

the founding of universities and learned societies, the establishment of museums and botanic gardens, the invention of printing and the translation of Aristotle's works—these and many other practical, emotional, and intellectual movements gave fresh force to science, and indeed to the whole life of man.

As far as biology was concerned, the direct result of the scientific renaissance might be described as a return to nature. It began to be perceived that Aristotle had not quite finished the subject, and that every man might be his own observer. With enthusiasm men turned to the task of seeing for themselves, and there began the period of the Encyclopædists. This somewhat cumbrous title is useful, for it suggests the omnivorous habits of those early workers, who, with an appetite greater than their power of digestion, collected all possible information about all sorts of living things. Prominent among them were four: the Englishman Edward Wotton (1492–1555), who wrote a treatise, *De Differentiis Animalium*, still in great part Aristotelian; the Swiss Conrad Gesner (1516–1565), author of a voluminous *Historia Animalium*; the Italian Aldrovandi (b. 1522); and the Scot Johnston (b. 1603).

Although Buffon was a thinker, it seems almost fair to say that the best aims of the Encyclopædists were realized in his *Histoire Naturelle*, which appeared in fifteen volumes between 1749 and 1767. He may be taken as the centre of a strong enthusiasm for natural history which characterized a great part of the eighteenth century, and found expression in the brilliant discoveries of workers like Réaumur, Roesel, De Geer, Schäffer, and Bonnet.

Buffon took all nature for his province; but from his date we have, apart from a few great workers, to deal with specialists, becoming more and more specialized as we approach to-day. Thus there is a marked division between the investigators of form and structure (morphologists) and the investigators of habit and function (physiologists). There have been, and are, many who may be cited as both, but the moods and methods of the two disciplines are quite different.