

there is some correspondence between average size of structure and strength of life-system. But a comparison of the typical of the former with the degradational of the latter leads to very false results.

An approximation to the right ratio is obtained from a comparison of the degradational species of each; but this is of no importance in its bearing on the question, since vegetative growth is apt to give the greatest proportional enlargement to the *lowest* species.

These facts teach that relative size of body, or of brain, is no necessary test of relative rank. The ratio, in *bulk*, of 1:3 between the brain of an average Man and that of a gorilla tells nothing of the actual difference of life-system, or of brain-power. At page 70, in the last volume of this Journal, the relative *lineal* dimensions of Microsthenes and Megasthenes is estimated at 1:4, which gives, for the relative *bulk*, 1:64. If this be the typical ratio between the life-systems of the highest Microsthenes and highest Megasthenes, surely that between the highest Megasthenes and normal Man—he constituting a *distinct order* (see p. 341)—must be at least as great.

The same ratio of 1:4, as shown by the writer, is that for the mean size, lineally, of Tetracapods and Decapods, under Crustaceans. In two cases, then, consecutive orders differ by a like ratio, or approximately so, in dimensions. As has been remarked, deductions from mere size may be very erroneous; yet there is no reason, in either of the above cases, to suppose the ratio of life-systems less than that thus indicated. May not, therefore, some similar ratio exist between other analogous consecutive orders, where size does not manifest it,—as, for example, between Spiders and Insects? And is not the ratio a much greater one between the highest of Insecteans and highest of Crustaceans, since these subdivisions of Articulates are not orders but *classes*? Important results may flow from following out the idea here touched upon.

After the preceding explanations, I proceed to exhibit some of the relations of the higher groups in zoological classification, as they appear in the light of this subject of cephalization.

3. Classification of Animals.

1. *Subkingdoms*.—Of the four subkingdoms, first recognized by Cuvier and since by most zoologists, the Vertebrate, Articulate and Molluscan are typical, or of the true *animal-type*, and the Radiate is degradational, being *plant-like* in type. Using the terms alphetypic, betatypic and gammatypic *simply as a numbering of the grades of types* (see p. 334), their relations are as follows: