

not those that have the brains, that are "fittest" to survive, though they may be fit for little else. Wallace himself reasons similarly regarding the mathematical faculties in general, contending that, in the evolution of man from the monkey, such faculties in their rudimentary stage could not have aided their possessors to keep alive, and so could not have been developed by natural selection. It is not necessary for us to pass any judgment upon the merits of this reasoning; but it is worthy of observation that hitherto it has apparently been found much easier to rail at Wallace's arguments than to answer them.—*Boston Advertiser*.

A MODIFIED DARWINISM.—It is now fully one year since Wallace's "Darwinism" was published, yet that remarkable volume is still the theme of much discussion, oral and written. We have not far to look for an explanation of this unabated interest. An impartial and competent estimate by a great man of a great man's life-work is something not to be had anew every day. Darwinism has suffered much from the zeal of its enemies, but more from the zeal of its friends. Some people see in the famous naturalist who wrote "The Descent of Man," only an unbelieving blasphemer winning the souls of men by "science falsely so called." Others see in him the prophet, priest, and king of truth. There was need of some one who had the breadth and depth of knowledge to avoid both extremes, and set before the world Charles Darwin and Darwinism as they were and are. That inestimable service has been performed by Wallace, we do not say completely, but to an admirable extent. It ought to be more generally known than it is, would be, if it were not for a modesty as fine as rare, which has kept the surviving scientist from proclaiming himself, that Wallace is just as much entitled to be called the author of the doctrine of evolution as Darwin himself. To the latter's credit it should be said that Darwin never denied this or sought to conceal the fact. The two men, investigating independently of each other, and reasoning from the known to the unknown, the visible to the invisible, came to the same idea simultaneously; or so nearly simultaneously that neither had published his new views until he learned that the other had reached the same conclusions. Then they acted as it is to be wished that all inventors, discoverers, and pioneers in fields of thought would act under similar circumstances: they agreed to give the world their theory on the same day. The agreement was fulfilled. The identification of Darwin's name alone in the popular, and to some extent even in the learned, mind with the doctrine of natural selection is partly owing to strenuous efforts which Darwin made to give the new theory popular currency, while Wallace made no such efforts; and partly to the notoriety which came to Darwin in consequence of pushing the hypothesis far beyond the field of empirical science into regions of dogmatic speculation.

In the *Nineteenth Century* for March is an elaborate essay on Wallace's Darwinism. The writer of the essay condenses in a very clear and convenient way the portion of Wallace's book which has already attracted, as it deserves, the most attention, and which is but one of many signs all tending to show that the ripest scientific thought of our day, while on the one hand generally indorsing the fundamental doctrines of evolution, is decidedly inclined to reject, as not proven and not provable or probable, those radical speculations concerning the human soul and the first cause of all things, which have produced so much commotion during the last quarter of a century. The limits of this article forbid anything like an adequate presentation of even the *Nineteenth Century's* resume of Wallace's chief difference from Darwin, but a helpful glimpse may be obtained by the examples that follow: The fundamental argument of evolutionists is that, in the struggle for existence, the fittest individuals survive; the conditions which make them fittest are transmitted and augmented from generation to generation, and all species of plants and animals are thus developed. Now Wallace declares that this theory will account for physical structures, but will not by any means account for mental and moral faculties. And the reason, he maintains, is that very many of these faculties, including some of the noblest, do not render any aid in the mere struggle to perpetuate animal life. The essayist cites the case of Sir Isaac Newton, who was an exceedingly feeble infant. Had his chances of living depended on such a struggle for existence as Darwin is so fond of describing he would have perished, and the world would never have had "The Principia," while babies with more stomach and muscle, but no brains to speak of, survived. For it is those that have the stomach and muscles,