

reasonable to infer that the egg which was to be developed when bathed in *water* should thus differ somewhat from one that was to be developed in the *air*; and also that such *aquatic* eggs should approach in constitution those of the true *aquatic* Vertebrates, or Fishes. We may safely conclude, further, that the method of development for eggs thus different in constitution, and at the same time of inferior grade, would necessarily differ from those of ordinary Reptiles, and differ by approximating to those of Fishes. Accordingly, in Amphibians there may be only that divergence from the method of making a Reptile that was required in order that a division of inferior Reptiles should exist characterized by a fish-like life in the young state.

The fact is that the *superstructures* (p. 184) do *not* widely differ. In the adult state the species are Reptiles in all essential structural characters:—they are air-breathing; they have imperfect circulation and, consequently, are cold-blooded; and outside or inside there are no fundamental differences in type that would require a separation from the Reptilian class. The divergence is small compared with that between typical Amphibians and Fishes.

Such considerations are sufficient to authorize the assertion that the evidence in favor of regarding Amphibians as Reptiles at least balances that on the other side, if it does not outweigh it.

Now add to the above the analogy drawn from other classes of Vertebrates, as presented in the paper referred to in the opening paragraph of this article:—that the class of Mammals has its *inferior* subdivision—the Oötocoids, or *semioviparous* species—intermediate between ordinary Mammals and the *oviparous* classes below; that the class of Birds, according to recent discoveries, has its *inferior* subdivision—the Erpetoids, or *Reptilian* species—between ordinary Birds and *Reptiles*; and that between ordinary Reptiles and the class below, or that of *Fishes*, there are the Amphibians, or *fish-like* Reptiles; also, that the grand distinction between semioviparous and ordinary Mammals is manifested in *their embryological development*, or their young state, as well as that between Amphibians and ordinary Reptiles; and the evidence becomes strong that if Oötocoids constitute a hypotypic subdivision of Mammals, so Amphibians constitute a hypotypic subdivision of Reptiles. It is not necessary to repeat at length the argument on this point, as the reader can easily refer to the former paper on the subject. This point is illustrated also in the following article in the same volume (Article I, On the Classification of animals based on the principle of Cephalization) by a wider range of analogies, showing that similar hypotypic groups constitute the lower subdivision in several departments of the animal kingdom.