

thors who wearied me, and I confess that at that age Linnæus was among the number. I found him dry, pedantic, dogmatic, conceited; while I was charmed with Aristotle, whose zoölogy I have read and re-read ever since at intervals of two or three years. I must, however, do myself the justice to add, that after I knew more of the history of our science I learned also duly to reverence Linnæus. But a student, already familiar with the works of Cuvier, and but indifferently acquainted with the earlier progress of zoölogy, could hardly appreciate the merit of the great reformer of natural history. His defects were easily perceived, and it required more familiarity than mine then was with the gradual growth of the science, from Aristotle onward, to understand how great and beneficial an influence Linnæus had exerted upon modern natural history.

“I cannot review my Munich life without deep gratitude. The city teemed with resources for the student in arts, letters, philosophy, and science. It was distinguished at that time for activity in public as well as in academic life. The king seemed liberal; he was the friend of poets and artists, and aimed at concentrating all the glories of Germany in his new university. I thus enjoyed for a