that, he had already adopted from Lamarck,1 whose many-sided genius has made a lasting impress on the history of natural science in quite a different direction, the broad morphological division of the animal kingdom into animals with or without backbone, uniting under the former designation the four first classes of Linnæus. The more we follow Cuvier in the development of his classifying attempts, the more we find the form, the figure, the external and internal structure, urged as the aspect from which the organisation of living creatures is to be considered. To him fixity of form is the everrecurring character of organised beings as distinguished from inorganic structures which depend on fixity of matter.2 The clearer enunciation of this fixity of form is accompanied in Cuvier's view by the rejection of an idea which, before him, had very largely governed the speculations of naturalists. This idea, by which Charles Bonnet has been immortalised in natural history, is the conception of a graduated scale according to which living creatures can be arranged—viz., the celebrated Échelle des Êtres, coupled with the axiom, "Natura non facit saltus." This idea Cuvier rejects as untenable, and introduces in the place of it the conception of distinct plans called later "types," according to which living beings are

more pointed enunciation of the types of the various classes was given by Lamarck in 1797 when he placed the animals with white blood as 'invertebrates' in opposition to those with vertebræ which expressions (à vertèbres and sans vertèbres) come from him" (ibid.,

^{1 &}quot;An indirect inducement for a | (El. iii. p. 156, &c.) and the extracts from it and from the 'Règne animal,' given in the first volume of this History, p. 129 and notes passim.

³ According to Carus ('Gesch. d. Zool.,' p. 615), the term "type," which became current later, was introduced by De Blainville, a philop. 612).

See Cuvier's 'Éloge of Haüy' sophical naturalist who held a kind of middle position between