

Theoligico-Scientific heresy. All courtesy and gentlemanly feeling is set aside ; and not only anonymous writers, but one at least who gives his name, persist in the accusation,—in his case grounded on knowledge acquired when in the confidential service of the reputed author ! Certainly the “Morals of Trade” can reveal nothing worse than this. Suddenly, however, the venue is changed. George Combe, who, in a quiet, steady, unostentatious way had stuck through life to his phrenological hobby, dies at Edinburgh in a good old age ; and the Cataloguers of the Museum Library—finding anonymous authors a blot on Panizzi’s well-matured scheme,—father the “Vestiges” on the deceased phrenologist. Once more Mr. Robert Chambers has to decline the questionable literary honors anew thrust upon him. Then the London *Critic* comes to the defence of the British Museum Cataloguers, and re-affirms the Combe authorship, in a way that promises a *finale* to the controversy ; if dogged affirmation, backed by mysterious hints of esoteric sources of information, could do it. But the controversy about the authorship of the “Vestiges” still goes on. Professor Nichol, who had been named long ago as one having some share in the responsibilities of the “Vestiges,” and who revived the idea that he had a hand in the preparation of the book, by the emphatic way in which he denied Mr. George Combe’s connection with it, has since met that supposition with a negative. The *Critic* reiterates its belief in Combe’s authorship. It says, “We have already stated that when we attributed the authorship of the ‘Vestiges’ to Mr. George Combe, we did so upon the authority of one whose name is second to that of none in the world of science—perhaps we should have indicated the source of our information more clearly had we said, whose name has no equal. We are now in a position to state the grounds upon which this conclusion was arrived at by the person indicated. When the ‘Vestiges’ first appeared he felt satisfied, as well from the style as from internal evidence, that Combe was the author of it. To test this, he made certain corrections of a few misstatements of recondite facts, and caused those corrections to be shown to George Combe, and to him only ; but when the second edition appeared, those mistakes, and those only, were found to have been corrected. This was pretty strong inferential evidence ; but it so happened that afterwards a long private correspondence took place between this personage and Mr. Combe, arising out of some points mooted in the ‘Vestiges,’ especially phrenological ones—the former combatting