

cockatoo, and a crowd of similar instances, are inexplicable by any influence of external circumstances or internal desires, for the same circumstances occur in the vegetable kingdom; thus the flower of the orchidium is the *fac simile* of a butterfly, and in plants of the same group we find flowers resembling almost every kind of animal.

There is, however, another objection which has been urged by Cuvier, which is of itself sufficient to set the question at rest in so far as the influence of desires can produce the transmutation of an animal species. In such a case an animal must desire in opposition to its own proper nature, as when an eel quits the waters and adopts the habits of a snake; or when a seal, so well organised for swimming, and whose favourite food is fish, attempts to run upon land and pursue its food like a bear. La Marck, Geoffroy, St. Hilaire, and other transmutationists, reject all final causes; and what is still more remarkable, they do so under a form still more incomprehensible than that of Lucretius himself. The old atomists maintain that the organ fortuitously produced suggested its use, '*quod natum est id procreat usus.*' The modern dynamists assert that the function existed first, and this produced its organ. Lucretius would have said the eye formed by chance produced the faculty of vision.