherington; Vicar of West Bradenham, Norfolk. Patron, the Bishop of Norwich.
Rev. W. Hope, Curate of Bradninch; Rector of All Hallows', Goldsmith-street, Exeter. Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Exeter.
Rev. S. E. Howe, Curate of St. Saviour's, Walthamstow; Rector of Luckington, Wilton. Patron, Mr. G. F. Ottley.
Rev. F. Hill, M.A.; Vicar of Great Cornard, Essex.
Rev. E. T. Holt; Curate of Wilton, Wilts, and Missioner to persons attending Fairs, &c.
Rev. G. L. James; Perpetual Curate of Church Gresley. Patrons, Simeon's Trustees.
Rev. F. C. Jagg, Rector of Luddenham; Perpetual Curate of Frosterley.
Rev. T. Johnson, M.A.; Rector of Elton. Patrons, the Parishioners.
Rev. L. Jones; Rector of Llandough-with-Leckwith and Cogan, Glamorganshire. Patrons, the Rev. W. H. Chaver, and the Rev. Lewis Jones.
Rev. W. G. Kinckler, M.A., Vicar of Alvanley; Vicar of All Saints', Hindley.
Rev. C. Morris, Vicar of Strete, near Dartmouth.
Rev. J. Patteson, M.A., Rector of Thorpe-next-Norwich; Honorary Canon in Norwich Cathedral. Patron, the Bishop of Norwich.
Rev. J. R. Pelham, M.A.; Vicar of St. John the Evangelist in Lewisham. Patron, the Rev. Edmund Holland, of Bentley Lodge, Suffolk, and others.
Rev. J. J. Pulleine, M.A., Rector of Kirkby Wiske; Honorary Canon in Ripon Cathedral. Patron, the Bishop of Ripon.
Rev. D. C. Randolph; Vicar of Major-cum-Redwick. Patron, the Duke of Beaufort.
Rev. T. Redfern, B.A., Curate of Oswestry; Rector of Trefonen. Patron, Earl Powis.
Rev. C. Ridley, B.A.; Chaplain of Bucks Pauper Lunatic Asylum at Stone.
Rev. W. J. Sinck, M.A.; Curate of the Northumberland County Lunatic Asylum.
Rev. C. E. Smith, Curate of Harbour Grace, Newfoundland; Rector of Heart's Content, Newfoundland.
Rev. W. R. Stone, Vicar of Walpole, Suffolk. Patron, the Bishop of Norwich by lapse.
Rev. E. Thomas, Vicar of Whitchurch and Llanfair Mathafarn Eithaf; Vicar of Llanegwad, Carmarthen. Patron, the Bishop of St. David's.
Rev. G. P. Turner, B.A., Vicar of Knaresboro'; Vicar of Scriven. Patron, the Lord Chancellor.
Rev. G. D. Wharton, B.A., Senior Curate of Rotherham Parish Church; Vicar of Newhall, near Burton-on-Trent.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

ADY.—On the 21st inst., at Little Baddow, the Rev. [illegible] Ady, Rector of the parish and Archdeacon

speculator something like universal admiration and respect. The chorus of regret which his removal has called forth seem to us to have been well earned; for nothing could possibly have been more deserving of praise than the industry, the patience, the acuteness, and the ingenuity with which he prosecuted his researches, except the calmness and moderation with which he has stated his views. Notwithstanding the obloquy and derision which his great work at first brought upon him, we cannot recall a sentence in his writings which betrayed any tinge of polemical bitterness.

The real nature of the Darwinian hypothesis is often misrepresented. Its lamented author did not originate the doctrine of Evolution—the theory, namely, that the innumerable varieties of animal and vegetable life which we see around us, so far from having always existed, are but modifications of a few types, or even of one primordial type. Something of the kind had been taught by Lord Monboddo, and in a more thorough form by Lamarck and the author of *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*. What Darwin did was to devise a reasonable, or, at least, a plausible, theory for the changes in question. One of his suggestions is based upon the fact that the reproductive energy of almost every form of life transcends the means of maintaining the individuals actually or potentially brought into existence. Hence it follows that a vast proportion of the creatures that are born will necessarily perish before they come to maturity; and that those which survive will be such as possess some accidental advantage which may enable them to win the battle of life. If, for example, the climate of a country should become colder, those individuals of a given race of animals which happened to have a somewhat warmer coat than the rest, would be more likely to survive; and these, breeding together, would gradually originate a new species with thicker clothing than their ancestors. There is no doubt whatever that this hypothesis will account for a good deal. Whether it is sufficient to bear the load which has been placed upon it, is another matter; but it is not surprising that the foolish bodies who say in their hearts that there is no God, should have eagerly seized upon it as a ready mode of eliminating the Creator from His own Universe. It was thought that it afforded a pretext for believing in an automatous or self-acting Nature; but a little further reflection has made it clear that the doctrine of Darwin does not touch the question at all. Whether the Universe is the result of a Divine fiat, or whether it is the result of a self-developing power, is a question which must be settled on other grounds than its own. Again, the notion that the gorgeous colours of certain male birds and insects have been perfected by the preference which their mates have shown, through long cycles of ages, for splendidly attired wooers, seems contrary to notorious fact. We have never heard it contended that the female has had any option. No doubt, the motto of Nature is "*Detur digniori*;" but the question which is the more worthy is settled by combat *à outrance* between the suitors; and the prize goes contentedly with the victor, whether he be Palamon or Arcite. We were going to say that Mr. Darwin had introduced into the discussion a purely human consideration, but we doubt whether even that could be a fair description of the matter; for it may be doubted whether even now, in any but an insignificant minority of cases, it is true that women select their mates at all, much less select them for their personal comeliness.

In fine, it seems to us that the Darwinian theory has as yet received nothing like satisfactory proof. The most that has been done is to make out a plausible case for it, and even then the evidence does not seriously touch the enormous difficulties with which it has to contend. Nevertheless, if Science should ultimately accept the hypothesis, it would not in the remotest degree infringe upon the solemn verity that God the Father Almighty is the Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things visible and invisible. It would only present to the mind a new and, if it were reverent so to speak, we should say a nobler and more worthy idea of creation than is suggested by what we may, for convenience' sake, call the Miltonic view. To invent a steamboat, a locomotive engine, and a navigable balloon would each be a great achievement; but to devise a steamboat which, when it reached land, should turn itself into a locomotive, and on nearing a mountain chain become a balloon, would require a vastly greater expenditure of mechanical genius. In like manner, the works of God, as we see them spread around us in their infinite variety, are marvellous; but they make a far less demand upon our devout wonder than the conception of life originating in a form so low as to be scarcely recognizable as life at all, and yet, in obedience to Divine fiat, growing as the vast cycles of cosmic time unfold their course, into the perfect mammal.

The history of Mr. Darwin's theory affords one more illustration of the absurd and baneful manner in which mankind are addicted to treat the unfamiliar. An idea is taken up—say, for example, that the earth is a plain, and that it is the fixed centre of the universe, round which the [illegible] in the manner in which the truth is just then taught. Thus if we grant all that can be said in disparagement of the Wesleyan movement, the very fact of its success proves that in the eighteenth century there must have been a painful lack of personal religion. But if so, does it not follow that the zeal of the first Wesleyans ought to have been utilized by the Church herself? Or, if that could not have been done—and there is some reason to think that the imperiousness and self-will of the Founder would have made him very difficult to guide—would not the proper way to deal with the movement have been, to meet it not with ridicule or abuse, but with a better style of preaching in the churches, and with a more Christian way of life? And so in our own times, if the Bishops, instead of joining in, or even fomenting, the howl with which the *Tracts for the Times* were greeted, had but dispassionately inquired what it was that the Tracts taught, and what there was in their teaching that was certainly true, the whole face of English society, and perhaps of Christendom, might ere this have been changed. What was there in the doctrine that the Church of England was not the creation of a Tudor King or a Tudor Parliament, but a Society of Divine origin; or that the Sacraments were really means of grace; or that churches were places of worship and should be arranged as such; or that the people should say their own prayers, instead of delegating the duty to an ignorant parish clerk, with or without an *obbligato* of still more ignorant school children—what was there in any one of these propositions to excite animosity, except that it seemed novel? That all of them were reasonable, right, and true is proved by the fact that Bishops would no more think of challenging them now than they would think of disputing the multiplication table; and the prelates of five and forty years ago would have been quite intelligent enough to reach the same conclusion, if they had only allowed themselves to think over the questions, instead of going with the fool multitude in its frenzied outbreak against what was new to it. If the right rev. bench had but shown a little more sense, they might have moulded the Oxford movement at their pleasure; they might have saved it from the smallest extravagance; they might have prevented the secessions to Rome; and they might have strengthened their own authority, instead of seeing it all but disappear.

And we have another problem to deal with—the "Salvation Army." Our own opinion of it, as at present advised, is not high. We think poorly of the movement,

Mr. J. H. L. Fleming.

Rev. R. Collins, M.A.; Vicar of Kirkburton. Patron, the Bishop of Ripon.

Rev. W. de L. Evans, M.A.; Vicar of St. Andrew, Leeds Patrons, the Trustees.

Rev. G. H. Fraser, Rector of Tulla; Acting Chaplain to Her Majesty's Troops in Garrison at Tulla. Patron, the Secretary of State for War.

Rev. F. P. Gilbert, M.A.; Rector of South Wootton. Patron, the Queen.

Rev. C. E. Grenside, M.A., Curate of St. George's, Hanover-square; Rector of Elmley. Patron, Mr. A. W. Savile, of Rufford Abbey, Notts.

Rev. S. Henderson; Rector of Bucklesham. Patron, Susan Brown, of Tunbridge Wells, Kent.

Rev. R. C. Heslop, M.A.; Chaplain of West Riding Pauper Lunatic Asylum.

Rev. H. Hetherington; Vicar of West Bradenham, Norfolk. Patron, the Bishop of Norwich.

Rev. W. Hope, Curate of Bradninch; Rector of All Hallows', Goldsmith-street, Exeter. Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Exeter.

Rev. N. E. Howe, Curate of St. Saviour's, Walthamstow; Rector of Luckington, Wilton. Patron, Mr. G. F. Ottley.

Rev. P. Hill, M.A.; Vicar of Great Cornard, Essex.

Rev. E. T. Holt; Curate of Wilton, Wilts, and Missioner to persons attending Fairs, &c.

Rev. G. L. James; Perpetual Curate of Church Gresley. Patrons, Simeon's Trustees.

Rev. F. C. Jagg, Rector of Luddenham; Perpetual Curate of Frosterley.

Rev. W. Johnson, M.A.; Rector of Elton. Patrons, the Parishioners.

Rev. L. Jones; Rector of Llandough-with-Leckwith and Cogan, Glamorganshire, Patrons, the Rev. W. H. Cleaver, and the Rev. Lewis Jones.

Rev. W. G. Knocker, M.A.. Vicar of Alvanley; Vicar of All Saints', Hindley.

Rev. T. Morris, Vicar of Strete, near Dartmouth.

Rev. J. Patteson, M.A., Rector of Thorpe-next-Norwich; Honorary Canon in Norwich Cathedral. Patron, the Bishop of Norwich.

Rev. J. B. Pelham, M.A.; Vicar of St. John the Evangelist in Lowestoft. Patrons, the Rev. Edmund Holland, of Benhall Lodge, Suffolk, and others.

Rev. J. J. Pulleine, M.A., Rector of Kirkby Wiske; Honorary Canon in Ripon Cathedral. Patron, the Bishop of Ripon.

Rev. D. C. Randolph; Vicar of Major-cum-Redwick. Patron, the Duke of Beaufort.

Rev. T. Redfern, B.A., Curate of Oswestry; Rector of Trefonen. Patron, Earl Powis.

Rev. C. Ridley, B.A.; Chaplain of Bucks Pauper Lunatic Asylum at Stone.

Rev. W. J. Slack, M.A.; Curate of the Northumberland County Lunatic Asylum.

Rev. C. E. Smith, Curate of Harbour Grace, Newfoundland; Rector of Heart's Content, Newfoundland.

Rev. W. R. Tate; Vicar of Walpole, Suffolk. Patron, the Bishop of Norwich by lapse.

Rev. E. Thomas, Vicar of Whitechurch and Llanfair Nantgwyn, Pembroke; Vicar of Llanegwad, Carmarthen. Patron, the Bishop of St. David's.

Rev. G. P. Turner, B.A., Vicar of Knowbury; Vicar of Downton. Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

Rev. C. D. Wharam, B.A., Senior Curate of Rotherham Parish Church; Vicar of Newhall, near Burton-on-Trent.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

ADY.—On the 21st inst., at Little Baddow, the Rev. William Brice Ady, Rector of the parish and Archdeacon of Colchester, aged 65.

CARTWRIGHT.—On the 24th inst., at Ellingham Rectory, Norfolk, the Rev. Robert Cartwright, of Ixworth Abbey, for thirty-nine years Rector of Ellingham, aged 79.

DE SAUMAREZ.—On the 17th inst., in the Island of Guernsey, the Rev. Havilland De Saumarez, formerly Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford, and Rector of St. Peter's, Northampton with Upton.

HARDING-NEWMAN.—At Nelmes, Hornchurch, Essex, the Rev. Thomas Harding-Newman, D.D., aged 70.

NEVILLE.—On the 18th inst., at Butleigh, the Rev. William Frederick Neville, Vicar of the parish, aged 63.

On Monday the Archbishop of York consecrated the new church of St. Thomas, Hull, an edifice capable of seating 750 persons.

ST. ANN'S, WILLENHALL.—In reference to the recent case of sacrilege at this church, the churchwarden, acting on a suggestion, was induced to search underneath some loose boards on the south side of the church below the choir-stalls, where the missing ornaments (the altar-cross and eight candlesticks) were found, and have been restored to their usual places.

© Reproduced with the permission of Cambridge University Library