

should not call artificial divisions by this name. The characters of artificial genera depend solely upon the taste of the worker and the convenience of separating into groups animals and plants. All species are considered to belong to the same natural genus which agree in structural characters, external and internal, or anatomical ones in the different stages, in transformation, in the manner of living. These definitions of a genus are accepted as well by naturalists who are strong Darwinians as those who oppose the development theory. In a prize essay of the Jena University, D. P. Mayer, a pupil of Prof. Haeckel, in a paper on the "Ontogeny and Phylogeny of Insects," enlarges this definition in so far as he asks for a conformity in the embryological characters. I believe no one will object that this definition is a good and exhaustive one; but if we attempt to use it in a special case we become bewildered by the astonishing amount of characters unknown to us, and the impossibility to make them out for our work. At present we know hardly well enough the external character of the imago. Of other characters our knowledge is merely fragmentary and often a *tabula rasa*. We may say that a century of hard work will not fill these gaps in our knowledge. It is obvious that we cannot wait till this enormous amount of work is done. And it is certain that naturalists will not and can not stop creating new genera.

Genera created with such a limited amount of knowledge will depend upon the experience and taste of the worker. Many of such genera will have to be modified or dropped by a farther advancing knowledge.

The most important question (what are generic characters?) is still unanswered.

The large literature and the difference of opinion emitted by prominent authorities seem to prove that a sufficient affirmative answer is impossible till our knowledge is further advanced. But here, as in other abstract questions, we can proceed in a negative manner by exclusion.

Genera consist of a number of related species. If we knew the character of the species, the specific character, we can by exclusion come nearer the character of the genus. Species differ by structural character, and as the species form the lowest degree of the classification, we can be sure that species must differ at least by minutest points of structure.

I think there is no objection of consequence possible. I know very well that differences in minuter points of structure have been considered as generic characters. But naturalists beginning with the construction and definition of the higher degrees of class, order, family, &c., used up all characters at hand, till, coming to genera, nothing was left but minute differences of structure; the simple consequence of using specific characters for generic ones was that nearly every species was considered to be a genus.

I said before that species must differ at least by minuter points of structure. The discovery which I mentioned before proves that structural characters of species are more important, and can by a different manner of living be changed in such a way as to represent forms which were formerly believed to belong to different genera. *Branchipus* and *Artemia*, belonging to the Phyllopod Crustacea, are represented by several species here and in Europe. The two genera are nearly related one to the other, and differ principally in the following points: *Artemia* has eight post-abdominal segments, the last one very long. *Branchipus* has nine post-abdominal segments, the last two of equal size. *Artemia* has three articulated claspers in the male; *Branchipus* two articulated claspers. *Artemia* is often propagated by Parthenogenesis, *Branchipus* never.

Nobody will deny that those characters of structure go very far beyond minuter points of structure, and are marked well enough to justify the separation sixty years ago by Dr. Leach. Now it is proved that not only the species of *Artemia* known up to-day from Europe, Asia and Africa, but even some species of *Branchipus* belong to one and the same genus and species. In the American fauna five species of *Artemia* and three of *Branchipus* are described; of course they will have to be studied again in a similar manner as the European ones. The two European species of *Artemia* are remarkably different. *Artemia salina* has a strongly bifid tail surrounded by 15 to 20 bristles and narrow gills; *Artemia mulhausenii* has a rounded tail without bristles and very large gills. This latter species lives in pools of a very concentrated salt water of 25° Beaumé; the other species in common salt water of about 8°. In 1871, a dam which surrounded a salt pool containing *Artemia mulhausenii*, broke down by accident, and the sea water washed in at the same time; *Ar-*

temia s
dam w
the po
A.

Artemi
tion, ti
fact wa
raised
the wat
counter
Artemi
that in
segment
only for
water v
media.

Mr
Cyclops,
about tl
ing the
to consi
possible
long as
We hav
points o
characte

Wha
lates. Si
as in the
"salt in
are Coleo
to other
changes
certainly
markable
we exclu

1. I
small on
a dozen,
appendag
veins of

2. T
is not a
and can
changing

3. T
4. T
principal

Havi
characteri
So fa
should be

1. T
2. T
3. T
locomotion
The