<page-header><page-header><text><text><text><text><text>

ove regards him, are capitally brought out. M. Savini's "Last Day of Pompeli' is a picture which merits, and will atand a close inspection. It is as good ing time. No English artisk could have painted if except, perhaps Mr. Leighton. Nor must we overlook M. de Joughe's charming "Lattle Coquette" (140), straining up on tiploo to kins her own reflection in the arge cheval glass. The absence of any appelment of M. Loos Ecocourts "Going on Duty" (40) is an admirable specimen of M. de Joughe's charming "Lattle Coquette" (140), straining up on tiploo to kins her own reflection in the arge cheval glass. The absence of any appelment of Messonies will be regretted, but Leon Ecocourts "Going on Duty" (40) is an admirable specimen of Nuture flaish. "Concoling the Widow" (64), by M. Vautier, and (58) "Discussion on the Infallibility," are also two capitally-painted small pictures, one of a schreyer sends us again a result of his Wallschian at Trough," and M. Pittars has two capitally elected inbject 27), "Travelling in Italy", and (122) "Italian Shopherds," both full of life and vigour. "Mong the landscape painters M. Lier is again ag freat attraction. The posito beauty of his (128) "Italian Shopherds," both full of life and vigour. "School of Landscape, claims attention for his (136) Bavaria," is also an admirable patiention. Montain Paas." More of venetian sunset and auries, and M. B. C. Koek koek a greefully patieted "Montain Paas". More of the same neighbourhood (22), "On the lase Chice," by M. Poschinger. M. Rodie thas a kock as a representative of the French Classical School of Landscape, claims attention for his (78) "K Maris, who has some very striking, though to same mentioned. So we must leave our reative to the diverse of the adving ontited strike were were then the same onited as well as to those which we have mentioned. So we must leave our strikes to adverse to do our cotice, so clever a work as his (19), "Any whith we have omitted as well as to those which we have mentioned. So we must leave our strikes to t

Literary Rebiew.

Bitterap Rebiew.

No one can at present say by what line of descent the three higher and related classes-maney maximals, birds, and reptiles —were derived from either of the two lower vertebrate classes, maney, amphiban and fahes.--{Vol. L, p. 21.3.} The remaining steps, however, "are not difficult to "concoive." Possibly not, if you start as Mr. Darwin does, by assuming bis principle of evolution as the sole origin of species, and rejecting separate [creation as "unscientific." In other words, you must first grant that man is descended from a monkey, and then it is not difficult to conjecture the intermediate steps; but if you decline to admit this petito principit, you are wilfally closing your eyos to what Mr. Darwin assures you is the fact. Such is the entire circle of this genitoman's logic. The book is full of interesting observations on natural history, exhibiting more or less relevancy to the argument it seeks to sustain ; but the induction never advances a step without a confession of logical defative-ness. We are treated to tendencies, and probabilities, and conjectures, which derive all their force from a previous assumption of the point to be proved. Take away this, and there is hardly a proposition in the whols work which could prevend to the character of a logical conclusion. It is a signal instance of what Mr. Tyndall lately called the province of imagrination in Science. The gobemouches who swallow for science all that ormes from scientific mon were confounded to hear of this secret laboratory of imagination. The Times pro-tested against the notion that experimental philosphers i respectability have been known in our day to fail to meat the rebligations; and noting the recklessness with which modern science files its kies, we cannot help rembing for its prospects at the settling day. The inductive leap has become too often a leap in the dark. Positions allowed for the moment, subject to after preof or or-rection, are treated as estabilished facts. The verification is forgotten, and new castes equally unsubstan

reared upon the sandy bottom.
Mr. Darwin's present book is a conspicuous example of this uterly uncelentific process. It begins by assuming evolution in the exact sense which Dr. Salmon justy called a scientific imagination, not a scientific fact.
From a plausible conjecture that some species may be modified descendants of other species—the very most that Darwinism can logically pretend to—its author quietly infers a universal law, also esta himself to inquire in the present book " whether man, *like every* " "doer species, is descended from some pre-existing form."
Having by this good beginning accomplished more than half his work, he proceeds in like manner to " take for "granted" the high antiquity assigned to man by " M. Boucher de Perthes, Sir Charles Lyell, Sir John Lubbock, and other, together with Professor Harkey's " "onclasive" proof that " man differs lass from the origination." Now here are at least four unproved hypotheses to be accepted in the dark for the lower members of " the same order of primates." Now here are at least four unproved hypotheses to be accepted in the dark before the new argument can see daylight. Of the first man differs lass from that " species" — instead of "some species" — are the modified descendants of other species. For this universal proporting. The battle, in short, has yet to be fough bypothetical orites. The antiquity of man is another has the prosting for the site. The antiquity of man is another bittle ground where it has hardly set up its banners. Assured it is a bareal using of the take, then a bardly set up its banners. Assured it is a solution is at present ladicrously ecanty, while the facts and reasons on the contrary side are overpowering. The battle, in short, has yet to be fough before Darwiniam can make good this first step in its hypothetical torites. The antiquity of man is another. Not a single fact is asshifted which is not quite as assally reconciled with the opposite theory. Against it is the unbroken testion, for the serve c

established fact, the whole basis of Darwinism is gone. Mr. Huxley's doctrine lies in the same category of assumption without proof and against evidence. He is not more logical than his fellows, because he is more peremptory and scornfall. Granting that in *physical* structure man approximates nearer to the ape than the ape to the lowest monkey, this is no argument for either being descended from the other, till we have admitted the two previous unproved hypotheses, uni-

BULLS
 Image: Second stress is a second stress of the same parents, because it is previously known that men are born of their parents, and often inherit their features. But it is identify not similarity that considinates and the same parents, because it is previously known that features. But it is identify not similarity that considinates and the same parents, and other one species it like another is aven to an experiment. The suggestion of lineal descent. For this suggestion has never yet bridged the galf between non species and nonther. All it is can do is to minimise the distance, but a little leap is as form disable as a large one, ill zome leaping power is established by experiment. Now all experience goes to show that species cannot leap at l. It is the very meaning of the word we refer individuals to the same species when their distinctions can pass into each of these and to different species when they cannot. Thus, the human race, with all its varieties, more or leas, in one species. It may be possible to reduce the solution of species by a more scientific classification, and intellectual mature is emphatically the storgation of species when the least in specific classification, and intellectual mature is emphatically the storgation of species when the least in specific difference from other mamula and bere it is easy to retork the distinction the lowest as saves. Whither cannot species is the subtract is a severe to be an another and the severe bounds are intearly on a share or the save is the severe the signification of a species of " imagination" to end the save strength in the lower is a save or deal when the save severe when he asks with a tudierow pannor " Key who indeed f if the. Darwin does, indeed, collect is he seems to be avare when he asks with a subicross is bataspeares " yoor beetie that we tread upon." There is only and other serves the signification and for the cannot show its own the sort is severe to company and the searest is nod to a sprease to be avare when h

What would be easily if any advocate of Revelation resorted to such puscile triding P In the case supposed, the creatures would not be men, but bees, and act like other bees. But that bees ever think anything a "secred " duy" is one of the thousand forms of begying the guestion artfully scattered up and down the book. Curiously enough, the best examples are found, not among the apes, from whom we ought to inherit, but among creatures so remote in physical structures as the dog, the elephant, and the bes. A mid all this irrelevant goesip, Mr. Darwin notices, with the feeblest attempt as refutation, the crucial arguments that man alone is expable of progressive improvement, and that man alone fashions implements for a special purpose. To the first he can only answer that in the hunting countries foxes are more wary than in districts where they are not disturbed; and, to the second, that the chim-pance cracks nuts with a stone, and other rape build term-porary plastions (se blick build ostio). which "might "medily grow into avoinstary and conscionasc." *Might*? But does if P and could it, unless we admit intellectual evolution, and so once more beg the question P is astonishing low persistently this artifice is resorted to throughost. Is pervades every part of the book, till, by din of repetition and incessant assumption, often vield in the most suble implications, the reader is led to think a point demonstrated for which not a shadow of evidence has been presented. In this way language is assumed to be developed from the will criss of nature, onscience from the complex instincts of beasts, and even religion and the ides of a spiritual world from the grasmingly allowed to be "affirmed by the highest " to ouridone that marks abore, existence of a Creator is assumed to the drespect from the will criss of nature, onside of God." The Bible, of course, is no evidence is the to the primitive faith or to the causes of its decay and disappearance. Hence, in the absence of its decay and disappearance. Hence, in the absen

A near 6, 1871.

by any kind of proof, is obliged to take refage in imagination. Its author, meanwhile, with as much assurance as if he had completed a mathematical demonstration, blandly apologises for the shock to our take and our religion, by avoving that, for his own part, he would rather be descended from amonkey than a Fuegian awarge; he adds that " it is not more irreligions to explain (1) the origin " of man as a distinct species from some lower form, " than to explain the birth of the individual through the " laws of ordinary reproduction." The first excuss overlooks the little fact that the simian ancestry involves the savage also; while the other must assume that " entry are reveal also his endowneet with the gift of increase. Mr. Darwin probably means that Evolution is not more irreligious than Traducianism; but this (beides not being true) is nothing to the purpose. A belief in the immortal part of man necessitates on expla-mation of the law of its transmission from father to child, confirmed by the voice of Revelation. Bat a theory that conscience, religion, and humanity itself, are neatural evolutions from brate instinct, is in the bighest degree irreligioas, not only as excluding the Creator Himself to a mere external fact—an ideal possibility instead of the Life and Light of our nature. Francis of Assist. By Mrs. Oliphant.—London : Mac-