

receives a blow, that is the best judge of its force ; and it is the same in regard to an argument. To what extent, and in what direction, the argument from an analogy crushes, we shall very soon see. The professor might have spared himself the elaborate comparison which he makes between a man and an ape, for we are perfectly aware that, not only are these animals very similar physiologically, but that there is a wonderful correspondence between the structure of a man and a mouse. But does this prove a common origin? Just as much as the fact that clocks and watches are very much alike in their internal structure proves that they were turned out by the same mould. The maker, by so many separate and independent series of operations, constructs a number of clocks and watches which, whilst varying in size, shape, material, &c., are substantially the same in their internal organization ; and why? Simply because the *object* aimed at is the same in all, namely, the accurate registration of time. So the Creator formed a number of animals, differing in size, form, intelligence, &c., but remarkably alike in their structure, because the object aimed at in each structure was the same—the performance of the functions of life. As to an analogy between natural operations and the development from inorganic matter to organic, and thence to a living being, there is none whatever. The vitalized egg is the production of two animals equal in all respects to that which the egg ultimately becomes, but in the other case Mr. Huxley is supposing a similar progression and result without a similar cause or starting point. What we have in nature is the regular reproduction of the *same* animal, and no progression from a lower to a higher type. In this very work Mr. Huxley admits that the oldest remains of man do not take us appreciably nearer to the monkey tribe ; whilst ancient literary remains and the records of history