

This lamentable estrangement between science and philosophy, and the rude empiricism which is now-a-days unfortunately praised by most naturalists as "exact science," have given rise to those strange freaks of the understanding, to those gross insults against elementary logic, and to that incapacity for forming the simplest conclusions which one may meet with any day in all branches of science, but especially in zoology and botany. It is here that the neglect of a philosophical culture and training of the mind, directly avenges itself most painfully. It is not to be wondered at that the deep inner truth of the Theory of Descent remains a sealed book to those rude empiricists. As the common proverb justly says: they cannot see the wood for the trees. It is only by a more general philosophical study, and especially by a more strictly logical training of the mind, that this sad state of things can be remedied. (Compare Gen. Morph. i. 63; ii. 447.)

If we rightly consider this circumstance, and if we further reflect upon it in connection with the empirical foundation of the philosophical theory of development, we shall at once see how we are placed respecting the oft-demanded *proofs of the theory of descent*. The more the doctrine of filiation has of late years made way for itself, and the more all thoughtful, younger naturalists, and all truly biologically-educated philosophers have become convinced of its inner truth and absolute necessity, the louder have its opponents called for actual proofs. The same persons who, shortly after the publication of Darwin's work, declared it to be "a groundless, fantastic system," an "arbitrary speculation," an "ingenious dream," now kindly condescend to declare that the theory of descent certainly