

He also thinks that the division of animals into clean and unclean was founded on the great or less tendency of various animals to convey disease to those who fed upon their flesh.

Evolution is a term now much bandied about, and a subject ever interesting because it has to do with some of the grandest problems of human existence. Mr. St. George Mivart, a well-known Scientist, has a very valuable paper on this subject in the current number of the *British Quarterly Review*. Mr. Mivart is an evolutionist, but he confines evolution strictly to that which he believes the true advocates of the theory to have proved, and draws the line with clearness and force between what has been proved, and what has not been proved. The "true doctrine of evolution" he defines thus: "that the various species of animals and plants have been evolved through the action of natural causes from antecedent animals and plants of different kinds." This, we are convinced, is all that Mr. Darwin and Professor Huxley would allege evolutionists to have proved. They may surmise more, nay, they may in a sense, believe more, but they would not claim to have proved more. Mr. Mivart and Professor Huxley differ—if they are, indeed, at variance on 'the point—in that Mr. Mivart expressly negatives the hypothesis of evolution at certain stages, whereas Professor Huxley merely suspends his judgment and declares the evidence to be insufficient. Mr. Mivart puts his finger on three points, at which that process of uniform and continuous evolution, which is alleged by Hæckel and other enthusiasts to be applicable to the whole universe, has, he maintains, been broken. Between the non-living and the living, between the non-feeling and the feeling, between the non-thinking and the thinking; such are the "three evident breaches of continuity" which, according to Mr. Mivart, occur in the world that science searches and surveys. That is to say, evolution has not proved that a living thing ever grew out of a dead thing, or that a feeling, thinking organism was ever evolved out of an organism that could neither feel nor think. We understand Mr. Mivart to hold that man, so far as his body is concerned, was "evolved through the action of natural causes," from some "antecedent animal." Bodily, man, of course, is an animal, and Mr. Mivart expressly says that "the various species of animals" have been evolved by natural causes from other animals. Man, however, is no mere animal. He is an animal that thinks; and Mr. Mivart holds that there is a gulf fixed between non-intellect and intellect which no natural cause can bridge. To effect this, we must look for some additional cause, some higher force which Mr. Mivart does not, so far as we have observed, expressly call supernatural, but which, we presume, he would not hesitate to characterize by that word. Mr. Darwin and Professor Huxley, while explicitly accepting Mr. Mivart's definition of evolution, would, we take it, allege not only that man has been evolved by natural causes in his mind as well as in his body, but evidence has been produced of sufficient amount and cogency to justify them in describing the statement as a fact established by science. The Darwinians contend that animals have language, and that the "brute ancestors of man, by possession of language, gradually acquired the gift of reason." Mr. Mivart declares that animals do not speak. He admits there is such a thing as animal language, but