

society of those who speak it, as the golden road to perfect mastery of Italian is to be born a Tuscan.

—Our new Professor of Moral Philosophy has given his inaugural and has proved, we believe we may say, to competent judges that he is master of his subject. He promises to connect philosophy with life. If he keeps his promise he will do what has been hardly done by any modern philosopher except the despised Paley. The others have devoted themselves to the quest of some sanction for morality other than the Will of the Author of our being and superior to experience which, as the debate still continues, they can scarcely be supposed to have found. Paley, who had no turn for metaphysical speculation, assumes at once that the sanction of morality is the Divine Will and proceeds to give practical rules of life. There is something of the same practical character in the lectures which Frederick Maurice gave as Professor of Moral Philosophy at Cambridge. Discovery in the region where the physical passes into the moral has completely changed the field and it is vain to suppose that a new professor can tread exactly in the footsteps of Professor Young.

—MR. FRANCIS E. ABBOT, who in the Boston *Unitarian Review* does us the honour to notice our criticism of Renan's Agnostic Manifesto, thinks that we have unconsciously thrown ourselves into the arms of Agnosticism by admitting that we can know nothing of infinity or eternity. We must frankly confess that if a knowledge of infinity or eternity were essential to religion and morality we should, so far as we can see, be reduced to Agnosticism. But the one thing needed, as it appears to us, to save us from Agnosticism, religious and moral, is a well-founded conviction that we are under the government of a Being whose character and objects are indicated by our moral nature, who will deal with us as we keep the moral law,