

principle similar to that which, by its excellence and superior endowments, places man so much above animals.<sup>1</sup> Yet the principle exists unquestionably, and whether

<sup>1</sup> It might easily be shown that the exaggerated views generally entertained of the difference existing between man and monkeys, are traceable to the ignorance of the ancients, and especially the Greeks, to whom we owe chiefly our intellectual culture, of the existence of the Orang-Outang and the Chimpanzee. The animals most closely allied to man known to them were the Red Monkey, κίβος, the Baboon, κυνοκέφαλος, and the Barbary Ape, πίθηκος. A modern translation of Aristotle, it is true, makes him say that monkeys form the transition between man and quadrupeds; (ARISTOTELES, Naturgeschichte der Thiere, von Dr. F. STRACK, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1816, p. 65;) but the original says no such thing. In the History of Animals, Book 2, Chap. V., we read only, *ἕνα δὲ τῶν ζῴων ἐπαμφοτερίζει τὴν φύσιν τῷ τε ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ τοῖς τετραπόσοις*. There is a wide difference between "partaking of the nature of both man and the quadrupeds," and "forming a transition between man and the quadrupeds." The whole chapter goes on enumerating the structural similarity of the three monkeys named above with man, but the idea of a close affinity is not even expressed, and still less that of a transition between man and the quadrupeds. The writer, on the contrary, dwells very fully upon the marked differences they exhibit, and knows as well as any modern anatomist has ever known, that monkeys have four hands. *ἔχει δὲ καὶ βραχίονας, ὡς περ ἀνθρώπος, . . . ἰδίους δὲ τοῖς πόδας. εἰσὶ γὰρ οἷον χεῖρες μεγάλαι. Καὶ οἱ δάκτυλοι ὡς περ οἱ τῶν χειρῶν, ὁ μίγας μικρότατος· καὶ τὸ κίττω τοῦ ποδὸς χειρὶ ὁμοιον, πλὴν ἐπὶ τὸ μέγος τὸ τῆς χειρὸς ἐπὶ τα ἔσχατα τείνον καθάπερ θύραρ. Τοῦτο δὲ ἐπ' ἄκρου σκληρότερον, κακῶς καὶ ἀμυδρῶς μιμούμενον πτέρην*.

It is strange that these clear and precise distinctions should have been so entirely forgotten in the days of Linneus that the great reformer in Natural History had to confess, in the year 1746, that he knew no character by which to distinguish man from the monkeys. Fauna Suecica, Præfat. p. 2. "Nullum characterem adhuc eruere potui, unde

homo a simia internoscatur." But it is not upon structural similarity or difference alone that the relations between man and animals have to be considered. The psychological history of animals shows that as man is related to animals by the plan of his structure, so are these related to him by the character of those very faculties which are so transcendent in man as to point at first to the necessity of disclaiming for him completely any relationship with the animal kingdom. Yet the natural history of animals is by no means completed after the somatic side of their nature has been thoroughly investigated; they, too, have a psychological individuality, which, though less fully studied, is nevertheless the connecting link between them and man. I cannot, therefore, agree with those authors who would disconnect mankind from the animal kingdom, and establish a distinct kingdom for man alone, as Ehrenberg (Das Naturreich des Menschen, Berlin, 1835, fol.) and lately I. Geoffroy St. Hilaire, (Hist. nat. générale, Paris, 1856, Tome 1, Part 2, p. 167,) have done. Compare, also, Chap. II., where it is shown for every kind of groups of the animal kingdom that the amount of their difference one from the other never affords a sufficient ground for removing any of them into another category. A close study of the dog might satisfy every one of the similarity of his impulses with those of man, and those impulses are regulated in a manner which discloses psychical faculties in every respect of the same kind as those of man; moreover, he expresses by his voice his emotions and his feelings, with a precision which may be as intelligible to man as the articulated speech of his fellow men. His memory is so retentive that it frequently baffles that of man. And though all these faculties do not make a philosopher of him, they certainly place him in that respect upon a level with a considerable proportion of poor humanity. The intelligibility of the voice of animals to one another, and all their actions connected with such calls are also a strong argument of their perceptive power, and of their ability to act spon-