

animals. In the course of his development, he passes from mere organised tissue to an embryonic form, and thence to the stage of a new-born animal—living free, yet devoid of intelligence and incapable of locomotion. He takes many months to get beyond the mental capacity of a dog, and twenty years to arrive at his full powers. The growth of his body is nothing more than an accumulation of material under a special form; and it makes no difference, philosophically, whether this accumulation has always followed its present order, or has formerly followed a different order. In the first case we must suppose the growth of Man always to have been what it now is; in the second case we must suppose him originally developed from one of the lower animals. To state it in a different form, we may suppose that two primitive cells have always grown into a man; or else that they, for a long time, grew only as far as one of the lower animals, but at length pushed on and attained the structure of man. Take what view we will, we are always talking of identical material, and of its building up, tumbling down, and rebuilding, just as a mason, having bricks and mortar, may build a house, or a tower, or a house surmounted by a tower. Whatever he builds he has but bricks and mortar, and his mode of using them is only a history—the history of his construction.

If, then, we know laws only in the form of tendencies, and matter only as a contradiction, we ought to be modest in our assertions about the order of nature. In other words, while we may amuse ourselves by arranging a procession of species, we must be prepared to see the pageant fall into confusion at any moment.

In the descriptive part of this monograph I have tried to use simple words as often as possible; and not to add to the jargon in which zoology is now smothering. In addition to a gigantic classification, to form which the dead languages have been torn up and recomposed, there is an ever-growing crop of anatomical and embryological terms. No callow *privat docent* but thinks he does good service in adding a score of obscure words, to define his ephemeral theory. Doubtless he is not aware that his work has two faces. First, as it regards himself, these new words of his have become familiar and convenient in a subject he has long studied. Secondly, as it regards his readers, not only have they never heard the new words, but have perhaps known the parts referred to by other names. They must, therefore, go through three painful processes:—(a) Commit to memory, with dreary labour, like sawdust-swallowing, the novel words. (b) Learn to what parts they apply. (c) Carefully forget the old terms.

The result of this system has been, not a language but a jargon such as Molière would scarcely have ventured to put in the mouths of the medical faculty in his *Malade Imaginaire*.

The ground trouble is in the notion, prevalent among scholars, that strict consistency and interdependence of words are of vast importance and to be attained *coute qui coute*; whereas they are of very slender importance and worth no sacrifice at all. What should