

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 'assent' to 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.

Even those whose subjects could not bring the test conflict with Scripture many would refuse to make the required promise. For there is, 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 up 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, inscribed in Greek philosophy. For man has to write, not only his own annals, but, 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, Hindalaya; farther on, the Europe of the lake-dwellers, and cave-dwelling, and the rise-ear period; the age of iron and of brass, and 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 Stages and bizarre commination 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, said they share the same honours? Did God communicate somewhat 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 support, 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 the cynical commentary which Nature, together with the wisest and most independent intellects, 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, ginsaid? 'No,' nature and science seem to say; 'let the old errors remain; but take this as a qualification.' Whether you are Stoic, 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'—'Inauspiciously he becomes "that creature of dust," "Imperial Caesar," according to the same speaker, "Imperial Caesar, dead, and to be laid to rest," might show a hole, and keep the wind away.

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

"Epipho non minor est Jove, diva, Liber, honestas, pulcher, sed desique regni,"  
"Præcipue senex, nisi quæ pietas volens ait."

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 needs 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-

296

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 weight of the many years of 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 honored names of Wallace, Huxley, Lyell, Vogt, Leubrock, Bichner, Haeckel, Haeckel. We might, we are convinced, have added to the list, to that number of those who ought to know has told us what we are to believe. And even archbishop Owen seems to have virtually abandoned the ascendant position to which he so long clung, from fear of 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 not be a large territory of cosmological generalizations whatever—Great puissance, great grandeur, and a demoralisation 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-laborers, 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, we may be able to furnish. We abate, 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, which is like 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 ascidian. 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 of the descent, many of which, so far 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 of the 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 filippical impotence. But whatever further evidence of this sort be procurable, it will probably be of a secondary character, and of secondary importance 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 domestication. 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 in the world are really nature's own work, 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, which with Mr. Darwin opens. When we think of the inherent impossibility of such forms as the corn, 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 stages, through which they pass in their development as such, 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 in the case of different animals are 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 antique 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 chance mutations, such as 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 mere reasonable misgiving. The Archbishop of York, in the address mentioned for his 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. It most means, in an over-refined civilization, 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 noble and 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. In the first place, 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 structure 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 servile contentment 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 often a very practical mistake 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 sort of heresies, who distorted the leading principles of Christianity by the extreme vehemence of their reaction against the Old Testament, and against every Jewish law; 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. The theory of evolution is 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 deprecates that material as less possible than the more 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 other 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 aversion, 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 tradition, 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 shut 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-apes; we are men. Shall we say, three parts towards it? If, indeed, I do not bite nor red, 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 Aëleis; 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 TILGNER FARRER, of Trinity College, formerly Fellow and tutor, has been elected Rector of the new University of Toronto.

MESSRS. WILLIAMS AND MORGAN 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 doctrine 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,' 'Pseudepistols of Unity,' 'The Infidelity 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 Moseley, A. J. Berkeley Hope, Esq., M.P.; G. S. Welby, Esq., M.P.; the Rev. J. C. Hyde, H. H. Bickersteth, G. H. Whitmore (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 sixteenth 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 of Balliol, and among those who met him were the Master (Professor Jewett), the Rev. Dr. Payne Smith (Dean of Canterbury), J. Palmer (Latin Professor), Woodhouse, Rawlinson, and Canon Oakley of Balliol, who saw us on our way, who directed us to the hall for the first time since his old days in Anglica. 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 Horrible Bill, said he would not deny the Dissenters the privilege of bringing their dead into their churchyards, nor would he force upon them the solemn and beautiful services 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. MIALI'S DISMEMBERMENT 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 tried 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 not the pettinal one. It is the social form of it. No probable parliamentary measure, as conventional legislation, 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 see 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, and occupying its regular 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