by the language in which the German embodies his view; though it may be not uninstructive to refer to it in evidence of the fact that a man may be *intellectually* on the very verge of truth, and yet for every moral purpose infinitely removed from it. "Man," he says, "is God manifest in the flesh." And yet it may be admitted that there is a certain loose sense in which man *is* "God manifest in the flesh." As may be afterwards shown, he is God's *image* manifested in the flesh; and an image or likeness *is* a manifestation or making evident of that which it represents, whether it be an image or likeness of body or of mind.

Not less extraordinary, but greatly more sound in their application, are the views of Professor Owen,-supreme in his own special walk as a comparative anatomist. We find him recognising man as exemplifying in his structure the perfection of that type in which, from the earliest ages, nature had been working with reference to some future development, and as therefore a fore-ordained existence. "The recognition of an ideal exemplar for the vertebrated animals proves," he says, "that the knowledge of such a being as man must have existed before man appeared; for the Divine mind that planned the archetype also foreknew all its modifications. The archetypal idea was manifested in the flesh, under divers modifications, upon this planet, long prior to the existence of those animal species that actually exemplify it." So far And not less wonderful is the conclusion at which Owen. Agassiz has arrived, after a survey of the geologic existences more extended and minute, in at least the ichthyic department, than that of any other man. "It is evident," we find him saying, in the conclusion of his recent work, "The Principles of Zoology," "that there is a manifest progress in the succession of beings on the surface of the earth. This progress consists in an increasing similarity to the living fauna, and among the vertebrates, especially in their increasing re-