

The facts, whether taken separately or taken as a whole, on any theory, strongly contradict such an idea.* Dr. Tyndall, in his Address, gives us an imaginary development of the eye, "from a kind of tactual sense diffused over the entire body," from which any deduction of this character is overthrown at once by a simple question propounded long ago by Newton, viz. : "Did blind chance know that there was light, and what was its refraction, and fit the eyes of all creatures after the most curious manner to make use of it?" Newton was the man of the highest scientific genius who ever lived. This is acknowledged by all. But he was more than this. Sir David Brewster, an eminent scientific man himself, who, in writing his memoirs, had access to all his letters and necessarily knew his life intimately, states that had he not been so famous as a mathematician and natural philosopher, he would have been

present state of our knowledge, to be entirely unknown."—"I have explained the similarity of muscles and bones in the vertebrate animals on simple Teleological principles, without making use of the unproved hypothesis of their descent from a supposed common ancestor."—Preface.

"The skilful artisan can produce from the same number of wheels and pinions either a clock or a roasting-jack, fulfilling the very different functions of marking time and of roasting meat. An ignorant but intelligent savage, who was shown the interior of these machines, would come to the conclusion that they were very like each other, simply because he would only consider their superficial resemblances, and would be unable to appreciate the purposes which the machines were respectively intended to fulfil. In like manner anatomists from observations of apparent resemblances in the structure of organs, such as the brain, (of the specific action of whose parts little or nothing is known), have sometimes rashly inferred a greater degree of affinity between various animals than there is any logical ground for admitting. If we confine our attention to the arrangement of muscles and bones, the objects and uses of which are perfectly known and understood, we may readily perceive that under a superficial appearance of similarity of parts there really exists a profound difference of function and intention as to the purposes to which these organs are devoted."

* Take the following example from Huxley's "Lay Sermons," p. 261 : "Examine the recently laid egg of some common animal, such as a salamander or a newt. It is a minute spheroid, in which the best micros-