

species resembling one another very closely, and exhibiting hardly any differences among themselves, excepting such as arise from age. This identity of the individuals of one and the same species is particularly striking among the Ctenophoræ. In this order, there are not even sexual differences among the individuals, as they are all hermaphrodites. In the Discophoræ proper, a somewhat greater diversity prevails. In the first place, we notice male and female individuals; and the difference between the sexes is quite striking in some genera, as, for instance, in *Aurelia*. Next, there occur frequent deviations among them in the normal number of their parts,—their body consisting frequently of one or two spheromeres more than usual, sometimes even of double the normal number, or of a few less. And yet year after year the same Discophoræ reappear upon our shores, with the same range of differences among their individuals. Among Hydroids, polymorphism prevails to a greater or less extent, besides the differences arising from sex. Few species have only one kind of individuals. Mostly the cycle of individual differences embraces two distinct types of individuals, one recalling the peculiarities of common *Hydræ*, the other those of *Medusæ*; but even the *Hydra* type of one and the same species may exhibit more or less diversity, there being frequently two kinds of *Hydræ* united in one and the same community, and sometimes even a larger number of heterogeneous *Hydræ*. And this is equally true, though to a less extent, of the *Medusa* type. Yet, among Siphonophoræ, there are generally at least two kinds of *Medusæ* in one and the same community. But, notwithstanding this polymorphism among the individuals of one and the same community genetically connected together, each successive generation reproduces the same kinds of heterogeneous individuals, and nothing but individuals, linked together in the same way. Surely, we have here a much greater diversity of individuals, born one from the other, than is exhibited by the most diversified breeds of our domesticated animals; and yet all these heterogeneous individuals remain true to their species, in one case as in the other, and do not afford the slightest evidence of a transmutation of species.

Would the supporters of the fanciful theories lately propounded, only extend their studies a little beyond the range of domesticated animals,—would they investigate the alternate generations of the *Aculephs*, the extraordinary modes of development of the *Helminths*, the reproduction of the *Salpæ*, etc., etc.,—they would soon learn that there are in the world far more astonishing phenomena, strictly circumscribed between the natural limits of unvarying species, than the slight differences produced by the intervention of men, among domesticated animals; and, perhaps, cease to be so confident, as they seem to be, that these differences are trustworthy indications of the variability of species. For my own part, I must emphatically declare that I do not know a single fact tending to show that species do vary