

ter; the *second* is that from Spiders to Insects (or Octapods to Hexapods), the two anterior feet in the former being mouth-organs in the latter. One of these cases occurs between the two higher divisions of *aereal* Articulates or Insecteans; and the other two between the two higher divisions of the foot-bearing *aquatic* Articulates or *Crustaceans*.

The *third* case is that from Quadrupeds to Man, the two anterior feet in the former being in man taken completely out of the locomotive series and given up to the cephalic series, to which series, moreover, they *structurally* belong.

Now there are numerous Tetradecapods with *prehensile* fore-legs, but they are no less Tetradecapods in type of structure and all their relations. These *prehensile* legs aid in capturing food; but they are no more part of the cephalic series than are the *prehensile* fore-feet of a squirrel. There are Decapods with *prehensile* fore-legs, which are none the less Decapods; and there are also inferior macrural species (certain shrimp-like kinds) which have the four outer mouth-organs foot-like in size and function, so that they have as many feet as the Tetradecapods; and yet they are Decapods in type of structure, and show no true approximation to the Tetradecapod type.

Among Quadrupeds, the fore-feet of the Carnivores are *prehensile*, and those of the Squirrels and Monkeys quite perfectly so; and yet these limbs are part of the locomotive series. Man stands alone among Mammals in having the fore-limbs, not only *prehensile*, but out of the inferior series, the posterior pair being the sole locomotive organs.

The question of the exact parallelism of this last of the three cases with the preceding two admits of arguments on both sides. But whichever way decided, it does not affect in the slightest degree our deductions under the principle of cephalization. It touches only one single argument on the question whether Man constitutes by himself a separate Order among Mammals, and this, in our view, not seriously. All must admit, whatever his views of the question, that this *ennobling* of the fore-limbs is one mark of that preëminence of cephalization which belongs to Man.

6. The necessity of an exact balancing of all characteristics bearing on grade, in order to arrive at correct results, is too obvious for an argument. If the inferior criterion is in any case made the superior one, only absurdities are reached. Our objector affords examples of this kind of error. Observing that narrow limits of variation, and a less tendency to run into bizarre forms, are set down as generally characteristic of a superior group, and as part of the evidence of the superiority of