

it belongs, stand in the closest causal connection with each other. I have endeavoured, in the second volume of the 'General Morphology,'⁴ to establish this theory in detail, as I consider it exceedingly important, and in my "Anthropogenesis" have discussed the subject with regard to man. As I have there shown, *ontogenesis, or the development of the individual, is a short and quick repetition (recapitulation) of phylogenesis, or the development of the tribe to which it belongs, determined by the laws of inheritance and adaptation*; by tribe I mean the ancestors which form the chain of progenitors of the individual concerned. (Compare my "Studies on the Gastræa Theory," 1877, p. 70.)

The agreement between many of the germinal forms of the higher animals and the developed forms of kindred lower animals is so striking that they were observed even by the earlier naturalists. Oken, Treviranus, and others drew attention to them as early as the beginning of our century. Meckel, in 1821, spoke of a "resemblance between the development of the embryo and the animal tribe." In 1828 Bär critically discussed the question, how far within a type or tribe (for instance, the vertebrates) the germinal forms of the higher animals pass through the permanent forms of the lower. However, there could, of course, be no actual understanding of this wonderful resemblance as long as the theory of descent had not become recognized. When Darwin, in 1859, at last accomplished this, he also, in his fourteenth chapter of his chief work, briefly referred to the great importance of the embryonic evidence. Still Fritz Müller was the first to discuss the subject fully and clearly, which he did in connection with the crustacea in his admirable work "On Darwin." I have myself given Müller's