

tic regions. Such, in the present day, are the geological notions of Oken! They were doubtless all promulgated in what is modestly enough termed “a *kind* of inspiration;” and there are few now so ignorant of Geology as not to know that the *possessing* agent in the case — for *inspiration* is not quite the proper word — must have been at least of kin to that ingenious personage who volunteered of old to be a lying spirit in the mouths of the four hundred prophets. And the well-known fact, that the most popular contemporary expounder of Oken’s hypothesis — the author of the “*Vestiges*” — has in every edition of his work been correcting, modifying, or altogether withdrawing his statements regarding both geological and zoological phenomena, and that his gradual development as a geologist and zoologist, from the sufficiently low type of acquirement to which his first edition bore witness, may be traced, in consequence, with a distinctness and certainty which we in vain seek in the cases of presumed development which he would so fain establish, — has in its bearing exactly the same effect. His development hypothesis was complete at a time when his geology and zoology were rudimentary and imperfect. Give me your facts, said the Frenchman, that I may accommodate them to my theory. And no one can look at the progress of the Lamarckian hypothesis, with reference to the dates when, and the men by whom, it was promulgated, without recognizing in it one of perhaps the most striking embodiments of the Frenchman’s principle which the world ever saw. It is not the illiberal religionist that rejects and casts it off, — it is the inductive philosopher. Science addresses its assertors in the language of the possessed to the sons of Sceva the Jew; — “The astronomer I know, and the geologist I know; but who are ye?”

One of the strangest passages in the “*Sequel to the*