

from the *Instincts* of the animal creation, to leave the subject of Instinct, considered in the abstract, exactly as I found it; a field, in which whoever perambulates 'may wander "in endless mazes lost." I will, therefore, do my best to make the way, in a small degree, more level, and less intricate, than it has hitherto been.

But, before I proceed, lest the reader should feel disposed to accuse me of contradicting the opinions on this subject stated in the *Introduction to Entomology*, I beg to direct his attention to the following paragraph in the advertisement to the third volume of that work. "It will not be amiss here to state, in order to obviate any charge of inconsistency in the possible event of Mr. Kirby's adverting in any other work to this subject; that, though on every material point, the authors have agreed in opinion, their views of the *theory of Instinct* do not precisely accord. That given in the second and fourth volumes is from the pen of Mr. Spence."

It is not without considerable reluctance that the author of this essay takes the field, in some degree, against his worthy friend and learned coadjutor, but as he is thus left at liberty to do it, and the nature of his subject requires it, he will state those views which seem to himself most consistent with nature and truth, and most accordant with the general plan of creation. It is doubtful whether the ancients had any distinct idea of that impulse upon animals, urging them necessarily to certain actions, which modern writers have denominated *instinct*. Aristotle, indeed, in a passage of his *Physics*, quoted by Bochart,* alludes to certain writers who doubted whether spiders, ants, and similar animals, were directed in their works by intellect, or by any other faculty. The Stagyrte himself resolves the causes of motion into intellect and appetite,† but I have

* Hierozoic. ii. 599, b.

† De Anima, l. iii. c. 11.