

but whole libraries, with descriptions of individual species, and with most childish controversies as to whether these species are good, or tolerably good, and bad, or tolerably bad, without entering upon the discussion of the significance to be attached to the idea of species itself. If naturalists, instead of spending their time on these useless fancies, had duly studied cultivated organisms, and had examined the transmutation of the living forms, instead of the individual dead ones, they would not have been led captive so long by the fetters of Cuvier's dogma. But as cultivated organisms are so extremely inconvenient to the dogmatic conception of the permanence of species, naturalists to a great extent intentionally did not concern themselves about them, and even eminent naturalists have often expressed the opinion that cultivated organisms, domesticated animals, and garden plants are artificial productions of man, and that their formation and transformation could not decide anything about the nature of species and about the origin of the forms of species that live in a natural state.

This perverse view went so far that, for example, Andreas Wagner, a zoologist of Munich, quite seriously made the following ridiculous assertion: "Animals and plants in their wild state have been called into being by the Creator as distinctly different and unchangeable species; but in the case of domestic animals and cultivated plants this was not necessary, because he formed them from the beginning for the use of man. The Creator formed man out of a clod of earth, breathed the living breath into his nostrils, and then created for him the different useful domestic animals and garden plants, among which he thought well to save himself the trouble of distinguishing species." Unfortunately,