

many years to an elaborate investigation of the fertilization of plants, and the variation of breeds in domesticated animals. In the 'Origin of Species' (1859), he reasons that, in the breeding of domesticated animals, a vast amount of variation may be produced *artificially*, by preferring persistently for breeding purposes those that present a particular type. He argued that in the struggle for existence of all organic nature, it follows from the high geometrical ratio of their increase, that any being, if it vary from others in the slightest degree in a manner profitable to itself, will have the best chance of survival, and thus be *naturally selected*. The type thus naturally selected, from the strong natural law of heredity, will tend to propagate itself in the new and modified form. He then showed a process by which on purely natural and scientific grounds it is intelligible that these great variations of type which we call species, or genera, may have come into existence. In his second great book, the 'Descent of Man,' he argued that man is no exception to the law of progress which everywhere else obtains, and 'is derived by natural descent from a hairy quadruped, furnished with a tail and pointed ears, and probably arboreal in its habits.' Darwin's doctrine of descent of the higher types from the lower, by natural selection, was received with acclamation by the scientific world. It at once furnished to the Evolution system such a scientific basis as Newton's doctrine of Gravitation supplied to the Copernican Astronomy. In putting it forward, Mr. Darwin was eminently cautious, modest, candid in admitting such objections to his system as the absence, as yet, of fact to confirm it in the geologic records. He was also a reverent believer in the Unknown Power, from whom all Life proceeds, of whose will Evolution is the manifestation visible to us.

But, of course, English ecclesiasti-

cism, true to its mission of mildly imitating the Church of Rome, was mightily incensed against this audacious impugner of the six days of Creation, and the origin of the universe out of nothing in the year 4004 B.C. Loud and shrill arose the anathema from platform, pulpit, and clerical press. Darwin was an infidel, an atheist, in the face of his solemn assertion of faith in a Creator. Thirty years ago, before modern thought had won its place in Europe, and when in England theology was still 'Queen of the Sciences,' all this clerical abuse might possibly have done some small injury to England's greatest naturalist. It might have cost him a Professorship, or caused some unpleasant social ostracism, some of the petty *desagremens* with which Anglo-Catholicism mimics the mightier weapons of an august superstition. But in the last decade of our century, society as well as thought, have completely outgrown clerical influence. Now-a-days if the Church disagrees with Science, so much the worse for the Church.

So completely is this the case, that Canon Liddon, who is a sort of Bosuet among the High Churchmen, and who a few years ago wrote the most terrible pulpit thunderings against Darwinism, was content the other day, in a funeral sermon over Darwin himself, to take back his words, and declare that belief in Evolution is quite reconcilable with belief in orthodoxy. Of course, in countries where the clergy are not brought into connection with education and advanced thought as they are in England, Canon Liddon's admission would be regarded as rank heresy, if not atheism, and the great thinker's memory be pelted with the old worn-out fallacies and jests.

It is by this time perfectly plain, that Darwin's system is not atheistical, and that such was his own distinct opinion. Like most of the leaders in modern scientific thought, Darwin must be admitted to oppose the literal