

enemy of science, and consequently of human welfare. The follies and hypocrisies which have assumed the name of Christianity, albeit the extreme opposites of the religion of Jesus of Nazareth, have alienated from it some of the best and most honest minds. Huxley's straightforward and vigorous thrusts against what he believed to be shams and fallacies, were, after all, not meant for honest and upright believers so much as for the Pharisees who assumed their garb, and were far less harmful than the blunders of the unwise or the misstatements of those who are "wolves in sheep's clothing." His controversial writings, like most others of that class, will not survive the special crises to which they belong. His clear and attractive delineations of natural facts, processes and relations, cannot be surpassed, and form the basis of his permanent reputation. Agnostic though he called himself, he was one of the divinely-gifted prophets of nature to whom is given more than to other mortals to penetrate and explain the plans of the All-wise in the structure of the world.

As Huxley was so largely the apostle of evolution, it may be well to refer to his position in that connection. He knew well that the word is one liable to much abuse, and that a modal evolution or development should not be confounded with a causal evolution, which is nothing unless founded on well ascertained proximate and ultimate causes. The first is merely a mode of development; the second leads back to origins. Yet in the loose popular writings of the day they are often identified and interchanged. The perception of this made him more cautious than many of his contemporaries in his statement of the great problem. The processes by which, from an apparently homogeneous egg, all the parts of a complex animal are derived, is an evolution, and fulfils precisely the conditions of Spencer's definition of that process. But it