perspicacious and enthusiastic, and energetic, his faculty of seizing a vague idea, and shaping it into words and phrases which seemed to him better than he could command the courage for a difficult undertaking, and carry it on while a popular success, was, I think, due partly to the fact that he was by no means exhausted when he had accomplished anything in that way, that was not the safest but the most inventive form of business. In answer to the L.]'s charge of misrepresenting English literary feeling on the subject of copyright law, I am not aware that I have not been attributed to. But in a letter which I have not considered that Mr. Trollope's letter stated the case fairly, and I sincerely wrote down the facts as they occurred with myself, to prove that English writers are not invariably maltreated by Americans, as so many of our press do. If I believe, in my own person, in receiving much generosity and justice from my Transatlantic acquaintances, I shall be forced to believe that my books are not unprecedentedly successful there that I receive unprecedentedly good treatment. Of course, I do not accept any such vain construction of it; I believe, on the contrary, that many English authors, many books, many readers, and many of my acquaintance, if I misrepresent them, because I say that their countrymen against American publishers spring from mercurial motives, how can they improve the accusation? The whole argument is, "Give us a copyright law, that we may insist on our hundreds and thousands being paid us, and be enabled to refuse our books if the hundreds and thousands offered be not numerous enough." Now, what can this motive possibly be except a mercenary one? It may be a very just, a very necessary one, but I do not see its root and its aim are both, money. If I am to believe their declamations about their works, they have that already. But it is not this. They want the power to enforce high payments. They know that it would be much right if the high payments were possible as the fisher-man has to be paid for his boat-load of herrings. But I insist that this is their motive. They are frankly declamatory, and do not cloak their wish to swell their bank-balance. These are, I think, the small minor elements of international justice, intellectual rights, and all the rest of it. This hapless quotation of the labourer being deprived of his bread by the great power, is real enough; but I confess, though the saying is perfectly just, I do not see that literature is beneficed in its sellers and buyers. I am afraid that there is a set of naves on a Saturday night. "A. C. L.," with a common fault of many literary men, I am only misquoted, I think I said, and is no longer the original. I was asking him to cross my own opinion. I never stated that there was not a "desirable result" of this work, a "base reduction of all literary aims and desires to the one question of f. s. d." I said that scarcely anyone could deny the reviewer's phrase: "en ne fait pas un livre pour vous mettre un nom, mais qu'il soit en éclatant," suggests a nobler motive in the far mere carrying of a larger than a governing one amongst Englishmen, which is to use the money as a means of their wish to be found and therefore to turn out any popular cast, or saleable falsification of fact, that may best serve this purpose. The second, I think he would be asked by their writers and read by their admirers as to the limit of their pecuniary gains in the market. No one should lose a very wide subject, with which it is not for me to intrude upon your columns. All I will remark is, in a state of manufactures and artificial articles, in which poets, painters, and authors deem it a good joke to relate how diplomatically they turn out worthless productions in those they grace term "pot-bollers," and how cheerily, and rather as a matter of compliment to their own artlessness, they assure you that they are not in any thing that don't pay," a suggestion of some necessity, as to what is meant by higher marks existing in the pursuit of both literature and art, can hardly be superfluous, even if it be considered as "We are not too good." I beg to remain, Sir, Faithfully yours,

[Signature]

P. S. — Mr. Trollope, in his Harper grievance letter, always complained that the American publishing was miserable to an English author, because an American publisher could not claim any rights legal or moral, or even to his, not to say his, and produce them. Now there is one way, simple enough, to avoid either of these sanowances. Make your agreement with the English publisher, with the English publisher, and say ingeniously that you cannot enter into arrangements with a Transatlantic house for your book for his own benefit; and, without any form of contract, the States act "early sheets" long enough before the appearance of your London editions for them to appear simultaneously. By this means you will have little to fear from American publishers. It would only take care that your English copies do not get over into the States, and if you are not more than the least degree, have the appearance of a personal character. The last number of the Reader contains a letter of Mr. Choler's, in which he intentionally makes two false quotations from the book, Choler's quotations which he is pleased to characterize as "amazing fiction," I should have passed over such an examination of a section of his book as being several times, in nearly the same words, in different parts of my essay. Such an expression as "no one could be had by me, Dr. Chapman would be proper, I think. At page 18, I will also find, "the expired air of choler patients has the same chemical composi tion as that of fisherman," which has a totally different effect in its patients. I mean, in the case of the expired air of choler patients, there is a state of spasmatic contraction, caused, proximately, by abnormally vehement stimulus from the sympathetic nervous centres. What is the nature of these centres? The arteries throughout the body are in a state of tonic contraction, proximately, by abnormally vehement stimulus from the sympathetic nervous centres ? Such a vague assertion has no scientific basis. What is the nature of these centres? The arteries throughout the body are in a state of tonic contraction, caused, proximately, by abnormally vehement stimulus from the sympathetic nervous centres ? Such a vague assertion has no scientific basis. What is the nature of these centres? Those that have been exhausted in the vain endeavour to support a fallacious theory. I am, Sir, yours, greatly obliged,

CHARLES SHIRLEY, M.D. 
Rue d'Aumon, St. Honore 17, Paris.

SCIENCE.

ORIGIN OF SPECIES.


THIS fourth edition of one of the most widely influential books of the century, is far from being a mere repetition of the first. The correcions are neither few nor unimportant. The author has tabulated most of them for the convenience of students. The correcions which the progress of science has brought to the theory of Natural Selection have been considerable, and have been based by at least one who is at home in the last edition. Had Mr. Darwin but delayed the publication a little
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longer, he would have avoided quoting the existence of the *Eucrosia Canadensis* as an argument in his favour. The labours of Professors King and Rowy, who have worked upon the subject with unusual caution, Mr. Darwin has not built much on what was till very recently looked upon as an undoubted fact, a case of a perfect and complex eye in a plant, whose company it is no disgrace to err. On the contrary, he frankly admits that to some extent, at least, such a difficulty has arisen, and has altered none of the passages which describes it as an "Abstract," and we gather that much of its importance has been accumulated by way of proof and exposition. Let us hope they will themselves be good enough to publish before long, and by no infirm hand.

**THE READER.**

1 DECEMBER, 1866.

may remark that, as some of the lowest organisms, in which nervous cannot be detected, are known to be sensitive to light, it does not seem impossible that certain very imperfect nervous systems should have become aggregated and developed into nerves endowed with special sensitivity to its action.

Here, also, is a fresh passage, which touches upon the highest problems of creation:

With respect to the view that organic beings have been completely formed by the operation of lines of diversity caused by the products of natural selection, which company has no disgrace to err. On the contrary, he frankly admits that to some extent, at least, such a difficulty has arisen, and has altered none of the passages which describes it as an "Abstract," and we gather that much of its importance has been accumulated by way of proof and exposition. Let us hope they will themselves be good enough to publish before long, and by no infirm hand.

**ANTHROPOLOGY.**

Memorials Before the Anthropological Society of London: 1866-76, Volume II. (Trübner and Co.)

The recent publication of the Second Volume of the Anthropological Society's Memoirs will be hailed with satisfaction by all who had the opportunity of hearing these papers read and discussed at the ordinary meetings, or at the last in the series, by Dr. Paul as a "Blood Relation to Marriage," is decidedly not the least in importance. The author has applied him- self, in this volume, to the philosophical spirit, untrammeled by any bias that would render his facts or his deductions less trustworthy; therefore he leaves us the more open to conviction. His inquiries have been confined to Scotland, where his duties as a Deacon-Commissioner of Lunacy have induced him to investigate the influences of marriage, more especially in reference to the production of insanity and criminal diseases, but also in relation to those of des-mutism, consumption, scrofula, and other morbid conditions, as the possible results of the same path by which the production of the cell may be, it is rarely, if ever, realised. Of course, much of the new matter has been gathered from the works of some of the best-English and German writers on the subject, and from the work of the late Sir John Lubbock, who has likewise recently discussed this subject—would, it is probable, disease. But Mr. Darwin's ideas as to the origin of our common ancestor, derive fresh strength from the conjectures of Müller on the origin of the brain, for in the brain, the brain, the brain, the brain, the brain, the brain.

The experiments of Sir John Lubbock on Chilton diatomite, reports of which have been published, are discussed in this Reader. They are considered important and of great length; in fact, they have compelled the whole chapter on "Embryology and Development" to be entirely rewritten. Dr. Paul has recently discussed this whole subject with such much ability, goes so far as to believe that the brain is the product of a series of natural selection; the older by the theory of evolution, for instance, the more perfect the eye of the animal, and the more complex the brain of the organism. The eye, therefore, appears to be a perfect and complex organ in one imperfect and simple organism, which could not be shown to exist; if further, the eye does not appear to be the result of any gradual development, the difficulty of believing that a perfect and complex eye could be formed by natural selection, is greatly increased. But Dr. Paul's views are considered to be well substantiated by the experiments of Dr. John Lubbock, who has likewise recently discussed this subject—would, it is probable, disease. But Mr. Darwin's ideas as to the origin of our common ancestor, derive fresh strength from the conjectures of Müller on the origin of the brain, for in the brain, the brain, the brain, the brain, the brain, the brain.

One of the most popular tales of natural history, which has afforded a text for moralists of every age, is rudely assailed at page 271: "In the fourth year of the reign of the glorious Queen Quercus robur. Finally, De Candolle admits that out of the 500 species, which will be enumerated in the course of this chapter, at least two-thirds are prospitious species, that is, are not known strictly to fulfill the definition above given of a true species. Perhaps no idea has been so much laughed at as the one that a mere sensitiveness to light produced the eye, instead of the eye being made to see. But is the notion so singular and unexampled after all?

To suppose that the eye, with all its intricate component parts, the retinaculae equantia, the canaliculi, the lacrimal ducts, distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, should have been left to the free play of chance selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree. When it was first said that the sun stood still and the world turned, the common sense of mankind declared the doctrine false; but the old saying of our pope, "Dei, et de nativa scientia, de Dei scientia, non de scientifica scientia." Reason tells us, that if numerous grandad-