

be more ready to embrace the "Darwinian theory" because many of the objections raised to it may be deemed futile.

The Celtic mind surely conceives any question unless there is infused into it a certain amount of the religious element; and, in this case, the real question involved is, whether the world is governed entirely by natural laws; or, whether these "natural laws" are subject to the constant management and control of an omnipotent Providence. The possibility of such interference without any apparent violation of the ordinary course of affairs is skillfully represented in Huxley's "Eucrotia," and we must be lost indeed if we advance far in life out fall in perceiving the existence of this influence; both faith and reason if we refuse to recognize it even within the limits of our own experience.

Mr. Page was formerly connected with the firm of W. and E. Chambers, and acquired his first notoriety by translations respecting the authorship of the "Vedas"; he still speaks of that unhappy publication as "standing blackened by the moral avalanche that strikes Down-sweeping its pathway." He is now well known as a successful writer of educational books on geology, a circumstance which strongly exhibits the dearth of literary talent among the homesteaders of the west. The present work is a little too ambitious—a little too much like an attempt to improve upon Professor Phillips' "Life on the Earth." It is "designed," we are told, "for the general reader," and for "style is somewhat more rhetorical than before the examples of science," which sounds like a warning to expect "fine writing," and have a dictionary at hand. Unfortunately no dictionary would explain the peculiar phraseology of our author, and the unusual sense in which some words are used. We have been a good deal puzzled by such expressions as " dealing with a present plan," " assimilating extinct forms of past life," " homologating an affirmation," " a law and order," " the lapse of vast epochs of time," " With Mr. Page " a perfect fossil in a chapter in the world's history," and " a fragment of journey will throw a flood of light," we mean a great many more.

"Classification" is a fortunate word, apparently mostly by mistake for *codification*; the dictionary means a putting over the threshold, or out of doors; and is used metaphorically to express, e. g., the removal of anything from the system; the putting out of the means of error, &c. But never in the sense of *disclassification*, like the "elimination of primal patterns," or "the elimination of a single cell." The illustrations, if not original or first-rate, have the merit of being differently compressed from those previously in use, and which every child and uneducated man knows by heart. Some of them are exceedingly funny; witness the vision of "marriage" "tempering the ocean," with an ill-regulated, three-angled archipelago; the glints of extinct conditions; and the "wishes" which make impossible contributions in the attempt to build graceful. There is a spider, like when children draw, with antennae, and any number of joints in its legs; and an *Ichneumon* which has become hairy by reason of frequent copying. We believe that good original figures teach more than fine writing; we know that they cut far more pains to prepare.

When we have penetrated Mr. Page's rhetoric, and arrived at his facts and opinions, we shall find that while teaching others he has still much to learn. In his Zoological Table it is curious to note the *Lepidoptera* and blind-worm given as examples of "Acanthozoa," and the *staphylinid* (or fossil mandible of the *Veratrum*), treated as a genus of protozoan ophiolopods. The "Cnidarians, or bird of the chalk," here still survives, though it was known to be a Protozooid in 1844, according to Huxley. Mr. Page tells us that he is almost "altogether ignorant" of fresh-water areas of the older epochs. We, therefore, recommended him to visit Scarborough, with "Phillip's Geology of the Yorkshire Coast" under his arm. Between the *epistyles* and the "Mormon's Heart," he will find some very difficult river-missions of the Celtic age; and though he will not see a road in descending peaty river banks (because there is a substantial cause preserved in reality), yet he will find many layers of bluish shale indicated by blackened outcrops, set up, apparently, as they lived in their ancient bed. Further on, at Grimsby, when the tide is out, he may walk over the plant-beds from which Mr. Ewen obtained his famous collection of fossil fishes, now divided between York and the British Museum. Or, turning in the opposite direction, he will find the beach at Seably encumbered with masses of little yellow stones, and every stroke of the hammer will reveal fresh surfaces painted, as if in ink, with fan-shaped leaves, resembling those of the graceful broad-leaved pine (*Sabalites*), of which there is one we have often passed to admire in the middle of the interminable street of Bradford. By prolonging his walk to Halifax Wyke, Mr. Page may combine instruction with amusement, for it is the most charming place for a picnic, and there he may see the giant *Epistyles* piled up as they grew, still upright in the loam. To obtain a good exhibition of the flora preserved in the "Solenaster areas" of the Fries, Mr. Page must visit Emsay; but there are places in Warwickshire where fossil plant-beds of peculiar kind exist.

It is somewhat surprising to find one who considers himself an "advanced" proteogen, and master at English professors, laboring under the delusion that the *Chlidia* fauna and flora extended simultaneously over the whole world, and ceased or changed at the same time, giving place to the *Cretaceous*. He cannot understand that there are portions of the world in which the *Chlidia* flora never extended, and that there may be portions where it still lingers, never having been displaced by any newer régime. As he is a proteogenist, it should be satisfactory to him to reflect that the existing biologists

of every country are superior in rank and intelligence (though not in bulk) to any pre-existing fauna known to us by fossil remains in the same area; but even accepting the region of the great central spot, for there also we find the oldest relics of man.

Mr. Page thinks "science was severely combated" the belief that extinctions have taken place in "the few thousand years of man's experience;" but, without repeating the many well-known and striking cases among animals, we may cite the following passage in Dr. Hooker's "Antarctic Botany": "During the interval that elapsed between two visits which I paid to St. Helena, one very peculiar bird-like plant, *Asplenium* valves, had disappeared, and two other hard-wooded shrubby species of *Melastoma*, with particularly showy flowers, had very recently become extinct; while the existence of some *Polypodium* of a *Phytolacca*, and a few of the peculiar *Antarctic* *Cycas*, though thus far prolonged, is held upon a very precarious tenure."

Before we pass another chapter about the tropics, Mr. Page would do well to consider Dr. Livingstone's remark, that "tropical climates seem unfavorable for the full development of other animals or man" (p. 30, 384); and also Mr. Darwin's description of the Galapagos, where he says, "We may conclude that the usual gaudy coloring of the intertropical productions is not raised either to the least or light of those zones, but to some other cause." For the character of the natural productions of a region depends more on its geological age than even upon "the existence of conditions generally favorable to life."

Mr. Page's arguments are less valuable, inasmuch as he evidently misunderstands Mr. Darwin's hypothesis to more than one essential respect. He complains that Darwin "fails to show how the operation of a purely physical law should not affect alike every member of a species;" but the law of natural selection would be wholly inoperative without that "chapter of accidents" to which, in default of exact knowledge, we ascribe the origin of "sports" and varieties. We will suppose that the gorilla and chimpanzee are descended from "superior and more manlike forms of monkey." They represent (hypothetically) the younger branches of a great family; and may have improved upon their "ancestors" as much as Mr. Page has surpassed the *Chlidia*. Our common ancestor must have departed very long ago, and may have been a little human monkey. His whole understanding Darwinism. Mr. Page admits the possible operation of secondary causes in physical nature, and has no objection to the derivation of Adam from an ape, instead of the "red earth," provided you admit the super-addition of human faculties to be equal to a new creation. At this point he gets into trouble with one of his own witnesses; for M. Agassiz, like Sir B. Brodie and the Rev. J. C. Atkinson, cannot find any essential difference between human and brute nature, and hopes again to meet his four-footed friends in Paradise.

We will not follow Mr. Page into his speculations concerning the future. They cannot be of much consequence. A far more profound acquaintance with the history of the past were but the first qualification for the gift of prophecy.

The best thing in the book, in our thinking, is the speculation concerning a possible alteration of climate, at least in our temperate zone, from the beginning of time. Geologists long since abandoned the notion that "Arctic refrigeration" had influenced the paleontology of the globe. Mr. Cuvier's error went so far as to suggest that the strong backbones of the Old Red Sandstone fishes enabled them to "battle with the ice" in their clime or east; and Professor Ramsey attributed the Permian hinder-herms to glacial agency. Mr. Page attempts to show that the *Cretaceous*, Old-red, Permian, Chalk, and Boulder-drift, are the product of cold periods alternating with the former; for all the modern periods of astronomy are included within this view; for all the modern periods of astronomy are included within this view; and if we could agree at anything like an indication of *probable* limits, and if we could agree at anything like an indication of *probable* limits, and if we could agree at anything like an indication of *probable* limits, there would be no end at once to all the questions to which it would give rise.

The second work before us, though published so long ago, is known to be the production of the Rev. George Baines, *Esquire*, a clergyman of Peterhead. It is styled in the preface to have been three times delivered as a lecture, and is published under the patronage of Bishop Trevor, of Glasgow. It is an energetic re-assertion against Mr. Darwin's doctrine; full of objections, and good reasoning, and apt quotations. We hope the author is a reader of the *Critic*, for we find expressions respecting the "domestic habitations" of the ante quæ in accordance with our own sage reflections when reading the "Genetic Cycle" of his countryman, Dr. Dugès.

The "Three Barriers" are the back-bone, breast, and loins; which the author considers as essentially peculiar to the higher classes of animals as to forbid the possibility of any invertebrate animal from becoming fish or land—any viviparous creature from becoming mammalian—any quadruped from relationship with man.

It is quite true that the characters which distinguish the vertebrate animal from the insect or shell-fish are established at a very early period of embryonic development, and no man naturally would dream of transmitting one into the other. Suppose all nature to be plastic in your hands, and that you can "build" an oviparous, as Mr. White talks of "building" an artificial fish. When you have improved your oviparous into a whale or cuttle-fish, and wish to carry the process a step further, you will suddenly find your plan and materials well adapted to it; and that if you want to make a real fish, you must go back to the beginning and try a new scheme altogether. The railway (or

lowest surface) had the lowest (or lowest fish) are more alike than any of the higher numbers of these two great lakes. It is, however, not a little singular that the oldest known fish—the only fish of the Silurian system—was originally, and more than once, described as a *trilobite* (*Pteraspis*), whereas the true trilobite fish are unknown as fossils of the rocks older than the Silurian.

The barrier which divides the *osteopores* *vertebrata* from the mammalia is not so absolute as Mr. Huxley supposes. Whales do not actually walk like young, neither does the *amblyrhynchus*; whereas *gryphos* possess that power, after a fashion, with more elaborate than is shown by the *osteopores*.

The third lecture is altogether illusory; it has no existence in nature, and has arisen in the imagination of the author from a misapprehension of Professor Owen's classification of mammalian beings. The Professor explains that people "give more force to his generalisation than he himself does, by mistaking his readers as official givers." He continues that his definitions and divisions are official, and that "to use another way our course of the distinction between the physical phenomenon of a chimpanzee and a *Dei-man*, as being other than a difference of degree." Why should Mr. Huxley be so anxious to find a difference between the brain of man and the ape? Does he believe, with Dr. Grant, that the power of thought depends on being "brained evolved"? That man's moral nature and dreams of immortality arise from a better development of the "lamp of consciousness"? If not—if he only wishes to establish a physical objection to the claims of "our poor relations"—we fear he has cited a witness whose opinions will prove to be not in harmony with his own.

Mr. Huxley has sought to strengthen his argument by "fresh details of the most authoritative kind," from two other "living legends of British science." The first of these, Professor Kelland, being interviewed regarding the "Geometry of the Ice-line," says, "The terminal prominent faces of the corals have the remarkable property, that each of the solid angles is formed of three equal angles. And I cannot regard this power of selecting equality of angles other than a simple endorsement derived from the Divine mind." Lord Brougham's older story is also quoted:—"The box had been for thousands of years, in all countries, everlastingly working according to this fixed rule, not only choosing the same exact angle of 120 degrees for the inclination of the sides of the little room—which every one had for ages before known to be the best possible angle—but also choosing the same exact angle of 100, and 70 degrees for the inclination of the roof, which no one had ever discovered till the eighteenth century." Mr. Cuvier has followed in the same strain, but has done so repeating it:—"The box actually makes the top and bottom of their walls of three square planes meeting in a point. Who would dream for an instant of the lines forming the highest branches of *amblyrhynchus*?" Who indeed? Does simple-headed philosophy? You remind us of the *decease* we experienced when the perception first dawned upon our mind that two and two make four—that they always make four.

We have often admired the exceeding uniformity in size of the bubbles given off (e.g.), during the action of sulphuric acid on zinc—how they married themselves in lines and become regular hexagons, "choosing the same exact angle of 120 degrees for the inclination of their sides." Still more wonderful are the bubbles of gas in the boiler you have just supplied of Scotch Lard or British Soap; spherical when first evolved, they become twelve-sided through mutual pressure, and, wherever they are equal in size, form regular dodecahedrons, whose hexagonal faces are terminated by "solid angles formed of three equal angles," like the cell of the honey-comb.

In point of fact, the bees have no choice, working as they do in a narrow, and upon a double layer of wax. No solitary bee makes a hexagonal cell, nor would the social bees, unless mutually compelled. They are the terminus of the cells formed of "three planes with equal angles" that they were constructed simultaneously with other cells at their base. The proof may be seen in the margin of any comb, and in the neighbourhood of the open cells. The smallest cells are rounded externally, and their sides do not correspond to each other; they are opposed in one, two, three, or more to the sides of their cells. Therefore, it is not true that the "angles are reasonable." They are only so where they could not be otherwise. We know that a *diagrammatic* astronomer took great pains to teach this to Lord Brougham, who committed him frequently on the subject more than twenty years ago; but the loss of the manuscript was too strong, and the old story too pretty to be forgotten. It is probable that no higher intelligence or profundity of our mathematical problems are as self-evident as the simplest equation is to go; meantime let us be reminded, with Kepler, for any amount of light we can obtain, though our sentiments of wonder should become satisfied.

We must not forget the other "leader of science," Sir David Brewster, who is called upon to "provide an official opinion" for the statement that "the eye is not perfectly spheroidal." What says Sir David? "It is true that the curvature for the aberration of colour is not perfect in the human eye, but it is, notwithstanding, perfect. The uncorrected colour is diminished by looking through the edge of the pupil."—Why?—must we say, "because so?" The eye is declared to be only so far perfect as it would be if produced by the means he has suggested.

We have still to notice the new edition of Hugh Miller's "Footprints," first published in 1843, as a reply to the "Vestiges," and

revised soon after in the *Cassell* (1850, Vol. X., p. 305). It was not until long after the author's death, but it had become still more quickly out of date, owing to the rapid progress of geological discovery; and under his modifications and improvements, with the constant improvements of his newspaper, the "New Library of the General Assembly," and the labour of arranging his new manuscript, he failed to return to a task which had probably become distasteful.

Since the work was written he had learned that the Old Red Sandstone of Geomery and Ardara, "profile of fish," was not so old as the "gray shales" of Forfar and Kinross; and the "Middle Devonian" was older than the "Lower Devonian," and thus the inference founded upon the supposed succession of life required to be reversed. An extraordinary locality also attended upon all the reported discovery of land fish in the Silurian strata; the species of sharks proved to be tails of sharks, portions of trilobites, and even of *scorpions*; and the palatal tooth were traced to the carboniferous formation. The very title of the book had a narrow escape; for the name *scorpions*, originally proposed by Richard Owen, was found to include two distinct forms, and while Agassiz gave the name *Cheloniceras* to the gigantic remains found in Russia, Hugh Miller himself bestowed the appropriate name of "Pteraspis" on the smaller species, which had become so famous through his writings.

After Hugh Miller's death, the prospect of a new edition became still worse. The "Vestiges" had ceased to be a scientific treatise, and a new phantom arisen in their place. The "Footprints" could not be transmitted into a reply to Mr. Darwin's "Origin of Species"; but they had acquired an historical reputation, and were still in demand. By the judicious advice of Sir Philip Egerton they have been reprinted with no alterations of moment in the original text, but the results of recent discovery are given in notes.

The title-page announces a "Memoir by Louis Agassiz," but the biographical fragment which follows is at first in the very words of Sir David Brewster's memoir in the *North British Review*, and then merges in a criticism of the particular book, dated at the end "Cambridge, 1850." It is followed by a preface written by Mrs. Miller, who has not herself fully conversed with all the difficulties of the case, and yet has not made good the argument of the "Footprints" where it had broken down, but also expressly assails Mr. Darwin, whom she continues to find more difficult to understand than the "Vestiges." We cordially agree with Mrs. Miller, that "natural selection" tends to maintain the persistence of any system of species; but we must venture to doubt whether Dr. M.'s "selection may be" "restricted"—even if it has any persons—as an example of one species being created solely for the benefit of another.

This is not the place to bear testimony to the genius of Hugh Miller, or to demonstrate the value of his labours. But he was the first who ever made scientific truths accessible to his religious countrymen; and we trust the influence of his life and writings will long continue, and stir up new veterans to become champions, and, if need be, even martyrs in the cause.

We have also received *Spirituality in Præterition, Psychology, and Cery*, in relation to *Evolution, Progress, England, and Future Anticipation*, by Edward Tones, F.R.C.S. (London: John W. Parker, Kingsway-Matthias and Co.)

VIYAGES AND TRAVELS.

The Medical Mission in China: a Narrative of Twenty Years Experience. By WILLIAM LOCKHART, F.R.C.S., F.R.S., of the London Missionary Society. London: Haden and Bickart, 1871, pp. 202.

MR. LOCKHART went out to China as a medical missionary, and this was his opportunity of doing some good for the world while he was endeavouring to do good to the body; yet Mr. Lockhart's mission, like, in all cases, the spiritual missionary and the secular should never be separated in our persons. Mr. Lockhart has had twenty years' experience of China, and he has, though he writes he has largely profited by his opportunities, and that, although he presents us with many things respecting the Chinese which we were already acquainted, he tells us many other things which we were not. Perhaps our best plan will be to give a few extracts from Mr. Lockhart. In the following extract he is writing, as a medical man, of the Humane Society of Shanghai. When persons fall overboard from junks in the river, boats are sent to rescue them; but the treatment of the apparently drowned, is not the treatment they would receive on the banks of the Susquehanna:

One of the plans for restoring suspended animation is to place the patient on the back, and then to immerse a large iron bottle (necessity need be cooling) over the abdomen. This, they say, because of the connection between the empty vessel and the distended abdomen of the patient, causes the opening of the water by the nose. Another plan is "to remove the patient by the feet from the abdomen of a man standing erect, at the same time stopping the ears by a dose of cotton to prevent the entrance of the water, which would be fatal. This will soon be followed by the flowing of water from the mouth, and the patient's life will then be saved."

Noni-herbarium are often more cruel in their punishments than other savages. They bring more indignity to bear upon their

Great criminals, beggars, slaves, and such the offenders, are often cruelly dealt with. Though the magnitude may not authorize their degradation, it may induce a severe reprimand, sometimes laid in the end, after the criminal has been beaten, he is led to a low cross with arms extended, and kneeling on a