

application of such a principle is inadmissible on any philosophical grounds^z. And Lamarck himself agrees with Cuvier in this opinion.

The only formal terms of classification employed by Aristotle are εἶδος and γένος, of the first of which he gives a remarkably precise definition. That definition is really, though not in literal order, as follows:—"an animal *species* " is an assemblage of individual animals, in " which not only the whole form of any one re- " sembles the whole form of any other, but each " part in any one resembles the corresponding " part in any other. Thus every horse not only " resembles every other horse generally, but the " eye or the hoof of every horse resembles the " eye or the hoof of every other horse. And the " same statement is applicable to man and other " animals. They are therefore the same in the " character of their individual parts." (Ἐχει δὲ τῶν ζώων ἕνια μὲν πάντα τὰ μόρια ταῦτὰ ἀλλήλοις, ἕνια δ' ἕτερα. Ταῦτὰ δὲ τὰ μὲν εἶδει τῶν μορίων ἐστίν, οἷον ἀνθρώπου ῥίς καὶ ὀφθαλμὸς ἀνθρώπου ῥινὶ καὶ ὀφθαλμῶ, καὶ σαρκὶ σὰρξ καὶ ὀστέῳ ὀστοῦν· τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον καὶ ἵππου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ζώων, ὅσα τῷ εἶδει ταῦτὰ λέγομεν ἑαυτοῖς· ὁμοίως γὰρ ὡσπερ τὸ ὅλον ἔχει πρὸς τὸ ὅλον, καὶ τῶν μορίων ἔχει ἕκαστον πρὸς ἕκαστον. p. 1.)

In comparing the preceding definition of Aristotle with the corresponding definition of Cuvier, we find that there is no essential difference.

^z Règne Animal, pref. p. xx, xxi.