

acceptable, I hope, since few of our libraries contain even the leading works of our science, and many zealous students are thus prevented from attempting to study what has thus far been done.

Science has begun, in the introduction of names, to designate natural groups of different value with the same vagueness which still prevails in ordinary language in the use of class, order, genus, family, species; taking them either as synonyms or substituting one for the other at random. Linnæus was the first to urge upon naturalists precision in the use of four kinds of groups in natural history, which he calls classes, orders, genera, and species.

Aristotle, and the ancient philosophers generally, distinguished only two kinds of groups among animals, *γένος* and *εἶδος*, (genus and species.) But the term genus had a most unequal meaning, applying at times indiscriminately to any extensive group of species, and designating even what we now call classes as well as any other minor group. In the sense of class, it is taken in the following case: λέγω δὲ γένος, ὅσον ὀρνίθια, καὶ ἰχθύων, (Arist. Hist. Anim., Lib. I., Chap. I.,) while *εἶδος* is generally used for species, as the following sentence shows: καὶ ἔστιν εἶδη πλείω ἰχθύων καὶ ὀρνίθων, though it has occasionally also a wider meaning. The sixth chapter of the same book, is the most important in the whole work of Aristotle upon this subject, as it shows to how many different kinds of groups the term *γένος* is applied. Here, he distinguishes between *γένη μέγιστα* and *γένη μεγάλα* and *γένος* shortly. *Γένη δὲ μέγιστα τῶν ζώων, εἰς ἃ διαιρεῖται τᾶλλα ζῶα, τὰδ' ἔστιν· ἐν μὲν ὀρνίθων, ἐν δ' ἰχθύων, ἄλλο δὲ κίτους. Ἄλλο δὲ γένος ἐστὶ τὸ τῶν ὀστρακοδέρμων. . . . Τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ζώων οὐκ ἔστι τὰ γένη μεγάλα· οὐ γὰρ περιέχει πολλὰ εἶδη ἐν εἶδος, . . . τὰ δ' ἔχει μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀνώνυμα.* This is further insisted upon anew: τοῦ δὲ γένους τῶν τετραπόδων ζώων καὶ ζωώτων εἶδη μὲν εἰσι πολλὰ, ἀνώνυμα δὲ. Here *εἶδος* has evidently a wider meaning than our term species, and the accurate Scaliger translates it by *genus medium*, in contradistinction to *γένος*, which he renders by *genus summum*. *Εἶδος*, however, is generally used in the same sense as now, and Aristotle already considers fecundity as a specific character, when he says, of the Hemionos, that it is called so from its likeness to the Ass, and not because it is of the same species, for he adds, they copulate and propagate among themselves: αἱ κυλοῦνται ἡμίονοι δι' ὁμοίτητα, οὐκ οὔσαι ἀπλῶς τὸ αὐτὸ εἶδος· καὶ γὰρ ὀχεύονται καὶ γεννῶνται ἐξ ἀλλήλων. In another passage it applies, however, to a group exactly identical with our modern genus *Equus*: ἐπεὶ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ γένει καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔχουσι χαιτήν, λοφούροις καλουμένοις, ὅσον ἵππων καὶ ὄνων καὶ ὄρει καὶ γίνγη καὶ ἴννω καὶ τοῖς ἐν Σνρίε καλουμένοις ἡμίονοις.

Aristotle cannot be said to have proposed any regular classification. He speaks constantly of more or less extensive groups, under a common appellation, evidently considering them as natural divisions; but he nowhere expresses a conviction that these groups may be arranged methodically so as to exhibit the natural affinities of animals. Yet he frequently introduces his remarks respecting different animals