

Natural History of Creation.' This book contained a very clear and popularly intelligible statement of the genetic or development hypothesis as applied to cosmic, geological, and organic phenomena. The importance of the book did not lie in its own original contributions, but in the great controversy which it occasioned. In this controversy most of the arguments for and against the

with an introduction, in which he "told for the first time" the "story of the authorship." It is of interest, after the lapse of half a century, to read the various—mostly hostile—criticisms of the book in the reviews and magazines of the day. The attacks came from two distinct sides: from scientific authorities, who—each in his own specific branch—challenged the correctness of single facts, mostly without inquiring whether, in spite of many misstatements, sufficient evidence was not after all adduced to prove the main thesis; and, secondly, from both scientific and popular writers, who used the well-known arguments, that the teaching of the book was unorthodox, both in a religious and scientific sense. In fact, they displayed in a great degree scientific and religious dogmatism and intolerance, and in some cases considerable temper. To this larger section of the critical attacks belonged the reviews in all the leading periodicals of the day, headed by the 'Edinburgh Review' (Adam Sedgwick), the 'North British' (Sir David Brewster), the 'Eclectic,' the 'North American' (Bowen and Asa Gray), the 'British Quarterly.' Tolerance and appreciation were, however, shown by some of those more recent reviews which were professedly the organs of freedom, enlightenment, and progress, notably the 'Prospective' (F. W. Newman) and the 'Westminster' in two articles, in

the first of which the genetic view of the 'Vestiges' is suggestively contrasted with the purely descriptive of the 'Kosmos.' Looking at the whole controversy, the 'Westminster Review' (xliii. 130) seems, in the light of history, justified in maintaining that, after "having attentively considered the objections which have been urged in numerous able criticisms to the theory and the arguments of the author," after noting that "learned men have discovered that he is less familiar than they with the pedantry of science," that "they have triumphed in the detection of slips of the pen, mistakes in technicalities, and some inaccuracies of fact," the conclusion is nevertheless justified that "these detract but little from the merit of a work which may be fairly characterised as the most skilful generalisation that has yet (1848) appeared of the results of geological, astronomical, and physiological researches made to bear upon the history of the first and most momentous of all problems—the order and plan of creation." It is known that some scientific men of first rank, such as Baden Powell of Oxford, and the physiologist W. B. Carpenter (who, according to Huxley, was the only authority in this country acquainted with the 'Entwicklungsgeschichte' of von Baer), distinctly supported the doctrine of the 'Vestiges'; and Darwin himself, who had studied the 'Vestiges' with evident care