

the fixity and independence of species. And it is equally interesting to mark the causes which militated against the more general acceptance of his views, and which cast the 'Philosophie Zoologique' into oblivion. To the first question Lamarck has himself, in the introduction¹ to his great work, furnished us with the means of replying. He there tells us that when the real study of natural history began, and each of the different kingdoms of nature received the due attention of naturalists, animals with a backbone—viz., mammalia, birds, reptiles, and fishes—received the greater attention.² Being in general larger, with parts more developed and more easily determinable, they, as it were, obtruded themselves on the attention of man, for whom they are both more useful and more formidable. The other large group of animals, classed together first by Lamarck himself as "Invertebrates," are mostly very small, with organs and faculties less developed, and thus much further removed from man and his interests. Of this by far more numerous class of beings, those called insects had alone at the end of the former century received considerable attention, whereas all the others, classed together by Linnæus as "worms," formed a kind of chaos, an unknown land.

¹ Lamarck's later genetic views are contained in the 'Philosophie Zoologique,' which appeared in 1809, and was republished with a biographical notice by Charles Martin in 1873. I quote from this edition. His principal ideas are also summarised in the introduction to his great work, 'Histoire des Animaux sans Vertèbres' (1816), which in fact he represents as con-

taining the "pièces justificatives de ce que j'ai publié dans ma Philosophie Zoologique." This great work was republished in 1837 by Deshayes and Milne-Edwards. I quote from this edition, which is in three volumes.

² See 'Philosophie Zoologique,' Discours préliminaire, vol. i. p. 29; also 'Animaux sans Vertèbres,' Introduction, vol. i. p. 11.