

The Project Gutenberg eBook of The Variation of Animals and Plants Under Domestication, Vol. I.

This ebook is for the use of anyone anywhere in the United States and most other parts of the world at no cost and with almost no restrictions whatsoever. You may copy it, give it away or re-use it under the terms of the Project Gutenberg License included with this ebook or online at www.gutenberg.org. If you are not located in the United States, you will have to check the laws of the country where you are located before using this eBook.

Title: The Variation of Animals and Plants Under Domestication, Vol. I.

Author: Charles Darwin

Release date: March 27, 2008 [eBook #24923]

Language: English

Credits: Produced by Steven Gibbs, Keith Edkins and the Online
Distributed Proofreading Team at <http://www.pgdp.net>

*** START OF THE PROJECT GUTENBERG EBOOK THE VARIATION OF ANIMALS AND PLANTS
UNDER DOMESTICATION, VOL. I. ***

Transcriber's note: A few typographical errors have been corrected. They appear in the text like this, and the explanation will appear when the mouse pointer is moved over the marked passage.

THE VARIATION OF ANIMALS AND PLANTS UNDER DOMESTICATION. BY CHARLES DARWIN, M.A., F.R.S., &c. IN TWO VOLUMES.—VOL. I. WITH ILLUSTRATIONS. LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET. 1868.

The right of Translation is reserved.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

ON THE ORIGIN OF SPECIES BY MEANS OF NATURAL SELECTION; or The PRESERVATION of FAVOURED RACES in the STRUGGLE for LIFE. Fourth Edition (*Eighth Thousand*), with Additions and Corrections. 1866. ... MURRAY.

A NATURALIST'S VOYAGE ROUND THE WORLD; or, A JOURNAL OF RESEARCHES into the NATURAL HISTORY and GEOLOGY of the COUNTRIES visited during the Voyage of H.M.S. Beagle, under the Command of Capt. FITZ-ROY, R.N. *Tenth Thousand*. ... MURRAY.

ON THE STRUCTURE AND DISTRIBUTION OF CORAL REEFS. ... SMITH, ELDER, & Co.

GEOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS ON VOLCANIC ISLANDS. ... SMITH, ELDER, & Co.

GEOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS ON SOUTH AMERICA. ... SMITH, ELDER, & Co.

A MONOGRAPH OF THE CIRRIPEDIA. With numerous Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo. ... HARDWICKE.

ON THE VARIOUS CONTRIVANCES BY WHICH BRITISH AND FOREIGN ORCHIDS ARE FERTILISED BY INSECTS; and on the GOOD EFFECTS of CROSSING. With numerous Woodcuts. ... MURRAY.

ON THE MOVEMENTS and HABITS of CLIMBING PLANTS. With Woodcuts. ... WILLIAMS & NORGATE.

LONDON: PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET, AND CHARING CROSS.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

{iii}

INTRODUCTION ... Page 1

CHAPTER I.

DOMESTIC DOGS AND CATS.

ANCIENT VARIETIES OF THE DOG—RESEMBLANCE OF DOMESTIC DOGS IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES TO NATIVE CANINE SPECIES—ANIMALS NOT ACQUAINTED WITH MAN AT FIRST FEARLESS—DOGS RESEMBLING WOLVES AND JACKALS—HABIT OF BARKING ACQUIRED AND LOST—FERAL DOGS—TAN-COLOURED EYE-SPOTS—PERIOD OF GESTATION—OFFENSIVE ODOUR—FERTILITY OF THE RACES WHEN CROSSED—DIFFERENCES IN THE SEVERAL RACES IN PART DUE TO DESCENT FROM DISTINCT SPECIES—DIFFERENCES IN THE SKULL AND TEETH—DIFFERENCES IN THE BODY, IN CONSTITUTION—FEW IMPORTANT DIFFERENCES HAVE BEEN FIXED BY SELECTION—DIRECT ACTION OF CLIMATE—WATER-DOGS WITH PALMATED FEET—HISTORY OF THE CHANGES WHICH CERTAIN ENGLISH RACES OF THE DOG HAVE GRADUALLY UNDERGONE THROUGH SELECTION—EXTINCTION OF THE LESS IMPROVED SUB-BREEDS.

CATS, CROSSED WITH SEVERAL SPECIES—DIFFERENT BREEDS FOUND ONLY IN SEPARATED COUNTRIES—DIRECT EFFECTS OF THE CONDITIONS OF LIFE—FERAL CATS—INDIVIDUAL VARIABILITY ... Page 15

CHAPTER II.

HORSES AND ASSES.

HORSE.—DIFFERENCES IN THE BREEDS—INDIVIDUAL VARIABILITY OF—DIRECT EFFECTS OF THE CONDITIONS OF LIFE—CAN WITHSTAND MUCH COLD—BREEDS MUCH MODIFIED BY SELECTION—COLOURS OF THE HORSE—DAPPLED—DARK STRIPES ON THE SPINE, LEGS, SHOULDERS, AND FOREHEAD—DUN-COLOURED HORSES MOST FREQUENTLY STRIPED—STRIPES PROBABLY DUE TO REVERSION TO THE PRIMITIVE STATE OF THE HORSE.

ASSES.—BREEDS OF—COLOUR OF—LEG- AND SHOULDER-STRIPES—SHOULDER-STRIPES SOMETIMES ABSENT, SOMETIMES FORKED ... Page 49

CHAPTER III.

PIGS—CATTLE—SHEEP—GOATS.

PIGS BELONG TO TWO DISTINCT TYPES, SUS SCROFA AND INDICA—TORF-SCHWEIN—JAPAN PIG—FERTILITY OF CROSSED PIGS—CHANGES IN THE SKULL OF THE HIGHLY CULTIVATED RACES—CONVERGENCE OF CHARACTER—GESTATION—SOLID-HOOLED SWINE—CURIOS APPENDAGES TO THE JAWS—DECREASE IN SIZE OF THE TUSKS—YOUNG PIGS LONGITUDINALLY STRIPED—FERAL PIGS—CROSSED BREEDS.

CATTLE.—ZEBU A DISTINCT SPECIES—EUROPEAN CATTLE PROBABLY DESCENDED FROM THREE WILD FORMS—ALL THE RACES NOW FERTILE TOGETHER—BRITISH PARK CATTLE—ON THE COLOUR OF THE ABORIGINAL SPECIES—CONSTITUTIONAL DIFFERENCES—SOUTH AFRICAN RACES—SOUTH AMERICAN RACES—NIATA CATTLE—ORIGIN OF THE VARIOUS RACES OF CATTLE. {iv}

SHEEP.—REMARKABLE RACES OF—VARIATIONS ATTACHED TO THE MALE SEX—ADAPTATIONS TO VARIOUS CONDITIONS—GESTATION OF—CHANGES IN THE WOOL—SEMI-MONSTROUS BREEDS.

GOATS.—REMARKABLE VARIATIONS OF ... Page 65

CHAPTER IV.**DOMESTIC RABBITS.**

DOMESTIC RABBITS DESCENDED FROM THE COMMON WILD RABBIT—ANCIENT DOMESTICATION—ANCIENT SELECTION—LARGE LOP-EARED RABBITS—VARIOUS BREEDS—FLUCTUATING CHARACTERS—ORIGIN OF THE HIMALAYAN BREED—CURIOUS CASE OF INHERITANCE—FERAL RABBITS IN JAMAICA AND THE FALKLAND ISLANDS—PORTO SANTO FERAL RABBITS—OSTEOLOGICAL CHARACTERS—SKULL—SKULL OF HALF-LOP RABBITS—VARIATIONS IN THE SKULL ANALOGOUS TO DIFFERENCES IN DIFFERENT SPECIES OF HARES—VERTEBRÆ—STERNUM—SCAPULA—EFFECTS OF USE AND DISUSE ON THE PROPORTIONS OF THE LIMBS AND BODY—CAPACITY OF THE SKULL AND REDUCED SIZE OF THE BRAIN—SUMMARY ON THE MODIFICATIONS OF DOMESTICATED RABBITS ... Page 103

CHAPTER V.**DOMESTIC PIGEONS.**

ENUMERATION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL BREEDS—INDIVIDUAL VARIABILITY—VARIATIONS OF A REMARKABLE NATURE—OSTEOLOGICAL CHARACTERS: SKULL, LOWER JAW, NUMBER OF VERTEBRÆ—CORRELATION OF GROWTH: TONGUE WITH BEAK; EYELIDS AND NOSTRILS WITH WATTLED SKIN—NUMBER OF WING-FEATHERS, AND LENGTH OF WING—COLOUR AND DOWN—WEBBED AND FEATHERED FEET—ON THE EFFECTS OF DISUSE—LENGTH OF FEET IN CORRELATION WITH LENGTH OF BEAK—LENGTH OF STERNUM, SCAPULA, AND FURCULA—LENGTH OF WINGS—SUMMARY ON THE POINTS OF DIFFERENCE IN THE SEVERAL BREEDS ... Page 131

CHAPTER VI.**PIGEONS—*continued.***

ON THE ABORIGINAL PARENT-STOCK OF THE SEVERAL DOMESTIC RACES—HABITS OF LIFE—WILD RACES OF THE ROCK-PIGEON—DOVECOT-PIGEONS—PROOFS OF THE DESCENT OF THE SEVERAL RACES FROM COLUMBA LIVIA—FERTILITY OF THE RACES WHEN CROSSED—REVERSION TO THE PLUMAGE OF THE WILD ROCK-PIGEON—CIRCUMSTANCES FAVOURABLE TO THE FORMATION OF THE RACES—ANTIQUITY AND HISTORY OF THE PRINCIPAL RACES—MANNER OF THEIR FORMATION—SELECTION—UNCONSCIOUS SELECTION—CARE TAKEN BY FANCIERS IN SELECTING THEIR BIRDS—SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT STRAINS GRADUALLY CHANGE INTO WELL-MARKED BREEDS—EXTINCTION OF INTERMEDIATE FORMS—CERTAIN BREEDS REMAIN PERMANENT, WHILST OTHERS CHANGE—SUMMARY ... Page 180

CHAPTER VII.

{v}

FOWLS.

BRIEF DESCRIPTIONS OF THE CHIEF BREEDS—ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF THEIR DESCENT FROM SEVERAL SPECIES—ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF ALL THE BREEDS HAVING DESCENDED FROM GALLUS BANKIVA—REVERSION TO

THE PARENT-STOCK IN COLOUR—ANALOGOUS VARIATIONS—ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE FOWL—EXTERNAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE SEVERAL BREEDS—EGGS—CHICKENS—SECONDARY SEXUAL CHARACTERS—WING-AND TAIL-FEATHERS, VOICE, DISPOSITION, ETC.—OSTEOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES IN THE SKULL, VERTEBRÆ, ETC.—EFFECTS OF USE AND DISUSE ON CERTAIN PARTS—CORRELATION OF GROWTH ... Page 225

CHAPTER VIII.

DUCKS—GOOSE—PEACOCK—TURKEY—GUINEA-FOWL—CANARY-BIRD—GOLD-FISH—HIVE-BEES—SILK-MOTHS.

DUCKS, SEVERAL BREEDS OF—PROGRESS OF DOMESTICATION—ORIGIN OF, FROM THE COMMON WILD-DUCK—DIFFERENCES IN THE DIFFERENT BREEDS—OSTEOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES—EFFECTS OF USE AND DISUSE ON THE LIMB-BONES.

GOOSE, ANCIENTLY DOMESTICATED—LITTLE VARIATION OF—SEBASTOPOL BREED.

PEACOCK, ORIGIN OF BLACK-SHOULDERED BREED.

TURKEY, BREEDS OF—CROSSED WITH THE UNITED STATES SPECIES—EFFECTS OF CLIMATE ON.

GUINEA-FOWL, CANARY-BIRD, GOLD-FISH, HIVE-BEES.

SILK-MOTHS, SPECIES AND BREEDS OF—ANCIENTLY DOMESTICATED—CARE IN THEIR SELECTION—DIFFERENCES IN THE DIFFERENT RACES—IN THE EGG, CATERPILLAR, AND COCOON STATES—INHERITANCE OF CHARACTERS—IMPERFECT WINGS—LOST INSTINCTS—CORRELATED CHARACTERS ... Page 276

CHAPTER IX.

CULTIVATED PLANTS: CEREAL AND CULINARY PLANTS.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS ON THE NUMBER AND PARENTAGE OF CULTIVATED PLANTS—FIRST STEPS IN CULTIVATION—GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF CULTIVATED PLANTS.

CEREALIA.—DOUBTS ON THE NUMBER OF SPECIES.—WHEAT: VARIETIES OF—INDIVIDUAL VARIABILITY—CHANGED HABITS—SELECTION—ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE VARIETIES.—MAIZE: GREAT VARIATION OF—DIRECT ACTION OF CLIMATE ON.

CULINARY PLANTS.—CABBAGES: VARIETIES OF, IN FOLIAGE AND STEMS, BUT NOT IN OTHER PARTS—PARENTAGE OF—OTHER SPECIES OF BRASSICA.—PEAS: AMOUNT OF DIFFERENCE IN THE SEVERAL KINDS, CHIEFLY IN THE PODS AND SEED—SOME VARIETIES CONSTANT, SOME HIGHLY VARIABLE—DO NOT INTERCROSS.—BEANS.—POTATOES: NUMEROUS VARIETIES OF—DIFFERING LITTLE, EXCEPT IN THE TUBERS—CHARACTERS INHERITED ... Page 305

CHAPTER X.

{vi}

PLANTS *continued*—FRUITS—ORNAMENTAL TREES—FLOWERS.

FRUITS.—GRAPES—VARY IN ODD AND TRIFLING PARTICULARS.—MULBERRY.—THE ORANGE GROUP—SINGULAR RESULTS FROM CROSSING.—PEACH AND NECTARINE—BUD-VARIATION—ANALOGOUS VARIATION—RELATION TO THE ALMOND.—APRICOT.—PLUMS—VARIATION IN THEIR STONES.—CHERRIES—SINGULAR VARIETIES OF.—APPLE.—PEAR.—STRAWBERRY—INTERBLENDING OF THE ORIGINAL FORMS.—GOOSEBERRY—STEADY INCREASE IN SIZE OF THE FRUIT—VARIETIES OF.—WALNUT.—NUT.—CUCURBITACEOUS PLANTS—WONDERFUL VARIATION OF.

ORNAMENTAL TREES—THEIR VARIATION IN DEGREE AND KIND—ASH-TREE—SCOTCH-FIR—HAWTHORN.

FLOWERS—MULTIPLE ORIGIN OF MANY KINDS—VARIATION IN CONSTITUTIONAL PECULIARITIES—KIND OF VARIATION.—ROSES—SEVERAL SPECIES CULTIVATED.—PANSY.—DAHLIA.—HYACINTH, HISTORY AND VARIATION OF ... Page 332

CHAPTER XI.

ON BUD-VARIATION, AND ON CERTAIN ANOMALOUS MODES OF REPRODUCTION AND VARIATION.

BUD-VARIATIONS IN THE PEACH, PLUM, CHERRY, VINE, GOOSEBERRY, CURRANT, AND BANANA, AS SHOWN BY THE MODIFIED FRUIT—IN FLOWERS: CAMELLIAS, AZALEAS, CHRYSANTHEMUMS, ROSES, ETC.—ON THE RUNNING OF THE COLOUR IN CARNATIONS—BUD-VARIATIONS IN LEAVES—VARIATIONS BY SUCKERS, TUBERS, AND BULBS—ON THE BREAKING OF TULIPS—BUD-VARIATIONS GRADUATE INTO CHANGES CONSEQUENT ON CHANGED CONDITIONS OF LIFE—CYTISUS ADAMI, ITS ORIGIN AND TRANSFORMATION—ON THE UNION OF TWO DIFFERENT EMBRYOS IN ONE SEED—THE TRIFACIAL ORANGE—ON REVERSION BY BUDS IN HYBRIDS AND MONGRELS—ON THE PRODUCTION OF MODIFIED BUDS BY THE GRAFTING OF ONE VARIETY OR SPECIES ON ANOTHER—ON THE DIRECT OR IMMEDIATE ACTION OF FOREIGN POLLEN ON THE MOTHER-PLANT—ON THE EFFECTS IN FEMALE ANIMALS OF A FIRST IMPREGNATION ON THE SUBSEQUENT OFFSPRING—CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY ... Page 373

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

{vii}

1. DUN DEVONSHIRE PONY, WITH SHOULDER, SPINAL, AND LEG STRIPES ... PAGE 56
2. HEAD OF JAPAN OR MASKED PIG ... 69
3. HEAD OF WILD BOAR, AND OF "GOLDEN DAYS," A PIG OF THE YORKSHIRE LARGE BREED ... 72
4. OLD IRISH PIG, WITH JAW-APPENDAGES ... 75
5. HALF-LOP RABBIT ... 108
6. SKULL OF WILD RABBIT ... 117
7. SKULL OF LARGE LOP-EARED RABBIT ... 117
8. PART OF ZYGOMATIC ARCH, SHOWING THE PROJECTING END OF THE MALAR-BONE, AND THE AUDITORY MEATUS, OF RABBITS ... 118
9. POSTERIOR END OF SKULL, SHOWING THE INTER-PARIETAL BONE, OF RABBITS ... 118
10. OCCIPITAL FORAMEN OF RABBITS ... 118
11. SKULL OF HALF-LOP RABBIT ... 119
12. ATLAS VERTEBRÆ OF RABBITS ... 121
13. THIRD CERVICAL VERTEBRÆ OF RABBITS ... 121
14. DORSAL VERTEBRÆ, FROM SIXTH TO TENTH INCLUSIVE, OF RABBITS ... 122
15. TERMINAL BONE OF STERNUM OF RABBITS ... 123
16. ACROMION OF SCAPULA OF RABBITS ... 123
17. THE ROCK-PIGEON, OR COLUMBIA LIVIA ... 135
18. ENGLISH POUTER ... 137
19. ENGLISH CARRIER ... 140
20. ENGLISH BARB ... 145
21. ENGLISH FANTAIL ... 147
22. AFRICAN OWL ... 149
23. SHORT-FACED ENGLISH TUMBLER ... 152
24. SKULLS OF PIGEONS, VIEWED LATERALLY ... 163
25. LOWER JAWS OF PIGEONS, SEEN FROM ABOVE ... 164
26. SKULL OF RUNT, SEEN FROM ABOVE ... 165
27. LATERAL VIEW OF JAWS OF PIGEONS ... 165
28. SCAPULÆ OF PIGEONS ... 167
29. FURCULÆ OF PIGEONS ... 167
30. SPANISH FOWL ... 226
31. HAMBURGH FOWL ... 228
32. POLISH FOWL ... 229
33. OCCIPITAL FORAMEN OF THE SKULLS OF FOWLS ... 261
34. SKULLS OF FOWLS, VIEWED FROM ABOVE, A LITTLE OBLIQUELY ... 262
35. LONGITUDINAL SECTIONS OF SKULLS OF FOWLS, VIEWED LATERALLY ... 263
36. SKULL OF HORNED FOWL, VIEWED FROM ABOVE, A LITTLE OBLIQUELY ... 265
37. SIXTH CERVICAL VERTEBRÆ OF FOWLS, VIEWED LATERALLY ... 267
38. EXTREMITY OF THE FURCULA OF FOWLS, VIEWED LATERALLY ... 268
39. SKULLS OF DUCKS, VIEWED LATERALLY, REDUCED TO TWO-THIRDS OF THE NATURAL SIZE ... 282
40. CERVICAL VERTEBRÆ OF DUCKS, OF NATURAL SIZE ... 283

{viii}

-
41. PODS OF THE COMMON PEA ... 328
 42. PEACH AND ALMOND STONES, OF NATURAL SIZE, VIEWED EDGEWAYS ... 337
 43. PLUM STONES, OF NATURAL SIZE, VIEWED LATERALLY ... 345
-

THE

{1}

VARIATION OF ANIMALS AND PLANTS UNDER DOMESTICATION.

INTRODUCTION.

The object of this work is not to describe all the many races of animals which have been domesticated by man, and of the plants which have been cultivated by him; even if I possessed the requisite knowledge, so gigantic an undertaking would be here superfluous. It is my intention to give under the head of each species only such facts as I have been able to collect or observe, showing the amount and nature of the changes which animals and plants have undergone whilst under man's dominion, or which bear on the general principles of variation. In one case alone, namely in that of the domestic pigeon, I will describe fully all the chief races, their history, the amount and nature of their differences, and the probable steps by which they have been formed. I have selected this case, because, as we shall hereafter see, the materials are better than in any other; and one case fully described will in fact illustrate all others. But I shall also describe domesticated rabbits, fowls, and ducks, with considerable fullness.

The subjects discussed in this volume are so connected that it is not a little difficult to decide how they can be best arranged. I have determined in the first part to give, under the heads of the various animals and plants, a large body of facts, some of which may at first appear but little related to our subject, and to devote the latter part to general discussions. Whenever I have found it necessary to give numerous details, in support of any proposition or conclusion, small type has been used. The reader will, I think, find this plan a convenience²; for, if he does not doubt the conclusion or care about the details, he can easily pass them over; yet I may be permitted to say that some of the discussions thus printed deserve attention, at least from the professed naturalist.

It may be useful to those who have read nothing about Natural Selection, if I here give a brief sketch of the whole subject and of its bearing on the origin of species.^[1] This is the more desirable, as it is impossible in the present work to avoid many allusions to questions which will be fully discussed in future volumes.

From a remote period, in all parts of the world, man has subjected many animals and plants to domestication or culture. Man has no power of altering the absolute conditions of life; he cannot change the climate of any country; he adds no new element to the soil; but he can remove an animal or plant from one climate or soil to another, and give it food on which it did not subsist in its natural state. It is an error to speak of man "tampering with nature" and causing variability. If organic beings had not possessed an inherent tendency to vary, man could have done nothing.^[2] He unintentionally exposes his animals and plants to various conditions of life, and variability supervenes, which he cannot even prevent or check. Consider the simple case of a plant which has been cultivated during a long time in its native country, and which consequently has not been subjected to any change of climate. It has been protected to a certain extent from the competing roots of plants of other kinds; it has generally been grown in manured soil, but probably not richer than that of many an alluvial flat; and lastly, it has been exposed to changes in its conditions, being grown sometimes in one district and sometimes in another, in different soils. Under such circumstances, scarcely a plant can be named, though cultivated³ in the rudest manner, which has not given birth to several varieties. It can hardly be maintained that during the many changes which this earth has undergone, and during the natural migrations of plants from one land or island to another, tenanted by different species, that such plants will not often have been subjected to changes in their conditions analogous to those which almost inevitably cause cultivated plants to vary. No doubt man selects varying individuals, sows their seeds, and again selects their varying offspring. But the initial variation on which man works, and without which he can do nothing, is caused by slight changes in the conditions of life, which must often have occurred under nature. Man, therefore, may be said to have been trying an experiment on a gigantic scale; and it is an experiment which nature during the long lapse of time has incessantly tried. Hence it follows that the principles of domestication are important for us. The main result is that organic beings thus

treated have varied largely, and the variations have been inherited. This has apparently been one chief cause of the belief long held by some few naturalists that species in a state of nature undergo change.

I shall in this volume treat, as fully as my materials permit, the whole subject of variation under domestication. We may thus hope to obtain some light, little though it be, on the causes of variability,—on the laws which govern it, such as the direct action of climate and food, the effects of use and disuse, and of correlation of growth,—and on the amount of change to which domesticated organisms are liable. We shall learn something on the laws of inheritance, on the effects of crossing different breeds, and on that sterility which often supervenes when organic beings are removed from their natural conditions of life, and likewise when they are too closely interbred. During this investigation we shall see that the principle of Selection is all important. Although man does not cause variability and cannot even prevent it, he can select, preserve, and accumulate the variations given to him by the hand of nature in any way which he chooses; and thus he can certainly produce a great result. Selection may be followed either methodically and intentionally, or unconsciously and unintentionally. Man may select and preserve each successive variation, with the distinct intention of improving and altering a breed, in accordance with a preconceived idea; and by thus adding up variations, often so slight as to be imperceptible by an uneducated eye, he has effected wonderful changes and improvements. It can, also, be clearly shown that man, without any intention or thought of improving the breed, by preserving in each successive generation the individuals which he prizes most, and by destroying the worthless individuals, slowly, though surely, induces great changes. As the will of man thus comes into play, we can understand how it is that domesticated breeds show adaptation to his wants and pleasures. We can further understand how it is that domestic races of animals and cultivated races of plants often exhibit an abnormal character, as compared with natural species; for they have been modified not for their own benefit, but for that of man.

In a second work I shall discuss the variability of organic beings in a state of nature; namely, the individual differences presented by animals and plants, and those slightly greater and generally inherited differences which are ranked by naturalists as varieties or geographical races. We shall see how difficult, or rather how impossible it often is, to distinguish between races and sub-species, as the less well-marked forms have sometimes been denominated; and again between sub-species and true species. I shall further attempt to show that it is the common and widely ranging, or, as they may be called, the dominant species, which most frequently vary; and that it is the large and flourishing genera which include the greatest number of varying species. Varieties, as we shall see, may justly be called incipient species.

But it may be urged, granting that organic beings in a state of nature present some varieties,—that their organization is in some slight degree plastic; granting that many animals and plants have varied greatly under domestication, and that man by his power of selection has gone on accumulating such variations until he has made strongly marked and firmly inherited races; granting all this, how, it may be asked, have species arisen in a state of nature? The differences between natural varieties are slight; whereas the differences are considerable between the species of the same genus, and great between the species of distinct genera. How do these lesser differences become augmented into the greater difference? How do varieties, or as I have called them incipient species, become converted into true and well-defined species? How has each new species been adapted to the surrounding physical conditions, and to the other forms of life on which it in any way depends? We see on every side of us innumerable adaptations and contrivances, which have justly excited in the mind of every observer the highest admiration. There is, for instance, a fly (*Cecidomyia*)^[3] which deposits its eggs within the stamens of a Scrophularia, and secretes a poison which produces a gall, on which the larva feeds; but there is another insect (*Misocampus*) which deposits its eggs within the body of the larva within the gall, and is thus nourished by its living prey; so that here a hymenopterous insect depends on a dipterous insect, and this depends on its power of producing a monstrous growth in a particular organ of a particular plant. So it is, in a more or less plainly marked manner, in thousands and tens of thousands of cases, with the lowest as well as with the highest productions of nature.

This problem of the conversion of varieties into species,—that is, the augmentation of the slight differences characteristic of varieties into the greater differences characteristic of species and genera, including the admirable adaptations of each being to its complex organic and inorganic conditions of life,—will form the main subject of my second work. We shall therein see that all organic beings, without exception, tend to increase at so high a ratio, that no district, no station, not even the whole surface of the land or the whole ocean, would hold the progeny of a single pair after a certain number of generations. The inevitable result is an ever-recurrent Struggle for Existence. It has truly been said that all nature is at war; the strongest ultimately prevail, the weakest fail; and we well know that myriads of forms have disappeared from the face of the earth. If then organic beings in a state of nature vary even in a slight degree, owing to changes in the surrounding conditions, of which we have abundant geological evidence, or from any other cause; if, in the long course of ages,

inheritable variations ever arise in any way advantageous to any being under its excessively complex and changing relations of life; and it would be a strange fact if beneficial variations did never arise, seeing how many have arisen which man has taken advantage of for his own profit or pleasure; if then these contingencies ever occur, and I do not see how the probability of their occurrence can be doubted, then the severe and often-recurrent struggle for existence will determine that those variations, however slight, which are favourable shall be preserved or selected, and those which are unfavourable shall be destroyed.

This preservation, during the battle for life, of varieties which possess any advantage in structure, constitution, or instinct, I have called Natural Selection; and Mr. Herbert Spencer has well expressed the same idea by the Survival of the Fittest. The term "natural selection" is in some respects a bad one, as it seems to imply conscious choice; but this will be disregarded after a little familiarity. No one objects to chemists speaking of "elective affinity;" and certainly an acid has no more choice in combining with a base, than the conditions of life have in determining whether or not a new form be selected or preserved. The term is so far a good one as it brings into connection the production of domestic races by man's power of selection, and the natural preservation of varieties and species in a state of nature. For brevity sake I sometimes speak of natural selection as an intelligent power;—in the same way as astronomers speak of the attraction of gravity as ruling the movements of the planets, or as agriculturists speak of man making domestic races by his power of selection. In the one case, as in the other, selection does nothing without variability, and this depends in some manner on the action of the surrounding circumstances on the organism. I have, also, often personified the word Nature; for I have found it difficult to avoid this ambiguity; but I mean by nature only the aggregate action and product of many natural laws,—and by laws only the ascertained sequence of events. {7}

In the chapter devoted to natural selection I shall show from experiment and from a multitude of facts, that the greatest amount of life can be supported on each spot by great diversification or divergence in the structure and constitution of its inhabitants. We shall, also, see that the continued production of new forms through natural selection, which implies that each new variety has some advantage over others, almost inevitably leads to the extermination of the older and less improved forms. These latter are almost necessarily intermediate in structure as well as in descent between the last-produced forms and their original parent-species. Now, if we suppose a species to produce two or more varieties, and these in the course of time to produce other varieties, the principle of good being derived from diversification of structure will generally lead to the preservation of the most divergent varieties; thus the lesser differences characteristic of varieties come to be augmented into the greater differences characteristic of species, and, by the extermination of the older intermediate forms, new species come to be distinctly defined objects. Thus, also, we shall see how it is that organic beings can be classed by what is called a natural method in distinct groups—species under genera, and genera under families.

As all the inhabitants of each country may be said, owing to their high rate of reproduction, to be striving to increase in numbers; as each form is related to many other forms in the struggle for life,—for destroy any one and its place will be seized by others; as every part of the organization occasionally varies in some slight degree, and as natural selection acts exclusively by the preservation of variations which are advantageous under the excessively complex conditions to which each being is exposed, no limit exists to the number, singularity, and perfection of the contrivances and co-adaptations which may thus be produced. An animal or a plant may thus slowly become related in its structure and habits in the most intricate manner to many other animals and plants, and to the physical conditions of its home. Variations in the organization will in some cases be aided by habit, or by the use and disuse of parts, and they will be governed by the direct action of the surrounding physical conditions and by correlation of growth.

On the principles here briefly sketched out, there is no innate or necessary tendency in each being to its own advancement in the scale of organization. We are almost compelled to look at the specialization or differentiation of parts or organs for different functions as the best or even sole standard of advancement; for by such division of labour each function of body and mind is better performed. And, as natural selection acts exclusively through the preservation of profitable modifications of structure, and as the conditions of life in each area generally become more and more complex, from the increasing number of different forms which inhabit it and from most of these forms acquiring a more and more perfect structure, we may confidently believe, that, on the whole, organization advances. Nevertheless a very simple form fitted for very simple conditions of life might remain for indefinite ages unaltered or unimproved; for what would it profit an infusorial animalcule, for instance, or an intestinal worm, to become highly organized? Members of a high group might even become, and this apparently has occurred, fitted for simpler conditions of life; and in this case natural selection would tend to simplify or degrade the organization, for complicated mechanism for simple actions would be useless or even disadvantageous.

In a second work, after treating of the Variation of organisms in a state of nature, of the Struggle for Existence and the principle of Natural Selection, I shall discuss the difficulties which are opposed to the theory. These difficulties may be classed under the following heads:—the apparent impossibility in some cases of a very simple organ graduating by small steps into a highly perfect organ; the marvellous facts of Instinct; the whole question of Hybridity; and, lastly, the absence, at the present time and in our geological formations, of innumerable links connecting all allied species. Although some of these difficulties are of great weight, we shall see that many of them are explicable on the theory of natural selection, and are otherwise inexplicable.

In scientific investigations it is permitted to invent any hypothesis, and if it explains various large and independent classes of facts it rises to the rank of a well-grounded theory. The undulations of the ether ~~affd~~ even its existence are hypothetical, yet every one now admits the undulatory theory of light. The principle of natural selection may be looked at as a mere hypothesis, but rendered in some degree probable by what we positively know of the variability of organic beings in a state of nature,—by what we positively know of the struggle for existence, and the consequent almost inevitable preservation of favourable variations,—and from the analogical formation of domestic races. Now this hypothesis may be tested,—and this seems to me the only fair and legitimate manner of considering the whole question,—by trying whether it explains several large and independent classes of facts; such as the geological succession of organic beings, their distribution in past and present times, and their mutual affinities and homologies. If the principle of natural selection does explain these and other large bodies of facts, it ought to be received. On the ordinary view of each species having been independently created, we gain no scientific explanation of any one of these facts. We can only say that it has so pleased the Creator to command that the past and present inhabitants of the world should appear in a certain order and in certain areas; that He has impressed on them the most extraordinary resemblances, and has classed them in groups subordinate to groups. But by such statements we gain no new knowledge; we do not connect together facts and laws; we explain nothing.

In a third work I shall try the principle of natural selection by seeing how far it will give a fair explanation of the several classes of facts just alluded to. It was the consideration of these facts which first led me to take up the present subject. When I visited, during the voyage of H.M.S. *Beagle*, the Galapagos Archipelago, situated in the Pacific Ocean about 500 miles from the shore of South America, I found myself surrounded by peculiar species of birds, reptiles, and plants, existing nowhere else in the world. Yet they nearly all bore an American stamp. In the song of the mocking-thrush, in the harsh cry of the carion-hawk, in the great candlestick-like opuntias, I clearly perceived the neighbourhood of America, though the islands were separated by so many miles of ocean from the mainland, and differed much from it in their geological constitution and climate.¹⁰ Still more surprising was the fact that most of the inhabitants of each separate island in this small archipelago were specifically different, though most closely related to each other. The archipelago, with its innumerable craters and bare streams of lava, appeared to be of recent origin; and thus I fancied myself brought near to the very act of creation. I often asked myself how these many peculiar animals and plants had been produced: the simplest answer seemed to be that the inhabitants of the several islands had descended from each other, undergoing modification in the course of their descent; and that all the inhabitants of the archipelago had descended from those of the nearest land, namely America, whence colonists would naturally have been derived. But it long remained to me an inexplicable problem how the necessary degree of modification could have been effected, and it would have thus remained for ever, had I not studied domestic productions, and thus acquired a just idea of the power of Selection. As soon as I had fully realized this idea, I saw, on reading Malthus on Population, that Natural Selection was the inevitable result of the rapid increase of all organic beings; for I was prepared to appreciate the struggle for existence by having long studied the habits of animals.

Before visiting the Galapagos I had collected many animals whilst travelling from north to south on both sides of America, and everywhere, under conditions of life as different as it is possible to conceive, American forms were met with—species replacing species of the same peculiar genera. Thus it was when the Cordilleras were ascended, or the thick tropical forests penetrated, or the fresh waters of America searched. Subsequently I visited other countries, which in all the conditions of life were incomparably more like to parts of South America, than the different parts of that continent were to each other; yet in these countries, as in Australia or Southern Africa, the traveller cannot fail to be struck with the entire difference of their productions. Again the reflection was forced on me that community of descent from the early inhabitants or colonists of South America would alone explain the wide prevalence of American types of structure throughout that immense area.

To exhume with one's own hands the bones of extinct and gigantic quadrupeds brings the whole question¹¹ of the succession of species vividly before one's mind; and I had found in South America great pieces of tesselated armour exactly like, but on a magnificent scale, that covering the pigmy armadillo; I had found great teeth like those of the living sloth, and bones like those of the cavu. An analogous succession of allied forms had been

previously observed in Australia. Here then we see the prevalence, as if by descent, in time as in space, of the same types in the same areas; and in neither case does the similarity of the conditions by any means seem sufficient to account for the similarity of the forms of life. It is notorious that the fossil remains of closely consecutive formations are closely allied in structure, and we can at once understand the fact if they are likewise closely allied by descent. The succession of the many distinct species of the same genus throughout the long series of geological formations seems to have been unbroken or continuous. New species come in gradually one by one. Ancient and extinct forms of life often show combined or intermediate characters, like the words of a dead language with respect to its several offshoots or living tongues. All these and other such facts seemed to me to point to descent with modification as the method of production of new groups of species.

The innumerable past and present inhabitants of the world are connected together by the most singular and complex affinities, and can be classed in groups under groups, in the same manner as varieties can be classed under species and sub-varieties under varieties, but with much higher grades of difference. It will be seen in my third work that these complex affinities and the rules for classification receive a rational explanation on the principle of descent, together with modifications acquired through natural selection, entailing divergence of character and the extinction of intermediate forms. How inexplicable is the similar pattern of the hand of a man, the foot of a dog, the wing of a bat, the flipper of a seal, on the doctrine of independent acts of creation! how simply explained on the principle of the natural selection of successive slight variations in the diverging descendants from a single progenitor! So it is, if we look to the structure of an individual animal or plant,² when we see the fore and hind limbs, the skull and vertebræ, the jaws and legs of a crab, the petals, stamens, and pistils of a flower, built on the same type or pattern. During the many changes to which in the course of time all organic beings have been subjected, certain organs or parts have occasionally become at first of little use and ultimately superfluous; and the retention of such parts in a rudimentary and utterly useless condition can, on the descent-theory, be simply understood. On the principle of modifications being inherited at the same age in the child, at which each successive variation first appeared in the parent, we shall see why rudimentary parts and organs are generally well developed in the individual at a very early age. On the same principle of inheritance at corresponding ages, and on the principle of variations not generally supervening at a very early period of embryonic growth (and both these principles can be shown to be probable from direct evidence), that most wonderful fact in the whole round of natural history, namely, the similarity of members of the same great class in their embryonic condition,—the embryo, for instance, of a mammal, bird, reptile, and fish being barely distinguishable,—becomes simply intelligible.

It is the consideration and explanation of such facts as these which has convinced me that the theory of descent with modification by means of natural selection is in the main true. These facts have as yet received no explanation on the theory of independent Creations; they cannot be grouped together under one point of view, but each has to be considered as an ultimate fact. As the first origin of life on this earth, as well as the continued life of each individual, is at present quite beyond the scope of science, I do not wish to lay much stress on the greater simplicity of the view of a few forms, or of only one form, having been originally created, instead of innumerable miraculous creations having been necessary at innumerable periods; though this more simple view accords well with Maupertuis's philosophical axiom "of least action."

In considering how far the theory of natural selection may be extended,—that is, in determining from how many progenitors the inhabitants of the world have descended,—we may conclude that at least all the members of the same class have descended from a single ancestor. A number of organic beings are included in the same class, because they present, independently of their habits of life, the same fundamental type of structure, and because they graduate into each other. Moreover, members of the same class can in most cases be shown to be closely alike at an early embryonic age. These facts can be explained on the belief of their descent from a common form; therefore it may be safely admitted that all the members of the same class have descended from one progenitor. But as the members of quite distinct classes have something in common in structure and much in common in constitution, analogy and the simplicity of the view would lead us one step further, and to infer as probable that all living creatures have descended from a single prototype.

I hope that the reader will pause before coming to any final and hostile conclusion on the theory of natural selection. It is the facts and views to be hereafter given which have convinced me of the truth of the theory. The reader may consult my 'Origin of Species,' for a general sketch of the whole subject; but in that work he has to take many statements on trust. In considering the theory of natural selection, he will assuredly meet with weighty difficulties, but these difficulties relate chiefly to subjects—such as the degree of perfection of the geological record, the means of distribution, the possibility of transitions in organs, &c.—on which we are confessedly ignorant; nor do we know how ignorant we are. If we are much more ignorant than is generally supposed, most of these difficulties wholly disappear. Let the reader reflect on the difficulty of looking at whole

classes of facts from a new point of view. Let him observe how slowly, but surely, the noble views of Lyell on the gradual changes now in progress on the earth's surface have been accepted as sufficient to account for all that we see in its past history. The present action of natural selection may seem more or less probable; but I believe in the truth of the theory, because it collects under one point of view, and gives a rational explanation of many apparently independent classes of facts.^[4]

CHAPTER I.

{15}

DOMESTIC DOGS AND CATS.

ANCIENT VARIETIES OF THE DOG—RESEMBLANCE OF DOMESTIC DOGS IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES TO NATIVE CANINE SPECIES—ANIMALS NOT ACQUAINTED WITH MAN AT FIRST FEARLESS—DOGS RESEMBLING WOLVES AND JACKALS—HABIT OF BARKING ACQUIRED AND LOST—FERAL DOGS—TAN-COLOURED EYE-SPOTS PERIOD OF GESTATION—OFFENSIVE ODOUR—FERTILITY OF THE RACES WHEN CROSSED—DIFFERENCES IN THE SEVERAL RACES IN PART DUE TO DESCENT FROM DISTINCT SPECIES—DIFFERENCES IN THE SKULL AND TEETH—DIFFERENCES IN THE BODY, IN CONSTITUTION—FEW IMPORTANT DIFFERENCES HAVE BEEN FIXED BY SELECTION—DIRECT ACTION OF CLIMATE—WATER-DOGS WITH PALMATED FEET—HISTORY OF THE CHANGES WHICH CERTAIN ENGLISH RACES OF THE DOG HAVE GRADUALLY UNDERGONE THROUGH SELECTION—EXTINCTION OF THE LESS IMPROVED SUB-BREEDS.

CATS, CROSSED WITH SEVERAL SPECIES—DIFFERENT BREEDS FOUND ONLY IN SEPARATED COUNTRIES—DIRECT EFFECTS OF THE CONDITIONS OF LIFE—FERAL CATS—INDIVIDUAL VARIABILITY.

The first and chief point of interest in this chapter is, whether the numerous domesticated varieties of the dog have descended from a single wild species, or from several. Some authors believe that all have descended from the wolf, or from the jackal, or from an unknown and extinct species. Others again believe, and this of late has been the favourite tenet, that they have descended from several species, extinct and recent, more or less commingled together. We shall probably never be able to ascertain their origin with certainty. Palaeontology^[5] does not throw much light on the question, owing, on the one hand, to the close similarity of the skulls of extinct as well as living wolves and jackals, and owing on the other hand to the great dissimilarity of the skulls of the several breeds of the domestic dogs. It seems, however, that remains have been found in the later^[6] tertiary deposits more like those of a large dog than of a wolf, which favours the belief of De Blainville that our dogs are the descendants of a single extinct species. On the other hand, some authors go so far as to assert that every chief domestic breed must have had its wild prototype. This latter view is extremely improbable; it allows nothing for variation; it passes over the almost monstrous character of some of the breeds; and it almost necessarily assumes, that a large number of species have become extinct since man domesticated the dog; whereas we plainly see that the members of the dog-family are extirpated by human agency with much difficulty; even so recently as 1710 the wolf existed in so small an island as Ireland.

The reasons which have led various authors to infer that our dogs have descended from more than one wild species are as follows.^[6] Firstly, the great difference between the several breeds; but this will appear of comparatively little weight, after we shall have seen how great are the differences between the several races of various domesticated animals which certainly have descended from a single parent-form. Secondly, the more important fact that, at the most anciently known historical periods, several breeds of the dog existed, very unlike each other, and closely resembling or identical with breeds still alive.

We will briefly run back through the historical records. The materials are remarkably deficient between the fourteenth century and the Roman classical period.^[7] At this earlier period various breeds, namely hounds, house-dogs, lapdogs, &c., existed; but as Dr. Walther has remarked it is impossible to recognise the greater number with any certainty. Youatt, however, gives a drawing of a beautiful sculpture of two greyhound puppies from the Villa of Antoninus. On an Assyrian monument, about 640 B.C., an enormous mastiff^[8] is figured; and according to Sir H. Rawlinson (as I was informed at the British Museum), similar dogs are still imported into this same country. I have looked through the magnificent works of Lepsius and Rosellini, and on the monuments from the fourth to the twelfth dynasties (*i.e.* from about 3400 B.C. to 2100 B.C.) several varieties of the dog are represented; most of them are allied to greyhounds; at the later of these periods a dog resembling a hound is figured, with drooping ears, but with a longer back and more pointed head than in our hounds. There is, also, a turnspit, with short and crooked legs, closely resembling the existing variety; but this kind of

monstrosity is so common with various animals, as with the ancon sheep, and even, according to Rengger, with jaguars in Paraguay, that it would be rash to look at the monumental animal as the parent of all our turnspits: Colonel Sykes^[9] also has described an Indian Pariah dog as presenting the same monstrous character. The most ancient dog represented on the Egyptian monuments is one of the most singular; it resembles a greyhound, but has long pointed ears and a short curled tail: a closely allied variety still exists in Northern Africa; for Mr. E. Vernon Harcourt^[10] states that the Arab boar-hound is "an eccentric hieroglyphic animal, such as Cheops once hunted with, somewhat resembling the rough Scotch deer-hound; their tails are curled tight round on their backs, and their ears stick out at right angles." With this most ancient variety a pariah-like dog coexisted.^{18}

We thus see that, at a period between four and five thousand years ago, various breeds, viz. pariah dogs, greyhounds, common hounds, mastiffs, house-dogs, lapdogs, and turnspits, existed, more or less closely resembling our present breeds. But there is not sufficient evidence that any of these ancient dogs belonged to the same identical sub-varieties with our present dogs.^[11] As long as man was believed to have existed on this earth only about 6000 years, this fact of the great diversity of the breeds at so early a period was an argument of much weight that they had proceeded from several wild sources, for there would not have been sufficient time for their divergence and modification. But now that we know, from the discovery of flint tools embedded with the remains of extinct animals in districts which have since undergone great geographical changes, that man has existed for an incomparably longer period, and bearing in mind that the most barbarous nations possess domestic dogs, the argument from insufficient time falls away greatly in value.

Long before the period of any historical record the dog was domesticated in Europe. In the Danish Middens of the Neolithic or Newer Stone period, bones of a canine animal are imbedded, and Steenstrup ingeniously argues that these belonged to a domestic dog; for a very large proportion of the bones of birds preserved in the refuse, consists of long bones, which it was found on trial dogs cannot devour.^[12] This ancient dog was succeeded in Denmark during the Bronze period by a larger kind, presenting certain differences, and this again during the Iron period, by a still larger kind. In Switzerland, we hear from Prof. Rütimeyer,^[13] that during the Neolithic period a domesticated dog of middle size existed, which in its skull was about equally remote from the wolf and jackal, and partook of the characters of our hounds and setters or spaniels (Jagdhund und Wachtelhund). Rütimeyer insists strongly on the constancy of form during a very long period of time of this the most ancient known dog. During the Bronze period a larger dog appeared, and this closely resembled in its jaw a dog of the same age in Denmark. Remains of two notably distinct varieties of the dog were found by Schmerling in a cave;^[14] but their age cannot be positively determined.

The existence of a single race, remarkably constant in form during the whole Neolithic period, is an interesting fact in contrast with what we see of the changes which the races underwent during the period of the successive Egyptian monuments, and in contrast with our existing dogs. The character of this animal during the Neolithic period, as given by Rütimeyer, supports De Blainville's view that our varieties have descended from an unknown and extinct form. But we should not forget that we know nothing with respect to the antiquity of man in the warmer parts of the world. The succession of the different kinds of dogs in Switzerland and Denmark is thought to be due to the immigration of conquering tribes bringing with them their dogs; and this view accords with the belief that different wild canine animals were domesticated in different regions. Independently of the immigration of new races of man, we know from the wide-spread presence of bronze, composed of an alloy of tin, how much commerce there must have been throughout Europe at an extremely remote period, and dogs would then probably have been bartered. At the present time, amongst the savages of the interior of Guiana, the Taruma Indians are considered the best trainers of dogs, and possess a large breed, which they barter at a high price with other tribes.^[15]

The main argument in favour of the several breeds of the dog being the descendants of distinct wild stock, is their resemblance in various countries to distinct species still existing there. It must, however, be admitted that the comparison between the wild and domesticated animal has been made but in few cases with sufficient exactness. Before entering on details, it will be well to show that there is no a priori difficulty in the belief that several canine species have been domesticated; for there is much difficulty in this respect with some other domestic quadrupeds and birds. Members of the dog family inhabit nearly the whole world; and several species agree pretty closely in habits and structure with our several domesticated dogs. Mr. Galton has shown^[16] how fond savages are of keeping and taming animals of all kinds. Social animals are the most easily subjugated by man, and several species of Canidæ hunt in packs. It deserves notice, as bearing on other animals as well as on the dog, that at an extremely ancient period, when man first entered any country, the animals living there would have felt no instinctive or inherited fear of him, and would consequently have been tamed far more easily than at present. For instance, when the Falkland Islands were first visited by man, the large wolf-like dog (*Canis*

antarcticus) fearlessly came to meet Byron's sailors, who, mistaking this ignorant curiosity for ferocity, ran into the water to avoid them: even recently a man, by holding a piece of meat in one hand and a knife in the other, could sometimes stick them at night. On an island in the Sea of Aral, when first discovered by Butakoff, the saigak antelopes, which are "generally very timid and watchful, did not fly from us, but on the contrary looked at us with a sort of curiosity." So, again, on the shores of the Mauritius, the manatee was not at first in the least afraid of man, and thus it has been in several quarters of the world with seals and the morse. I have elsewhere shown^[17] how slowly the native birds of several islands have acquired and inherited a salutary dread of man: at the Galapagos Archipelago I pushed with the muzzle of my gun hawks from a branch, and held out a pitcher of water for other birds to alight on and drink. Quadrupeds and birds which have seldom been disturbed by man, dread him no more than do our English birds the cows or horses grazing in the fields.

It is a more important consideration that several canine species evince (as will be shown in a future chapter) no strong repugnance or inability to breed under confinement; and the incapacity to breed under confinement is one of the commonest bars to domestication. Lastly, savages set the highest value, as we shall see in the chapter on Selection, on dogs: even half-tamed animals are highly useful to them: the Indians of North America cross their half-wild dogs with wolves, and thus render them even wilder than before, but bolder: the savages of Guiana catch and partially tame and use the whelps of two wild species of *Canis*, as do the savages of Australia those of the wild Dingo. Mr. Philip King informs me that he once trained a wild Dingo puppy to drive cattle, and found it very useful. From these several considerations we see that there is no difficulty in believing that man might have domesticated various canine species in different countries. It would indeed have been a strange fact if one species alone had been domesticated throughout the world.

We will now enter into details. The accurate and sagacious Richardson says, "The resemblance between the Northern American wolves (*Canis lupus, var. occidentalis*) and the domestic dogs of the Indians is so great that the size and strength of the wolf seems to be the only difference. I have more than once mistaken a band of wolves for the dogs of a party of Indians; and the howl of the animals of both species is prolonged so exactly in the same key that even the practised ear of the Indian fails at times to discriminate them." He adds that the more northern Esquimaux dogs are not only extremely like the grey wolves of the Arctic circle in form and colour, but also nearly equal them in size. Dr. Kane has often seen in his teams of sledge-dogs the oblique eye (a character on which some naturalists lay great stress), the drooping tail, and scared look of the wolf. In disposition the Esquimaux dogs differ little from wolves, and, according to Dr. Hayes, they are capable of no attachment to man, and are so savage, that when hungry they will attack even their masters. According to Kane they readily become feral. Their affinity is so close with wolves that they frequently cross with them, and the Indians take the whelps of wolves "to improve the breed of their dogs." The half-bred wolves sometimes (Lamare-Picquot) cannot be tamed, "though this case is rare;" but they do not become thoroughly well broken in till the second or third generation. These facts show that there can be but little, if any, sterility between the Esquimaux dog and the wolf, for otherwise they would not be used to improve the breed. As Dr. Hayes says of these dogs, "reclaimed wolves they doubtless are."^[18]

North America is inhabited by a second kind of wolf, the prairie-wolf (*Canis latrans*), which is now looked at by all naturalists as specifically distinct from the common wolf; and is, according to Mr. J. K. Lord, in some respects intermediate in habits between a wolf and a fox. Sir J. Richardson, after describing the Hare Indian dog, which differs in many respects from the Esquimaux dog, says, "It bears the same relation to the prairie wolf that the Esquimaux dog does to the great grey wolf." He could, in fact, detect no marked difference between them; and Messrs. Nott and Gliddon give additional details showing their close resemblance. The dogs derived from the above two aboriginal sources cross together and with the wild wolves, at least with the *C. occidentalis*, and with European dogs. In Florida, according to Bartram, the black wolf-dog of the Indians differs in nothing from the wolves of that country except in barking.^[19]

Turning to the southern parts of the New World, Columbus found two kinds of dogs in the West Indies; and Fernandez^[20] describes three in Mexico: some of these native dogs were dumb—that is, did not bark. In Guiana it has been known since the time of Buffon that the natives cross their dogs with an aboriginal species, apparently the *Canis cancrivorus*. Sir R. Schomburgk, who has so carefully explored these regions, writes to me, "I have been repeatedly told by the Arawaak Indians, who reside near the coast, that they cross their dogs with a wild species to improve the breed, and individual dogs have been shown to me which certainly resembled the *C. cancrivorus* much more than the common breed. It is but seldom that the Indians keep the *C. cancrivorus* for domestic purposes, nor is the Ai, another species of wild dog, and which I consider to be identical with the *Dusicyon silvestris* of H. Smith, now much used by the Arecunas for the purpose of hunting. The dogs of the Taruma Indians are quite distinct, and resemble Buffon's St. Domingo greyhound." It thus

appears that the natives of Guiana have partially domesticated two aboriginal species, and still cross their dogs with them; these two species belong to a quite different type from the North American and European wolves. A careful observer, Rengger,^[21] gives reasons for believing that a hairless dog was domesticated when America was first visited by Europeans: some of these dogs in Paraguay are still dumb, and Tschudi^[22] states that they suffer from cold in the Cordillera. This naked dog is, however, quite distinct from that found preserved in the ancient Peruvian burial-places, and described by Tschudi, under the name of *Canis Ingæ*, as withstanding cold well and as barking. It is not known whether these two distinct kinds of dog are the descendants of native species, and it might be argued that when man first migrated into America he brought with him from the Asiatic continent dogs which had not learned to bark; but this view does not seem probable, as the natives along ~~the~~^[23] line of their march from the north reclaimed, as we have seen, at least two N. American species of Canidæ.

Turning to the Old World, some European dogs closely resemble the wolf; thus the shepherd dog of the plains of Hungary is white or reddish-brown, has a sharp nose, short, erect ears, shaggy coat, and bushy tail, and so much resembles a wolf that Mr. Paget, who gives this description, says he has known a Hungarian mistake a wolf for one of his own dogs. Jeitteles, also, remarks on the close similarity of the Hungarian dog and wolf. Shepherd dogs in Italy must anciently have closely resembled wolves, for Columella (vii. 12) advises that white dogs be kept, adding, "pastor album probat, ne pro lupo canem feriat." Several accounts have been given of dogs and wolves crossing naturally; and Pliny asserts that the Gauls tied their female dogs in the woods that they might cross with wolves.^[24] The European wolf differs slightly from that of North America, and has been ranked by many naturalists as a distinct species. The common wolf of India is also by some esteemed as a third species, and here again we find a marked resemblance between the pariah dogs of certain districts of India and the Indian wolf.^[25]

With respect to Jackals, Isidore Geoffroy Saint Hilaire^[26] says that not one constant difference can be pointed out between their structure and that of the smaller races of dogs. They agree closely in habits: jackals, when tamed and called by their master, wag their tails, crouch, and throw themselves on their backs; they smell^[27] at the tails of dogs, and void their urine sideways.^[28] A number of excellent naturalists, from the time of Güldenstädt to that of Ehrenberg, Hemprich, and Cretzschmar, have expressed themselves in the strongest terms with respect to the resemblance of the half-domestic dogs of Asia and Egypt to jackals. M. Nordmann, for instance, says, "Les chiens d'Awhasie ressemblent étonnamment à des chacals." Ehrenberg^[29] asserts that the domestic dogs of Lower Egypt, and certain mummied dogs, have for their wild type a species of wolf (*C. lupaster*) of the country; whereas the domestic dogs of Nubia and certain other mummied dogs have the closest relation to a wild species of the same country, viz. *C. sabbar*, which is only a form of the common jackal. Pallas asserts that jackals and dogs sometimes naturally cross in the East; and a case is on record in Algeria.^[30] The greater number of naturalists divide the jackals of Asia and Africa into several species, but some few rank them all as one.

I may add that the domestic dogs on the coast of Guinea are fox-like animals, and are dumb.^[29] On the east coast of Africa, between lat. 4° and 6° south, and about ten days' journey in the interior, a semi-domestic dog, as the Rev. S. Erhardt informs me, is kept, which the natives assert is derived from a similar wild animal. Lichtenstein^[30] says that the dogs of the Bosjemans present a striking resemblance even in colour (excepting the black stripe down the back) with the *C. mesomelas* of South Africa. Mr. E. Layard informs me that he has seen a Caffre dog which closely resembled an Esquimaux dog. In Australia the Dingo is both domesticated and wild; though this animal may have been introduced aboriginally by man, yet it must be considered as almost an endemic form, for its remains have been found in a similar state of preservation and associated with^[29] distinct mammals, so that its introduction must have been ancient.^[31]

From this resemblance in several countries of the half-domesticated dogs to the wild species still living there,—from the facility with which they can often be crossed together,—from even half-tamed animals being so much valued by savages,—and from the other circumstances previously remarked on which favour their domestication, it is highly probable that the domestic dogs of the world have descended from two good species of wolf (viz. *C. lupus* and *C. latrans*), and from two or three other doubtful species of wolves (namely, the European, Indian, and North African forms); from at least one or two South American canine species; from several races or species of the jackal; and perhaps from one or more extinct species. Those authors who attribute great influence to the action of climate by itself may thus account for the resemblance of the domesticated dogs and native animals in the same countries; but I know of no facts supporting the belief in so powerful an action of climate.

It cannot be objected to the view of several canine species having been anciently domesticated, that these animals are tamed with difficulty: facts have been already given on this head, but I may add that the young of the *Canis primævus* of India were tamed by Mr. Hodgson,^[32] and became as sensible to caresses, and manifested as much intelligence, as any sporting dog of the same age. There is not much difference, as we have already shown and shall immediately further see, in habits between the domestic dogs of the North American Indians and the wolves of that country, or between the Eastern pariah dogs and jackals, or between the dogs which have run wild in various countries and the several natural species of the family. The habit of barking, however, which is almost universal with domesticated dogs, and which does not characterise a single^[33] natural species of the family, seems an exception; but this habit is soon lost and soon reacquired. The case of the wild dogs on the island of Juan Fernandez having become dumb has often been quoted, and there is reason to believe^[33] that the dumbness ensued in the course of thirty-three years; on the other hand, dogs taken from this island by Ulloa slowly reacquired the habit of barking. The Mackenzie-river dogs, of the *Canis latrans* type, when brought to England, never learned to bark properly; but one born in the Zoological Gardens^[34] "made his voice sound as loudly as any other dog of the same age and size." According to Professor Nillson,^[35] a wolf-whelp reared by a bitch barks. I. Geoffroy Saint Hilaire exhibited a jackal which barked with the same tone as any common dog.^[36] An interesting account has been given by Mr. G. Clarke^[37] of some dogs run wild on Juan de Nova, in the Indian Ocean; "they had entirely lost the faculty of barking; they had no inclination for the company of other dogs, nor did they acquire their voice," during a captivity of several months. On the island they "congregate in vast packs, and catch sea-birds with as much address as foxes could display." The feral dogs of La Plata have not become dumb; they are of large size, hunt single or in packs, and burrow holes for their young.^[38] In these habits the feral dogs of La Plata resemble wolves and jackals; both of which hunt either singly or in packs, and burrow holes.^[39] These feral dogs have not become uniform in colour on Juan Fernandez, Juan de Nova, or La Plata.^[40] In Cuba the feral dogs are described by Poeppig as nearly all mouse-coloured, with short ears and light-blue eyes. In St. Domingo, Col. Ham. Smith says^[41] that the feral dogs^[28] are very large, like greyhounds, of a uniform pale blue-ash, with small ears, and large light-brown eyes. Even the wild Dingo, though so anciently naturalised in Australia, "varies considerably in colour," as I am informed by Mr. P. P. King: a half-bred Dingo reared in England^[42] showed signs of wishing to burrow.

From the several foregoing facts we see that reversion in the feral state gives no indication of the colour or size of the aboriginal parent-species. One fact, however, with respect to the colouring of domestic dogs, I at one time hoped might have thrown some light on their origin; and it is worth giving, as showing how colouring follows laws, even in so anciently and thoroughly domesticated an animal as the dog. Black dogs with tan-coloured feet, whatever breed they may belong to, almost invariably have a tan-coloured spot on the upper and inner corners of each eye, and their lips are generally thus coloured. I have seen only two exceptions to this rule, namely, in a spaniel and terrier. Dogs of a light-brown colour often have a lighter, yellowish-brown spot over the eyes; sometimes the spot is white, and in a mongrel terrier the spot was black. Mr. Waring kindly examined for me a stud of fifteen greyhounds in Suffolk: eleven of them were black, or black and white, or brindled, and these had no eye-spots; but three were red and one slaty-blue, and these four had dark-coloured spots over their eyes. Although the spots thus sometimes differ in colour, they strongly tend to be tan-coloured; this is proved by my having seen four spaniels, a setter, two Yorkshire shepherd dogs, a large mongrel, and some fox-hounds, coloured black and white, with not a trace of tan-colour, excepting the spots over the eyes, and sometimes a little on the feet. These latter cases, and many others, show plainly that the colour of the feet and the eye-spots are in some way correlated. I have noticed, in various breeds, every gradation, from the whole face being tan-coloured, to a complete ring round the eyes, to a minute spot over the inner and upper corners. The spots occur in various sub-breeds of terriers and spaniels; in setters; in hounds of various kinds, including the turnspit-like German badger-hound; in shepherd dogs; in a mongrel, of which neither parent had the spots; in one pure bulldog, though the spots were in this case almost white; and in greyhounds,—but true black-and-tan greyhounds are excessively rare; nevertheless I have been assured by Mr. Warwick, that one ran at the Caledonian Champion meeting of April, 1860, and was "marked precisely like a black-and-tan terrier." Mr. Swinhoe at my request looked at the dogs in China, at Amoy, and he soon noticed a brown dog with yellow spots over the eyes. Colonel H. Smith^[43] figures the magnificent black mastiff of Thibet with a tan-coloured stripe over the eyes, feet, and chaps; and what is more singular,^[44] he figures the Alco, or native domestic dog of Mexico, as black and white, with narrow tan-coloured rings round the eyes; at the Exhibition of dogs in London, May, 1863, a so-called forest-dog from North-West Mexico was shown, which had pale tan-coloured spots over the eyes. The occurrence of