

has himself. Yet M. FLOURENS, and the whole school of French physiologists, ridicule both his doctrine and language. Even HUXLEY says it is only a theory. Why is it unscientific savagery in a Christian to say so, too? M. VIAL, in his observations on *Le Darwinisme*, not only ridicules the *gasconade* of M. DARWIN, but adds, "*Ce pauvre HUXLEY n'est pas plus HEUREUX avec la tête des signes qu'avec leurs pieds.*" M. DE QUATREFAGES denies that DARWIN's theory has even the merit of originality, "Since it was clearly put forth by M. NAUDIN, prior to its publication in England." (*Unity of the Human Race*, ch. XII., p. 199.) Professor OWEN, whose supremacy in his own sphere of science is undisputed, (*Palæontology*, p. 443, second edition), laughs at DARWIN's hypothetical transmuting influences, saying, "Past experience of the *chance aims of human fancy*, unchecked and unguided by observed facts, shows how widely they have ever glanced away from the gold centre of truth."

What if a noble savage said the following, taken from the *Pall Mall Gazette*, August 13, 1872:—"The teaching of natural science, even if it were carried out on a really satisfactory system, can never fill the place of letters," or this from HERBERT SPENCER (*First Principles*, ch. I., p. 17), "Every addition to its surface does but bring it into wider contact with surrounding nescience." By the way, the mention of HERBERT SPENCER's name reminds us of what BROWNSON, the great American reviewer, says of him. BROWNSON's estimate of SPENCER as a powerful and original thinker, differs very materially from that formed in reference to him by a gentleman who lately delivered a lecture on Evolution in this city. Speaking of evolution, BROWNSON says, vol. iii., No. 2, p. 159:—"But your doctrine of evolution is not science; it is only an unverified hypothesis, an unproved theory, and a very absurd theory at that. Even that prince of modern English humbugs, HERBERT SPENCER, did not originate it, but plagiarised it from the old Greek sophists refuted both by PLATO and ARISTOTLE, and laughed out of countenance by old HERMIAS. The advanced thinkers of the age, called *thinkers*, because they do not think, and are incapable, through their own fault of thinking, if they are not avowed materialists, restrict all our knowledge to the material order, and exclude from the domain of science the whole supersensible world. Matter and its laws constitute for them the whole field of science. Because the Church insists on the recognition, partly by science, and partly by faith, of not only a supersensible, but a supernatural and superintelligible world, they cry out against her as the enemy of science."

HUMBOLDT ridiculed the "superficial omniscience" of of scientists, and professes slight esteem for what he calls the "pretended conquests of our age" and its "superficial self-knowledge."—*Preface to Cosmos*. "When I want to know," says RUSKIN (*The Queen of the Air*, p. 70, 72), "why a leaf is green, they tell me that it is colored by 'chlorophyll,' which at first sounds very instructive; but if they would only say plainly that a leaf is colored by a thing called 'green-leaf,' we should see more precisely how far we have got."

MR. LECKEY (*Rationalism*, vol. I., ch. XI., p. 187), says—"It has long been a truism that we are passing through a state of chaos of anarchy, and of transition. During the past century the elements of dissolution have been multiplying all around us." There does not appear, then, that there has been much progress, or that modern thought has led to much that is useful by way of result. And in his treatise on *European Morals*, vol. I., ch. XI., p. 276, this able writer remarks:—"Sincerely Catholic nations are distinguished for their reverence, for their habitual and vivid perception of religious things, for the warmth of their emotions, for a certain aimability of disposition, and a certain natural courtesy and refinement of manner, that are inexpressibly winning" On the other hand, Mr. RUSKIN (*The Queen of the Air*, p. 145), says:—"England is chiefly remarkable now for the multiplication of crimes more ghastly than ever yet disgraced a nominal civilization." And Mr. WILKIE COLLINS (*Man and Wife*, preface, p. 9), says:—"We have been so shamelessly familiar with violence and outrage, that we recognise them as a necessary ingredient in our social system, and class our savages as a representative part of our population." This much must suffice for to-day, our breath is fairly taken away. Here we see the result of modern thought and progress described, by their representative men, who *nolens volens*, are compelled to bear evidence in favor of the grand old Church, and the

result of her teaching. The more we read the writings of modern thinkers, and their descriptions of modern progress, the more we dislike both, and the less are we tempted to desert the noble old institution to which Christendom owes all it has of faith, piety, grace, of all that is noble in art, grand in architecture, pure in morals, sublime in literature, true in religion, winning in manners, honorable in politics, humane in the relations of man to man, and truthful in social relations. To the Roman Church it is due that in Christendom there is a liberty that prevails nowhere else, even in theory; that real progress has been made. The only advance that modern thought and modern progress can claim, is an advance backwards. To these is due the tendency now manifesting itself in the direction of paganism, and universal enslavement.

THE IRISH DISESTABLISHED CHURCH.

THERE may be many of our readers who are not aware of the conditions upon which the Disestablishment of the Irish Church was effected, and for the information of such persons we extract the following facts from a return recently presented to the Imperial Parliament upon the subject. When the Bill became law, and the voice of the country had proclaimed that the monstrous injustice towards the Irish people should be for ever swept away, provision was made whereby the Irish Protestant bishops and other ecclesiastics were allowed to rate their life interests in their respective holdings; that is to say, they were permitted to name a bulk sum as compensation for the loss of their future yearly stipends. This arrangement became applicable to all members of the Church, from the Archbishop of ARMAGH down to the lowest curate. In carrying out the process of commutation it is a somewhat notable fact from the very large demands put forth, either that the contemplated change greatly enhanced the value of the livings, or that their possessors were making provision for extreme longevity. During the existence of the State Church in Ireland, it was a generally supposed fact that its curates were anything but a well paid class; statistics, however, bear out the fact that many of those gentlemen who were supposed to have been living on miserable pittances, appeared to be in possession of most respectable incomes, judging from their assessment of loss when asked to commute. It will be thus seen that the dignitaries and clergy of the Church of England, who were in possession at the passage of the Bill had but little cause for complaint, no portion of the burden falling upon their shoulders, but on the contrary, a very liberal provision being secured for the remainder of their days. Under those circumstances, it is scarcely surprising to learn that being thus provided for, and the extent of their duties in many instances being now, as heretofore, absolutely none, numbers have left the scenes of their former "labors," there being no further need for their enforced residence. In noticing this exodus, an English organ says: "The bubble has burst, and the Establishment is down. Its clerical supporters have in crowds fled from the land, but not like the Israelites of old, for they have taken some little flesh-pots with them to help them while passing through the desert of life." Many of those reverend gentlemen, for the support and maintenance of whom the unhappy peasantry were heavily taxed, were in the condition of Dean SWIFT, who, preaching one day in a church where the congregation was solely represented by his venerable clerk, dropped the "brethren," and addressed it as "My dear ROGEE." The following statement of the remuneration granted to a few of the Episcopacy will be read with interest. The Archbishop of ARMAGH, who is also the Primate of Ireland, estimated the loss to his purse by the carriage of the measure to the extent of £90,000. Considering that the venerable prelate was eighty years of age when the claim was put forward, and his yearly stipend amounted to £11,000, it must be confessed that his Lordship seemed determined to make provision for, and enjoy, a good old age. In addition to that sum the clergy in his diocese have voted themselves half a million as compensation. His Lordship of DERRY would appear to have secured the lion's share, no less a sum than £111,000 falling to his lot, while the clergy under his charge were apportioned £360,000. Dr. TRENCH, Archbishop of Dublin, had to rest satisfied with £93,000, his subordinates having the sum of £500,000 distributed amongst them. His Lordship of TUAM was cut down to £65,000, and quarter of a million for those within his jurisdiction; the Bishop of MEATH obtained £47,000,