CONSIDERED.

and standing of the bimana? Or .what, in the parallel case, have the Suctorii-the worms of Linnæus-to do in a question respecting the place and standing of the real Placoids? True it is that, according to one principle of classification, now grown somewhat obsolete, men and earthworms are equally red-blooded animals; true it is that, according to another principle of classification, the Placoids of Agassiz and the cartilaginous worms of Linnæus are equally Chondropterygii. The bimana and the earthworm have their red blood in common; the glutinous hag and the true Placoids have as certainly their internal cartilage in common; and if the fact of the red blood of the worm lowers in no degree the rank of the bimana, then, on the same principle, the fact of the internal cartilage of the glutinous hag cannot possibly detract from the standing of the true Placoid. In both cases they are creatures that entirely differ, - the earthworms from the bimana, and the cartilaginous worms from the Placoids; and the classification which tags them together, whether it be that of Aristotle or that of Cuvier, cannot be converted into a sort of minus quantity, of force enough to detract from the value and standing of the bimana in the one case, or of the true Placoids in the other. It is in no degree derogatory to the human family that earthworms possess red blood; it is in no degree derogatory to the true Placoids that the Suctorii possess cartilaginous skeletons.

Let the reader now mark the use which has been made, by the author of the "Vestiges," of the name and authority of Linnæus. "Linnæus," he states, "was so impressed by the low character of many of this order, (the *Chondropterygii*,) that he actually ranked them with worms." Now, what is the fact here? Simply that Linnæus had no such general order