

the principle of the division of labour, "that great principle to which human society owes the most important attributes which raise it above such aggregates as we find in certain animal families." And he looked forward to a time when through "the condensation of our species and the ever-increasing competition in a given space the division of labour would be driven to such a point that each individual would be employed according to his special ability." This idea has been taken up and further developed by M. Durkheim with the assistance of the evolutionist ideas introduced by Darwin and Spencer.¹ It acquires with him a higher

which the leaders of social reform are only tardily recognising. (See Ingram, *loc. cit.*, p. 227.) "It is quite singular how little . . . the function of the *entrepreneur* is taken into account. Bagehot objects to the phrase 'wages of superintendence' commonly used to express his reward, as suggesting altogether erroneous ideas of the nature of his work, and well describes the large and varied range of his activity and usefulness, and the rare combination of gifts and acquirements which go to make up the perfection of his equipment. It can scarcely be doubted that a foregone conclusion in favour of the system of [so-called] co-operation has sometimes led Economists to keep these important considerations in the background. They have been brought into due prominence of late in the treatises of Profs. Marshall and F. A. Walker, who, however, have scarcely made clear, and certainly have not justified, the principle on which the amount of the remuneration of the *entrepreneur* is determined."

¹ Already long before the time of Darwin, the celebrated French

zoologist, Henri Milne-Edwards, had (1827) stated the principle of the division of physiological labour, and shown that this division was the criterion of the degree of perfection of each species, and of the position it should occupy in the *Échelle des Êtres*. This theory about the degree of perfection has been much exploited by French sociologists, though Comte himself took no notice of it. In general, the tendency to work with physiological and even mechanical analogies is very prominent, and nowhere more than with M. Durkheim. Dr Barth (*loc. cit.*, p. 290) remarks on this tendency, and shows how after all "this parallelism of the animal and sociological series could have been carried much further, and if this had been done, the limit of the applicability of this analogy would have shown itself." And he indicates his own view in the following passage: "The contrast of nature and mind arises in society as soon as mind or society itself becomes the subject of scientific thinking. This moment, however, does not wait for the appearance of a special