

possessed by the Principal of our Free Church College, Dr Cunningham; and there are not a few opposed to college extension on the principle that, even in the Free Church, Professors of Church History of similar calibre and acquirement are not to be had in every district of country, and that yet such are imperatively demanded by the emergencies of the time. To distinguish between the permanent forms and the accidental circumstances,—between the ever-recurring cycloidal types, and those mere varieties which belong to but one phase or period in the appearance of these,—must ever form no inconsiderable portion of the science of ecclesiastical history. Nay, save for this tendency in the typical forms of error to return upon the world altered in their features but unchanged in their framework, at least two-thirds of all ecclesiastical history would be but a profitless record of the nonsense and errors of the past; and the *beau ideal* of a Church History would be a work such as that of Milner, which is little else than a record of the better thoughts and deeds of Christian men chronologically arranged, and useless for the most important ends served by ecclesiastical history of the better type. It sounds no note of warning, and furnishes no armour of defence, against the cycloidal errors.

There are two of these returning errors of a diametrically opposite character, which arise out of natural science, and of which the last century has seen several revivals, and the centuries to come must witness many more. The one—that of Maillet and Lamarck—sees no impassable line between species, or even genera, families, and classes; and so holds that all animals,—the human race as certainly as the others,—may have commenced in the lowest forms, and developed during the course of ages to what they now are. The other,—that of Kames and Voltaire,—recognises in even the varieties of the species impassable lines, and holds, in consequence, that the human race cannot have sprung from a single