

the origin of past dynasties in the changes of the foetus if not the rise of the future dynasty in the transformations of the caterpillar? "These [embryonic] characters [that of the heterocercal tail, and of the mouth of the ordinary shark 'type] are essential and important," remarks the author of the "Vestiges," "whatever the Edinburgh Reviewer may say to the contrary; — they are the characters which, above all, I am chiefly concerned in looking to, for they are the features of embryonic progress, and embryonic progress is the grand key to the theory of development." Yes; the grand key to the theory of *foetal* development; for embryonic progress is foetal development. But on what is the assertion based that they form a key to the history of creation? Aurelia are not human bodies laid out for the sepulchre, nor are butterflies human souls; as certainly gestation is not creation, nor a life of months in the uterus a succession of races for millions of ages outside of it. On what grounds, then, is the assertion made? Does it embody the result of a discovery, or announce the message of a revelation? Did the author of the "Vestiges" find it out for himself, or did an angel from heaven tell it him? If it be a discovery, show us, we ask, the steps through which you have been conducted to it; if a revelation produce, for our satisfaction, the evidence on which it rests. For we are not to accept as data, in a question of science, idle comparisons or vague analogies, whether produced through the intentional juggling of the sophist, or involuntarily conjured up in the dreamy delirium of an excited fancy.

It is one of the difficulties incident to the task of replying to any dogmatic statement of error, that every mere annunciation of a false fact or false principle must be met by elaborate counter-statement or carefully constructed argument,