scope, it became itself a scientific instrument which no longer hurried over its objects in flighty motion, but is disciplined by the intellect of the observer and forced into methodical work."[1] Similarly, no doubt, the increasing devotion to the pastime of sketching from life and nature in our days must have the effect of obliging the eyes of many persons to look stedfastly and carefully at the forms and outlines of things, and of thus training the artistic faculty.

It is, however, a remarkable fact that one of the greatest leaders in the morphological study of natural objects, Bichat, the great observer of membranes and tissues, despised the microscope, the instrument by which the sciences he founded were to benefit so enormously.

27. Morphology and classification.

The object of morphology, as distinct from that of classification, can be defined as the attempt to describe, and if possible to comprehend and explain, the relative similarity as well as the graduated differences of form and structure which natural objects present to our gaze. Although the study can be conducted on a large as well as on a small scale, these similarities and differences sooner made themselves felt in the comparatively smaller objects of living nature. These can, without apparent loss of their characteristic appearance and individuality, be collected and brought together, whereas a collection of minerals, with the exception of crystals and gems, always presents only fragments, and forces upon us the conviction that they can really be studied only in their habitation, *in situ*. The same conviction has indeed gradually

[1] Sachs, *loc. cit.*, p. 237.