

bilities of the man of science cannot be denied to him by those who differ most widely from his premises or his conclusions. On the other hand, it must be admitted that he had a certain impatience, bordering sometimes upon contempt, for principles and theories which did not square with his own opinions, even if they were the settled convictions of men no less distinguished than himself.

When Huxley returned to England after his service in the navy (1851), he had already made contributions of importance to the cause of science, and these had met with such recognition that he found a hearty welcome from the new republic of which he had become a citizen. Referring to this period, he says himself, that "the veterans were civil, and the younger men cordial; and it speedily dawned on my mind that I had found the right place for myself if I would only continue to stop in it."

That he did occupy this place with conspicuous and consummate ability is shown alike by the positions to which he was called as a teacher and by his contributions to the literature of science. In 1865, at the age of 30, he became Professor of Natural History in the Royal School of Mines and Professor of Physiology in the Royal Institution. The University of Aberdeen, in the year 1874, elected him to the dignity of Lord Rector for a period of three years. He was Rede Lecturer at Cambridge in 1883 and President of the Royal Society from 1883 to 1885.

It is superfluous to remark that he became a disciple and adherent of Darwin, like Professor Tyndale, Mr. Herbert Spencer, and many others. Yet he was no blind adherent to the evolutionary theory of Darwin; but thought and spoke for himself. For example, referring to Darwin's quotation: "*Natura non facit saltum*"—Nature makes no leap; he declares that nature does make leaps, an assertion which, we imagine, would now hardly be accepted, at least not in every sense of the words.

It was in the department of biology that Huxley was most distinguished, and to this subject he has made important contributions. His publications in the form of books, lectures, and essays, were very numerous, and it would not serve any good purpose to give a list, or even a partially complete list of them here. Among his writings which would be intelligible to others than the specialist, we may mention the following: *Evidence as to Man's Place in Nature* (1863), *Comparative Anatomy* (1864), *Lay Sermons* (1871)—one of his most popular works and in many respects admirable—*Critiques and Addresses* (1873), *Evolution and Ethics* (1893).

This is hardly the time to consider his relation to religious thought and to the subject of divine revelation; yet a few words may be said. It may not be generally known that he was the author of the term *agnostic*, a word which is now familiar to every one who speaks our language, and to those who speak many other languages as well. The word describes very well his own position. He was not one of those who sneered at the Christian for believing in the spirituality of man and the hope of a life to come. For his own part he declared that he could obtain no satisfaction on the subject, and he was contented to live this life if no other were reserved for him. If he had kept to this philosophical temper and mood, the believers in the supernatural would have had little fault to find with him. Unfortunately he sometimes became sarcastic and scornful when such a spirit had no proper place; and those who recall his controversy with Bishop Magee will mostly confess that the witty Irish prelate had the best of the controversy, not merely in the way of argument, but in the matter of temper. But this is hardly the time to revive these memories. The Frenchman, before laying his head under the guillotine, declared that he was about to know the great secret. Dr. Huxley knows it now better than we do.

WILLIAM CLARK.

Criticisms of Some Magazine Articles.

PART I: MR. GOLDWIN SMITH ON "THE MANCHESTER SCHOOL."—THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW.

THERE is a need for a sounder criticism—than from various causes is now given—of some of the articles appearing in the magazines, which either misinform readers, or, on the other hand, are of great merit and are not done justice to. An intelligent and careful reader is

often impressed by the unequal merit of the various contributions. Some excel in style, or show that the writers have taken pains with their themes. But with respect to others, he who carefully reads, observes a lack of manner, or else that the writers have written carelessly so far as facts or reasoning are concerned. The reader may be far from being fully informed upon the particular subject treated of, but he often knows enough to be aware that it represents slipshod work. The satirical article in *Blackwood* (December, 1894), anent Mr. Gladstone's "Horace," is a case in point. There the spirit of the poet is supposed to review the work. It concludes, "Admire this book of Gladstone's as much as you please, only do not think it is me." Mr. Gladstone is a very clever man, but attempts to pose—after the manner of Lord Brougham—as an "admirable Crichton." Cobden wrote (Morley's abridgement, p. 110): "It is this attempt at universality which has been the error of Lord Brougham's public life."

The carelessness referred to is more especially to be seen where figures are concerned. Some writers are heedless in such cases, and without due consideration quote crude and palpable misstatements as authentic. Only a small minority combine: (1) a judicial mind, which presupposes a high degree of carefulness; and (2) the requisite ability to reason correctly upon the facts.

There is, I respectfully submit, sometimes a lack of an intelligent, honest and fearless criticism in cases where there are unintentional or intentional deviations from the real facts or faulty reasoning; and on the other hand a non-appreciation of highly meritorious articles. The usual brief notices are practically of little value. Editors—and even those on the staff—cannot always spare the time to thoroughly read up, nor is there always sufficient space to give the results. The mutual admiration magazine is often too optimistic.

A CELTIC STATISTICIAN.

Mr. Mulhall, the Statist, poses as a good object lesson where figures are concerned. He illustrates the relative rareness of the judicial faculty among the Celts in comparison with the Teutons. His specialty is statistics—a satirist might say—tempered by patriotism. It served the interest of his party to greatly exaggerate the number of persons who were evicted in Ireland subsequent to 1847. A patriot who invents a good Irish grievance achieves Hibernian fame, and often something more tangible.

On this side of the Atlantic if tenants refuse to pay, they are, as a matter of course, evicted, but to do so in Ireland is the eighth deadly sin. Mr. Mulhall had all the official returns before him and posed as an Irish expert, and yet he Munchausened the facts. He stated that 3,668,000 persons had been evicted. If he had thought for five seconds, or examined the returns with the slightest care, he would, unless he patriotically shut his eyes, have avoided such a misstatement, one so sure to be exposed. The official returns quoted by him showed that the total number evicted in about thirty-three years, including men, women, and children, was 524,000. This on the Irish statistical average of five to a family means about 105,000 families, roughly, about 3,180 every year, not near one per cent. per annum of the tenants. But many who appear in the returns as having been evicted had, as Mr. Mulhall knew, been reinstated as caretakers or otherwise. In the city of New York, during the same period, there had been in proportion to the population more than a dozen times as many evicted. Mr. Mulhall actually multiplied the real number by seven. It was a good second to Falstaff's eleven men in buckram. Such statistics "smell woundily" of the national beverage. He assumed that every man, woman and child, had a family of six depending upon him or her. It was a good specimen of "patriotic facts." But such "patriotic facts" are, as Cobbett humorously observed of the preserved eggs of two generations back, "things to be run from and not after." This statement, coming from a supposed reliable authority, made a great sensation and formed the basis for much indignant speechifying. On his misstatement being exposed he frankly acknowledged it, making a very lame explanation of how it happened. But notwithstanding his acknowledgment of the truth, the Munchausenism is still published by some Nationalists as being true, and it was used as an electioneering weapon in Great Britain during the general election of 1892.