

Personal God could and can adapt each item of His plans, "secret to us," to the past, the present and the future order of nature, than to suppose with an eminent biologist of the present day, that plants have endowed themselves with an almost superhuman intelligence? Not to be misunderstood, his unaltered statements are given at length:—"The more the flowers of the original lily family succeeded in attracting the eyes of their winged guests. . . ." "By devoting one row of stamens to the function of alluring fertilizing flies they have secured the benefit of cross-fertilization, and so have got the better of all their less developed competitors." "The amaryllids and their more advanced descendants have not had time to adapt themselves. . . ." "These water-weeds have acquired the habit of trusting for fertilization to the wind, which carries the pollen of one blossom to the sensitive surface of another, perhaps at less trouble and expense to the parent-plant than would be necessary for the allurements of bees or flies by all the bribes of brilliant petals and honeyed secretions. . . ." "To effect this object their stamens hang out pensile to the breeze. . . ." "The amaryllids . . . have not yet had leisure to gain quite so firm a footing in the world. . . ." "The existing rushes are all plain little lilies with dry, brownish flowers, specially adapted to wind fertilization alone. . . ." "The wood-rushes may thus be regarded as some of the earliest plants among the great trinary class to adapt these tactics of storing gluten, starch and other food-stuffs along with the embryo, which have given the cereals their acknowledged superiority as producers of human food." Is it more absurd to suppose, that admitting evolution to be a fact and not a hypothesis or perhaps a theory, that a Divine Being cannot alter the relations of plants and cannot change

their variability or invariability, than to humanize plants so that they can comprehend not merely their present but their future? Which is the more anthropomorphic, which the more sophistic, the more like a certain dogma of a certain sect of Grecian philosophers by no means the first, by no means the best—"Man is the measure of all things?" Is it more silly to believe and to teach that each fossil, whether vegetable or animal, each rock or stone, every living being, the history, the philosophy and the mythology of every nation, point forward wittingly or unwittingly towards "Cross-crowned Calvary," than to endow "by a strong effort of scientific imagination," inorganic matter with "the promise and potency of life?" So far as a short article can go let a summary of the evidence on both sides be stated; or rather let the evidence be placed side by side. And thus we find:—

1. A number of "found links," with the presumption that more may be found.

2. Varieties, indubitably made by human effort, differing more widely from one another than certain well-marked species.

3. An ingeniously woven web of mere unproved assertion made to do duty for hard science. If any one doubts this, let him read the works of Darwin, or of Hæckel, of Huxley, or if time do not so allow, the short, yet fascinating essays of Mr. Grant Allen in "Flowers and their Pedigrees," "Robin Clout's Calendar," "Colours of Flowers," and other works of a similar character.

1. A yet larger number of "missing links," with the certainty that many cannot be found.

2. The absolute invariability of species so far as our experience has yet gone.

3. Indubitable instances of Design, Plan, and even Miracle, many in number, far more reasonably referable to a Divine Personality than to a blind, unintelligent, unknown, somewhat of something—the said Plan not excluding "Evolution by the Word of His Power," as an efficient cause production of new species, whether by "Natural Selection," by "slight variations in the ovum," by "Parthenogenesis," by "a force which is a mode of the unknowable," or by any other, or by all these methods, while including here and there, the direct creation of species "out of the dust of the ground."

Let the reader carefully weigh even this imperfect summary, and then let him see whether the words of a veteran