

certain function which also appears to partake of the nature of a deformity. The decrease sometimes goes so far as to leave nothing but the rudiment of what was possibly at an earlier period in the career of the species a very important organ or function. Conversely from the slightest nuclei in the animal organism, the most important functions have been known to develop with the changes in anatomical structure. There is also change in physiological action. The one implies the other. It will often be convenient to imply the anatomical change when only expressing the physiological change.

Evolution is a normal condition of life, and, therefore, the fluctuations in physiological action, provided they be merely a matter of greater or less intensity, are also a normal condition.

It is disease which accomplishes a change from one thing to another sometimes completely different, and the difference between the changes of evolution and of disease will be suggested in simple imagery by comparing an unusually developed muscle to a suppurating carcinoma. *En passant* it may be noted that some changes first produced by disease are afterwards retained, and, as it were, incorporated in the developing organism, which for long afterwards bears the vestiges of changes originally due to disease.

Without referring to the career of our own species from very early times, as not pertaining to this paper, the suppressed stadia of that career must be kept closely in mind, and also the tendency seen very clearly in individual members of the species to revert often to characteristics which had been very marked in some former stadium, but which at the time had almost entirely disappeared from the mass of the species. In other words, the long suppressed rudiment will in some isolated member of the species regain all its former strength. These are called reversions or survivals. Such instances very clearly point out how much the popular idea of proportion depends upon the momentary condition of the race.

In the eyes of our earlier progenitors we would appear physically as a race of monsters, hideously deformed, and beyond conception dreadful to behold. Our customs, too, would cause them utter repulsion, just perhaps as our customs or our habits of thought may in the future be regarded with repulsion by our remote posterity.

As our bodies and our mental qualities would be regarded with intense aversion both by the dim past and the dark future; as we are unpopular at both extremes, so it is only fair to say, we would ourselves shudder, I have no doubt, if we could obtain an intimate knowledge of what our race has been in the past or will be in the future. The dislike would be reciprocal in fact. This leads one to the conclusion that we do not like anything that is very much different from ourselves.

Much perversion is undoubtedly a survival of some earlier animal custom, to which the instincts of the individual revert, an instinct which lies latent in the mass of the species.