

ethical, and scientific, are all brought to this great solvent. His view of the world is, that all things are in a state of becoming, progress along the lines of evolution, will as it were describe an arc, first evolution *upwards*, then devolution *downwards*. It is not encouraging, the one grain of comfort is that we have not yet reached the zenith. To the attaining of this we may contribute, and we may take encouragement by riveting our eyes on the sublime figure which will surmount the arc we are in process of describing. This figure is the figure of a man, look at him limned against the sky, on the summit of the rainbow of progress, which is a pledge not that man will always be preserved, but that he must ultimately perish. This man is a positive Agnostic, reigning among positivists, in a positivist world, calmly surveying the enormous effort it has cost struggling humanity to make him, unconcerned at the thought of the ruin which the fall from such a height will excusably entail. We are not told why from such an one, or such a pair, if his counterpart could be found, there may not spring a being of a higher order than even this exalted creature. We are not told why, if protoplasm can reach this height, it must stop here. Is it that the courage of the Evolutionist fails at this giddy height? Why cannot he be an Evolutionist without becoming a Devolutionist? He does not tell us; why then are we bound to give up evolution? We will not give it up, we cling to it as a process of becoming; we reject it as an account of the Alpha and Omega of existence.

As a philosophic or scientific account of things, evolution merely describes the steps in an upward or downward progress, as the case may be. It does not account for the inner power, which is working so as to cause things to rise from the lower to the higher or *vice versa*. This undefined force in the background is recognized by Mr. Spencer as "the great first cause, unknown and unknowable." This admission practically, though he has not acknowledged this, removes his philosophy from the ranks of materialistic systems. Criticizing Darwin's phrase, "natural selection," on the ground that it involves ideas of purpose and design, and for this reason fails to account for things on a purely physical basis, he supplements it with his own phrase, "survival of the fittest," but this he now allows is open to the same objection. The Duke of Argyle emphasizes this "great confession," and shows, as many others have shown, that the flaw lies not in the phrase, but in the philosophy. Evolution has not solved the problem of being. It postulates and must postulate a cause. About this cause it professes to know nothing. This is as near to Theism as science can approach. It is all the Theist asks of science. The philosophy therefore of this great apostle of evolution is not necessarily an antitheistic philosophy. If Mr. Herbert Spencer's life's work had been to build up an antitheistic argument, it would have been a complete failure. He has done a greater work than that. His work is positive, not negative. He has applied to all departments of life and thought the great Darwinian doctrine of evolution. He has

revealed that the laws of evolution are everywhere at work. He has shown that all things are moving forward and upward. Darwin by showing order in one kingdom has done the work of a Copernicus. Spencer by showing that this order pervades all kingdoms, has done the work of a Newton. Darwin has not shown what gives nature her power of adaptability, Copernicus has not resolved "the sweet influences of the Pleiades," Newton did not worship the power of the great central sun. Spencer may yet learn that his great first cause, unknown and unknowable, may be known.

Trinity University Review.

Published by the Students of TRINITY COLLEGE. Contribution and literary matter of all kinds solicited from the Alumni and friends of the University.

All matter intended for publication to be addressed to the Editors, Trinity College.

No notice can be taken of anonymous contributions. All matter to be signed by the author, not necessarily, &c.

Advertisements, subscriptions, and business communications should be directed to CHAS. H. SHUTT, B.A., Business Manager.

Terms, post paid—Annual subscription, \$1.00.

EDITORS:

A. CARSWELL, B.A.	E. C. CAYLEY, B.A.
H. P. LOWE.	S. F. HOUSTON. T. T. NORGATE.

TRINITY COLLEGE, TORONTO.

EASTER TERM, 1888.

With the various examinations but a short distance before us, we are perhaps inclined to give but slight attention to our editorial duties. No one who has not been through a similar experience can very well conceive the mingled feelings with which we undertake the issuing of this number of the REVIEW. It is a labour of love indeed, but our ambition, our more serious duty, our real work is elsewhere. We hope, however, that no deterioration may be detected in the present issue.

Volapük, as perhaps most of our readers are aware, is the name of an artificial language invented by a German Catholic clergyman, Johann Martin Schleyer, and designed to serve as a medium of communication between persons of different nations who are ignorant of each others native languages. Little time is required for its mastery. Two or three hours study, owing to the ingenuity of the system of word-formation, and grammatical structure, suffice to enable one to begin reading. Though only ten years old, two hundred thousand persons are already acquainted with it, and ten periodicals are now circulated in Volapük in Europe. It is not to be expected that it can become a "universal language" in any proper sense of the word. But as a medium of commercial and perhaps scientific correspondence it may conceivably become of great use. Its weak point is its phonetic system. It is not so well