

correspondence of parts or organs based not so much on external likeness as on similarity of origin. By admitting the latter conception, the idea of origin, the rigidity of the purely structural classification was lost. Morphology became the science, not of fixed, but of flowing forms and structures. It is remarkable that Owen, in following up this line of reasoning, was pre-eminently attracted to the oracular writings of Oken, whose influence his great forerunner Cuvier had combated with all his

pendent to the first volume of his 'Hunterian Lectures,' as follows: "'Analogue'—A part or organ in one animal which has the same function as another part or organ in a different animal." "'Homologue'—The same organ in different animals under every variety of form and function." He then goes on to distinguish "special," "general," and "serial" homology. For a history of thought the important point in all these discussions is that, besides the similarity of structure and the sameness of function, relations and points of comparison of a different kind were introduced; that these were, with more or less clearness, traced to development; and that through this the genetic view, the doctrine of descent, was prepared by those who, like Owen, were least ready to accept it when it appeared in a definite form. In the light of this new view, of which the next chapter will treat, the whole vocabulary of the older morphologists required recasting. These older views, which traced homology to the existence of definite types, models, or patterns possessing a purely ideal existence, have been termed Platonic, inasmuch as in the philosophy of Plato the existence of a world of ideal forms or

archetypes served to explain whatever of order is found in the real world of separate things. "The term 'homology,'" says Prof. Ray Lankester, "belongs to the Platonic school, but is nevertheless used without hesitation by those who reject the views of that school. Prof. Owen . . . would understand by 'homologue' the same organ in different animals under every variety of form and function. . . . But how can the sameness of an organ under every variety of form and function be established or investigated? This is, and always has been, the stumbling-block in the study of homologies without the light of Evolutionism; for, to settle this question of sameness, an ideal 'type' of a group of organisms under study had to be evolved from the human mind, after study of the component members of the group; and then it could be asserted that organs might be said to be the 'same' in two animals which had a common representation in the ideal type" ('Annals and Mag. of Natural History,' 4th series, vol. vi., 1870, p. 34, &c.) See also Huxley in 'Life of Owen,' vol. ii. p. 303, &c.; and J. Arthur Thomson, 'The Science of Life,' p. 32 (1899).