

brides the idea of the "development theory." In other writers that we would examine, all Spain parent, the doctrine in question is instinctively allowed to.

A large portion of Mr. Huxley's "Psychology" is an admirable exposition of "development" as qualified by animated nature; and we may add, his views on "Progress; in the Law and Cause; and we believe" Modern Astronomy, are no less masterly explications of that principle as well in the material universe as in the life of those productions by us now distinguished by the term that the "Vestiges" was published first. Having established Mr. Huxley's general reasoning, we will now proceed to offer some additional remarks on the theory itself.

It is not sufficient to say that there is a law by the operation of which variety of structure in animals is produced and progressive development is brought about. This teaches us nothing. We want to know not only that animals are modifiable, but what is the modus operandi; what is the agency instrumental in accomplishing this modification and development? We will endeavor to make this clear. Animals try to adapt themselves to circumstances, and those to themselves in the best way they can for their own good, and several advantages in an animal world prompt and suggest a better use of its bodily organs for accomplishing its own good; and this would tend to improve its physical organism, that is, make it better suited for rendering the external world subservient to the satisfaction of needs; and, again, this improved bodily construction would react upon and improve its mental capacity, by giving it additional experiences. The senses may be said to constitute outside of its bodily advantages that an animal might possess; and the effects of this world of course be accumulative in the race. Now there are animal forms better suited than others for rendering the external world subservient to needs, and towards these superior types it would be the tendency of the cause indicated to make the others approximate. Take one of these beautiful creatures resembling birds, as existing both a part of itself, and attaching this to the variety, it is seen to long itself along, wrapping itself round its food and extracting the value therefrom in order, thus improving locomotive apparatus, and, next, as occasion requires, it gradually constructs how such a creature as this, under the operation of the cause referred to, the infinite variety of instances and conditions to be found in the world, would, in the course of time, acquire a pronounced ear, or stomach, with limbs just where they would be wanted, namely, in the neighborhood of the mouth, thus serving the double purpose of locomotive and feeding. Surely any one will be inclined to say, in some cases the tendency of food-seeking being one of the principal agencies of work, would tend to make

American portion of the Anglo-Saxon race at the present day, which differentiates them from English people, were, according to his view, brought about by a special and instantaneous miracle, or by the operation of natural causes in the course of a few generations; and if it be a sudden miracle, he might, as he appears to be in the secret of these things, have kindly forewarned us with the date; but if through the gradual modification produced by the influences and conditions at work, then he might have enlightened us touching the extent to which such modification may go, whether there is any ultimate limit beyond which it cannot go, and where this is to be fixed, or whether, on the other hand, this modifiability may not go to an indefinite extent, according to the nature of the influences and conditions in operation; and, finally, whether he does not consider this view as consistent with the doctrine of Transmutation, or the supposition that each and every so-called species of animal was created, as occasion required, out of clay or out of nothing, and if not, why not?

Dr. Huxley not only appreciates the composition of others as his own, but he seems to have taken Mr. DARWIN'S views on trans and at several hand from some other writer, otherwise he would hardly fall into the misrepresentations he does. If we suppose he would not misrepresent intentionally, as, for instance, p. 108, where by leaving out the time of sleep, he makes it appear as if Mr. DARWIN had said that sleep itself was a habit, though, in our opinion, and in the case that Pascal called nature a "lost habit," we believe that this description of sleep is correct; and again at p. 108, where he treats the Darwinian theory as teaching that the hierarchical form of cells in a honeycomb is due to pressure, when pressure is neither directly nor indirectly alluded to. But to point out all these misrepresentations would be to cite almost every paragraph in the "Origin of species" with which the doctor attempts to deal.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF PROGRESS.*

BUT very few persons trouble themselves with philosophical politics now-a-days, and indeed, the present age may be said to be worse off in this respect than the last. For the eighteenth century commenced and ended with philosophical treatises on Government. What was new in the last century has been copied in this, and the doctrine of Free Trade, now so universally received, must be acknowledged to owe their origin to Adam Smith, and will testify to Blackstone, Bentham, and others. It is said, to a Whig who had written some papers on the subject of the Poor Laws, "I think I have never seen a more able philosopher; and various criticisms have returned in detested language that wherever it is, and the idea of a good thing, it is not to be done."

It is not to be supposed that it has so, for, after Dr. Huxley's death, it is the most important that we obtain the attention of individuals. We have always combined the ingenious lines Johnson added into Goldsmith's poem, and by no means agree with the conclusion of

"How small of all that human hearts endure,
That pass through ours, or leave no cause or cure."

Considering that all that man sees, feels, hears, or reads; and much of what he believes, thinks, feels, and writes, are greatly affected by laws, and the control of the governing class. It is possible we should endeavor to discover what principles we should legislate.

Mr. Stock has given us a great deal of assistance to this end in his readable and clever little work, which is neither printed in small type, nor composed in sloppy English, with redundant verbiage. He is primarily a practical politician as well as author, and although he is an earnest and definite thinker, his feeling is tempered with philosophy; and as he knows that every question has several sides, he runs a-round at nothing. His book is that of an experienced as well as of a scholarly writer; and of one who looks to the possible as well as to the right. He has no lack of determination, but he has also no headless enthusiasm, which would push abstract rights into impossible positions. He speaks as one experienced in the world's proceedings, as well as one learned in the theories of human progress.

He gives us abundant pleasantly-written and exceedingly valuable chapters on the great topics of the time, in which he treats of the distribution of law, change, the law of progress, the doctrine of rights, also of liberty, the position of women, the relation of political economy to social science, democracy, workmen's combinations, abolition, social evil, international relations, and the prospects of political thought and action. These are each and all important topics, and those who have in any way to consider them, cannot do better than give Mr. Stock's book a speedy perusal; and the perusal, we figure, may be speedy, for his style is remarkably clear, correct, and telling. There are in his evidence of very wide reading; and the illustrations are not confined to those taken from the works of the philosophical writers, but extend to the poets, scriptures, and thinkers of all classes.

It is not our present purpose to discuss the absolute quality of the arguments and principles of this work, which in the main we agree with, but merely to recommend to those readers who are pursuing this kind of study, a book they ought to be acquainted with. We may take a further opportunity of inspiring into some of the doctrines contained in the work, and portions of connecting some

of the same. We have to add, in conclusion, that one of the passages in Dr. Huxley's work, extracted in our last week's article, is not his own composition, but was taken from another writer, and inserted by him in his book without quotation marks. He writes us, that he "most fully endorse the paragraph" we cited, so that having made it his own in every sense, he criticises it as to criticise him. We cannot therefore, on the probability of his letter, which he begins with saying that we "have fallen into an error which is very much regretted, because it was owing to his own carelessness." He then goes on to the explanation given above, which only shows that there are two persons instead of one responsible for a statement the reverse of dispassionate and philosophical. But while writing to us on a point only to show that it was totally unimportant, and that there was no occasion to trouble at all, we wonder it did not occur to him to advise to a point that is of importance. He might have shown us how the dissent of the various types of mankind now on the earth from one pair of ancestors can be explained, except on the assumption of the gradual modifiability of animals; if there is not some difference between the highest of the stock and the lowest of the human type, that between the highest and the lowest human type, he might have explained why animal modifiability might have given the latter differences, and not the former; he might have stated whether the modifiability of the latter