

to show that branches in the animal kingdom are founded upon different plans of structure, and for that very reason have embraced from the beginning representatives between which there could be no community of origin; that classes are founded upon different modes of execution of these plans, and therefore they also embrace representatives which could have no community of origin; that orders represent the different degrees of complication in the mode of execution of each class, and therefore embrace representatives that could not have a community of origin any more than the members of different classes or branches; that families are founded upon different patterns of form, and embrace representatives equally independent in their origin; that genera are founded upon ultimate peculiarities of structure, embracing representatives, which, from the very nature of their peculiarities, could have no community of origin; and that, finally, species are based upon relations and proportions that exclude, as much as all the preceding distinctions, the idea of a common descent.

As the community of characters among the beings belonging to these different categories arises from the intellectual connection which shows them to be categories of thought, they cannot be the result of a gradual material differentiation of the objects themselves. The argument on which these views are founded may be summed up in the following few words: species, genera, families, etc., exist as thoughts; individuals, as facts. It is presented at full length in the first volume of this work (pp. 137-168), where I have shown that individuals alone have a definite material existence, and that they are for the time being the bearers, not only of specific characteristics, but of all the natural features in which animal life is displayed in all its diversity; individuality being, in fact, the great mystery of organic life.

Since the arguments presented by Darwin in favor of a universal derivation, from one primary form, of all the peculiarities existing now among living beings, have not made the slightest impression on my mind, or modified in any way the views I have already propounded, I may fairly refer the reader to the paragraphs alluded to above as containing sufficient evidence of their correctness; and I will here only add a single argument, which seems to leave the question where I have placed it. Had Darwin or his followers furnished a single fact to show that individuals change, in the course of time, in such a manner as to produce, at last, species different from those known before, the state of the case might be different.¹ But it stands recorded now as before, that the animals known to the

¹ It seems to me that there is much confusion of ideas in the general statement, of the variability of species, so often repeated of late. If species do

not exist at all, as the supporters of the transmutation theory maintain, how can they vary? And if individuals alone exist, how can the differences