PROBLEMS OF ANIMAL MORPHOLOGY

In choosing a subject for the address with which it is my duty, as president of this section, to trouble you, I have found myself in no small embarrassment. As one whose business it is to lecture and give instruction in the details of comparative anatomy, and whose published work, quaecunque sit, has been indited on typical and, as men would now say, old-fashioned morphological lines, I seem to stand self-condemned as a morphologist. For morphology, if I read the signs of the times aright, is no longer in favor in this country, and among a section of the zoological world has almost fallen into disgrace. At all events, I have been very frankly assured that this is the case by a large proportion of the young gentlemen whom it has been my fate to examine during the past two years; and, as this seems to be the opinion of the rising generation of English zoologists, and as there are evident signs that their opinion is backed by an influential section of their elders, I have thought that it might be of some interest, and perhaps of some use, if I took this opportunity of offering an apology for animal morphology.

It is a sound rule to begin with a definition of terms, so I will first try to give a short answer to the question “What is morphology?” and, when I have given a somewhat dogmatic answer, I will try to deal in the course of this address with two further questions: What has morphology done for zoological science in the past?
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