

subsequent zoologists, with great propriety, have generally considered them as forming a Class by themselves, under their primeval name of Reptiles. This Class M. Brongniart divided into *four* Orders, viz., *Chelonians*, *Saurians*, *Ophidians*, and *Batrachians*: and Baron Cuvier has followed this arrangement in his *Règne Animal*. Latreille, adopting the Group, has divided it into *two* Classes, *Reptiles* and *Amphibians*. The Reptiles he considers as forming two *Sub-classes*, viz., *Cataphracta*, containing the *Chelonians*, and *Crocodyles*, and *Squamosa*, containing the remaining *Saurians* and the *Ophidians*. His second Class, the *Amphibians*, consisting of the *Batrachians* of Brongniart, with the addition of the *Proteus*, *Siren*, &c., he divides into two Tribes, viz., *Caducibranchia*, or the *proper Batrachians*, and *Perennibranchia*, or the *Proteus*, *Siren*, *Axolot*, &c. This classification is adopted by Dr. Grant,\* except that he does not sub-divide the Reptiles into two Sub-classes; and Latreille's two Tribes of Amphibians he properly denominates *Orders*.

That Reptiles, in the larger sense of the term, form a *natural* Group, will be generally admitted, when it is considered that the *salamanders*, or naked efts, evidently connect the *Batrachians* with the *Saurians*, and were formerly considered as a kind of *lizard*; it seems to me therefore more consistent with nature to consider the Reptiles as forming a *single* Class.

This opinion has received strong confirmation from a circumstance communicated to me by my kind friend Mr. Owen, well known as one of our most eminent comparative anatomists. In a letter received from him, since I wrote the preceding paragraph, in reply to some queries I had addressed to him, he says,—“I lose no time in replying to your very welcome letter, because I have a statement to

\* Outlines of a Course of Lectures, &c. 14—16.