

Creator intended, and directing each to that function and office which he devolved upon them, and to exercise which he adapted them. Were we to go through the whole animal kingdom the same mutual relation and dependence between the different parts and organs of the structure and their functions would be found.

Can any one in his rational senses believe for a moment that all these adaptations of one organ to another, and of the whole structure to a particular function, resulted originally from the wants of a senseless animal living by absorption, and whose body consisted merely of cellular tissue, which in the lapse of ages, and in an infinity of successive generations by the motions of its fluids, directed here and there, produced this beautiful and harmonious system of organs all subservient to one purpose: and which in numerous instances vary their functions and character, but still preserve their mutual dependence, while passing through three different states of existence.

Lamarck's great error, and that of many others of his compatriots, is materialism; he seems to have no faith in anything but *body*, attributing everything to a physical, and scarcely anything to a metaphysical cause. Even when, in words, he admits the being of a God, he employs the whole strength of his intellect to prove that he had nothing to do with the works of creation. Thus he excludes the Deity from the government of the world that he has created, putting nature in his place; and with respect to the noblest and last formed of his creatures, into whom he himself breathed the breath of life, he certainly admits him to be the most perfect of animals; but instead of a son of God, the root of his genealogical tree, according to him, is an animalcule, a creature without sense or voluntary motion, or internal or external organs, at least in his idea: no wonder, therefore, that he considers his intellectual