

most as well as an effective reasoning, their mutual influence.

For example, the dental system of hoofed animals, not ruminant, is usually more perfect than that of cleft-footed animals, or those which ruminate, because the former have either incisores or canine teeth, and generally both in both jaws; and the structure of their foot is more complicated, because they have more toes, or nails which less enclose the phalanges, or more separate bones of the metacarpus and metatarsus, or the bones of the tarsus more numerous, or a more distinct prominence of the tibia, or in fact because they unite all these points. It is impossible to account for these correspondences; but what proves that they are not the effect of chance, is, that whenever a cleft-footed animal shows, in the arrangement of its teeth, any tendency to a similarity with the animals of which we are speaking, it also evinces a similar tendency in the formation of its feet. Thus camels, which have canine teeth, and even two or four incisors in the upper jaw, have a bone more in the tarsus, because their scaphoid is not united with the cuboid, and very small nails corresponding with the phalanges which have nails. The chevrotains, whose canine teeth are much developed, bear a distinct mark along the tibia, whilst other cleft-footed animals have only, instead of the fibula, articulated a small bone along the tibia. There is then a constant harmony between two organs apparently very distinct from each other; and the gradations of their formation correspond without alteration, even in cases where we can assign no cause for the similarity.

But, in thus adopting the method of observation as an additional means when theory forsakes us, we arrive at astonishing results. The least prominence