this the es? All pecies?" striking cies; he separate I freely, ey were e multi-

ufficient original nave the of the d thousce or in ed, and ge and genus, iled to

ory, all ated on the unifferent opecies spread pairs, we posFor if n, the time in the sany are got a proves of the structure.

of the

ontact

cture,

according to its susceptibility to receive the impression, we have no right to look in that direction for dividing lines between Species, and the torture of conflicting uncertainty endured by conscientious men, in their efforts to arrive at a correct conclusion by that method about various forms. Whether they are Species or which is the Species and which is the and Variety, and where the line is to be drawn between them, is really deplorable, and is well voiced in the vigorous language of Darwin, when he says: - "After describing a set of forms as "distinct Species, tearing up my manuscript and making them one "Species, tearing that up and making them separate, and then "making them one again -as has often occurred to me-I have "gnashed my teeth, cursed Species, and asked what sin I had com-"mitted to be so punished?" And thus it is made abundantly manifest, that determination by structure is not necessarily a determination of Species at all, but only the defining of the differences between various forms, which may be improperly called Species; and that all this misery and conflict that is endured by Speciesmakers is quite uncalled for and unnecessary, for the differences are there, visible to the eye, and are easily described. The trouble comes in when the effort is made to decide just how much difference should be considered enough to make a Species, which is merely a matter of individual opinion, and of which there is an abundant diversity; and so it appears perfectly plain to me that the contention which has been going on for so many years under the head of the origin of Species is a mismomer; it is the origin of varieties that has been brought to view, and the ages yet to come will have ever to acknowledge their indebtedness to Darwin for the vast stores of facts which he has accumulated for their use on this subject.

In the American Naturalist for April, 1888, is an article by Mr. Chas. Morris, entitled "Intelligent Selection," in which he contends that man may have produced, in that way, as true Species as nature does by natural selection, and says "that Species have not "been produced by man is more an assertion than a demonstrated "fact," then claims that certain forms of pigeons and dogs might be "regarded as of specific value, or even generic, and says "if we take "the varieties of the dog, such wide differences in size, form and "habit, if found in Nature, would be at once accepted as well "defined Species." A perfectly true statement I believe, but one